

# Den Europæiske Unions Tidende

# C 105 E



56. årgang

Dansk udgave

## Meddelelser og oplysninger

11. april 2013

---

<u>Informationsnummer</u>	Indhold	Side
---------------------------	---------	------

### IV Oplysninger

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

#### Europa-Parlamentet

FORESPØRGSLE TIL SKRIFTLIG BESVARELSE

2013/C 105 E/01

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

1

*(Se meddelelse til læseren)*

# DA

*Meddelelse til læseren*

Denne publikation indeholder forespørgsler til skriftlig besvarelse fra medlemmer af Europa-Parlamentet og svarene fra en EU-institution.

Den oprindelige sprogudgave af forespørgslen og svaret er anført før en eventuel oversættelse.

Det er muligt, at svaret i visse tilfælde er givet på et andet sprog end forespørgslen. Det afhænger af arbejds sproget i det udvalg, der er blevet anmodet om et svar.

Forespørgsler og svar offentliggøres i overensstemmelse med artikel 117 i Europa-Parlamentets forretningsorden.

Der er adgang til alle forespørgsler og svar gennem Europa-Parlamentets websted (Europarl) under overskriften parlamentariske spørgsmål og forespørgsler:

<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/da/parliamentary-questions.html>

**FORKORTELSER FOR DE POLITISKE GRUPPER**

PPE	Det Europæiske Folkepartis Gruppe (Kristelige Demokrater)
S&D	Gruppen for Det Progressive Forbund af Socialdemokrater i Europa-Parlamentet
ALDE	Gruppen Alliancen af Liberale og Demokrater for Europa
Verts/ALE	Gruppen De Grønne/Den Europæiske Fri Alliance
ECR	De Europæiske Konservative og Reformister
GUE/NGL	Den Europæiske Venstrefløjs Fællesgruppe/Nordisk Grønne Venstre
EFD	Gruppen for Europæisk Frihed og Demokrati
NI	Løsgængere

**DA**

## IV

(Oplysninger)

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

## EUROPA-PARLAMENTET

## FORESPØRGLER TIL SKRIFTLIG BESVARELSE

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

(2013/C 105 E/01)

Indhold	Side
<b>E-001612/12</b> by Niki Tzavela to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Food crisis in Yemen	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	15
English version .....	16
<b>E-001613/12</b> by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Declaration of the Commission on the distribution of food products to the most deprived persons in the Union	
Versiunea în limba română .....	17
English version .....	18
<b>E-001614/12</b> by Daciana Octavia Sârbu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Implications of ACTA for fundamental rights	
Versiunea în limba română .....	19
English version .....	20
<b>E-001615/12</b> by Bas Eickhout to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Transparency of NER300 project selection	
Nederlandse versie .....	21
English version .....	22
<b>E-001616/12</b> by Ana Gomes and Marita Ulvskog to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Deteriorating human rights situation in Ethiopia: anti-terrorism laws and the Charities and Societies Proclamation	
Versão portuguesa .....	23
Svensk version .....	25
English version .....	27
<b>P-001617/12</b> by Fiona Hall to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Internet freedom in Belarus	
English version .....	29

<b>E-001618/12</b> by Filip Kaczmarek to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Discriminatory bill in Uganda	
Wersja polska .....	30
English version .....	31
<b>E-001621/12</b> by Catherine Bearder to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Misuse of the Hague Convention in combination with Brussels II on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction	
English version .....	32
<b>E-001622/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Damage to agriculture in Apulia	
Versione italiana .....	33
English version .....	34
<b>E-001623/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Athens — Crisis and European aid plan	
Versione italiana .....	35
English version .....	37
<b>P-001625/12</b> by Rachida Dati to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Role of gas in Europe's energy mix by 2050	
Version française .....	39
English version .....	41
<b>P-001626/12</b> by Chris Davies to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Faulty breast implants	
English version .....	42
<b>E-001630/12</b> by Nicole Sinclair to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> iPads	
English version .....	43
<b>E-001631/12</b> by Nicole Sinclair to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> RTL/CLT-UFA	
English version .....	44
<b>E-001632/12</b> by Charalampos Angourakis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Installation and operation of wind turbines on Mount Vourinos, Siatista, Kozani	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	45
English version .....	46
<b>E-001633/12</b> by Georgios Papastamkos to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Protected Designation of Origin (PDO) Kalamata	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	47
English version .....	48
<b>E-001634/12</b> by Filiz Hakaeva Hyusmenova to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Energy saving light bulbs	
българска версия .....	49
English version .....	50
<b>E-001636/12</b> by Jens Rohde to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The right to strike	
Dansk udgave .....	51
English version .....	52
<b>E-001637/12</b> by Alexander Graf Lambsdorff to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Points of single contact	
Deutsche Fassung .....	53
English version .....	54



<b>E-001643/12</b> by Maria Badia i Cutchet, Alejandro Cercas and Inés Ayala Sender to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Mobilisation of the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) for the case of Spanair	
Versión española .....	55
English version .....	56
<b>E-001644/12</b> by François Alfonsi to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Simplifying funding for cultural projects	
Version française .....	57
English version .....	58
<b>E-001645/12</b> by Matteo Salvini to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Petrol in Italy	
Versione italiana .....	59
English version .....	60
<b>E-001646/12</b> by Matteo Salvini to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The professional status of denturists/clinical dental technicians	
Versione italiana .....	61
English version .....	62
<b>E-001647/12</b> by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Property rights and the situation in Venezuela	
Versione italiana .....	63
English version .....	64
<b>E-001648/12</b> by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Female genital mutilation in Europe	
Versione italiana .....	65
English version .....	66
<b>E-001649/12</b> by Lena Kolarska-Bobińska to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Allocation of promotional funds for bakery products	
Wersja polska .....	67
English version .....	68
<b>E-001650/12</b> by Edite Estrela to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Fiscal competition within the EU	
Versão portuguesa .....	69
English version .....	70
<b>E-001651/12</b> by Edite Estrela to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Portuguese government's decision to suspend new permits for renewable energies and cogeneration	
Versão portuguesa .....	71
English version .....	72
<b>E-001652/12</b> by Nuno Melo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Policies for market protection and job creation in the EU	
Versão portuguesa .....	73
English version .....	75
<b>E-001653/12</b> by Nuno Melo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Portuguese companies at risk due to lack of access to credit	
Versão portuguesa .....	76
English version .....	77
<b>E-001654/12</b> by Nuno Melo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Hospital waste	
Versão portuguesa .....	78
English version .....	79
<b>E-001655/12</b> by Nuno Melo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Brussels investigates Johnson & Johnson and Novartis as a potential cartel	
Versão portuguesa .....	80
English version .....	81

<b>E-001658/12</b> by Nuno Melo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Malaria outbreak in Greece	
Versão portuguesa .....	82
English version .....	83
<b>E-001659/12</b> by Nuno Melo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Copper stolen through Chinese networks	
Versão portuguesa .....	84
English version .....	85
<b>E-001661/12</b> by Nuno Melo to the Council	
<i>Subject:</i> Van Rompuy in favour of restricting sovereignty in countries that fail to meet obligations	
Versão portuguesa .....	86
English version .....	87
<b>E-001665/12</b> by Ioan Enciu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Racist and discriminatory website promoted by the Dutch Freedom Party (PVV)	
Versiunea în limba română .....	88
English version .....	89
<b>P-001666/12</b> by Iliana Ivanova to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Discriminatory attitude of Netherlands website towards Eastern Europeans	
българска версия .....	90
English version .....	91
<b>E-001667/12</b> by Mario Borghezio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Lactalis and others against Basque milk producers	
Versione italiana .....	92
English version .....	93
<b>E-001668/12</b> by Nuno Melo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Investigational medicinal product may reduce the risk of breast cancer by 38 %	
Versão portuguesa .....	94
English version .....	95
<b>E-001669/12</b> by Nuno Melo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> New drug — Krokodil	
Versão portuguesa .....	96
English version .....	97
<b>E-001670/12</b> by Nicole Sinclair to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> EU property transactions	
English version .....	98
<b>E-001671/12</b> by Nicole Sinclair to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Commonwealth Heads of Government Conference	
English version .....	99
<b>E-001672/12</b> by Nicole Sinclair to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Grants to the Institute for Global Financial Integrity (IGFI)	
English version .....	100
<b>P-001673/12</b> by Paweł Robert Kowal to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Transparency of negotiations concerning the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA) in Member States	
Wersja polska .....	101
English version .....	102
<b>E-001674/12</b> by Linda McAvan to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Children shot in Gaza	
English version .....	103
<b>E-001675/12</b> by Julie Girling to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — 'Children of the Gravel' — Gaza	
English version .....	103

<b>E-001739/12</b> by Graham Watson to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — ‘Children of the Gravel’ and shootings into Gaza	
English version .....	103
<b>E-001676/12</b> by Sophia in 't Veld, Nathalie Griesbeck, Renate Weber, Louis Michel, Sonia Alfano, Sarah Ludford and Cecilia Wikström to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Applications for asylum in Canada by Hungarians	
Version française .....	105
Versione italiana .....	106
Nederlandse versie .....	107
Versiunea în limba română .....	108
Svensk version .....	109
English version .....	110
<b>E-001677/12</b> by Marc Tarabella to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Commission support for regional consumer education schools	
Version française .....	111
English version .....	112
<b>E-001678/12</b> by Andrea Zanoni to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> European Football Championships EURO 2012: intervention of the EU vis-à-vis the Ukrainian authorities	
Versione italiana .....	113
English version .....	114
<b>E-001680/12</b> by Oreste Rossi to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Transplants in Europe	
Versione italiana .....	115
English version .....	116
<b>E-001682/12</b> by Oreste Rossi to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Disability: condemnation by a blind teenager of lack of access to web content	
Versione italiana .....	117
English version .....	119
<b>E-001683/12</b> by Oreste Rossi to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> WHO plan to eliminate measles and German measles by 2015	
Versione italiana .....	121
English version .....	122
<b>E-001685/12</b> by Oreste Rossi to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Reform of the CAP: disposal of agricultural land	
Versione italiana .....	123
English version .....	124
<b>E-001686/12</b> by Oreste Rossi to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Syria and the violation of children’s rights: unprecedented violence	
Versione italiana .....	125
English version .....	126
<b>E-001687/12</b> by Oreste Rossi to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Illegal trafficking and ill-treatment of tropical fish	
Versione italiana .....	127
English version .....	128
<b>P-001688/12</b> by Morten Løkkegaard to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Compulsory affiliation to cable distribution networks	
Dansk udgave .....	129
English version .....	130
<b>P-001689/12</b> by Niki Tzavela to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Special account for Greece	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	131
English version .....	132

<b>E-001690/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Accession of Croatia	
Versione italiana .....	133
English version .....	134
<b>E-001691/12</b> by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Causes of delay in the approval of funding for 2011 for the comprehensive programme for the management of the Greek borders	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	135
English version .....	136
<b>E-001692/12</b> by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Announcement by Unicef on the death of 400 children in Syria	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	137
English version .....	138
<b>E-001693/12</b> by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Public revenue from the licensing of gaming in Greece	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	139
English version .....	140
<b>E-001694/12</b> by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Utilisation of Structural Fund resources for Greece, as envisaged in the memorandum of understanding	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	141
English version .....	142
<b>E-001695/12</b> by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Public child protection institutions in Greece	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	143
English version .....	144
<b>E-001696/12</b> by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Development of production and harmonisation of red tape	
Versione italiana .....	145
English version .....	147
<b>E-001698/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Chinese rubber eggs	
Versione italiana .....	148
English version .....	149
<b>E-001700/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Experiment in monitoring air quality	
Versione italiana .....	150
English version .....	151
<b>E-001701/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Attack in Aleppo	
Versione italiana .....	152
English version .....	153
<b>P-001703/12</b> by Marianne Thyssen to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Compulsory use of winter tyres for passenger vehicles	
Nederlandse versie .....	154
English version .....	155
<b>E-001704/12</b> by Marianne Thyssen to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Mandatory requirement for passenger vehicles to be equipped with a full size spare wheel	
Nederlandse versie .....	156
English version .....	157
<b>E-001705/12</b> by Karl-Heinz Florenz to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Revision of the Tobacco Products Directive (2001/37/EC).	
Deutsche Fassung .....	158
English version .....	159

<b>E-001707/12</b> by Andreas Mölzer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Extraction of shale gas deposits	
Deutsche Fassung .....	160
English version .....	161
<b>E-001708/12</b> by Andreas Mölzer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Weapon shipments to the Syrian rebels	
Deutsche Fassung .....	162
English version .....	163
<b>E-001709/12</b> by Andreas Mölzer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Economic benefits of immigrants	
Deutsche Fassung .....	164
English version .....	165
<b>E-001711/12</b> by Fiorello Provera to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Lead poisoning crisis in Nigeria	
Versione italiana .....	166
English version .....	168
<b>E-001713/12</b> by Elisabetta Gardini to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Impact of the cold on the effectiveness of medicines	
Versione italiana .....	170
English version .....	171
<b>E-001714/12</b> by Elisabetta Gardini to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Directorate-General for Health funds	
Versione italiana .....	172
English version .....	174
<b>E-001715/12</b> by Elisabetta Gardini to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Solidarity Fund and bad weather	
Versione italiana .....	176
English version .....	177
<b>E-001716/12</b> by Elisabetta Gardini to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Funds for the restoration of works of art	
Versione italiana .....	178
English version .....	179
<b>E-001717/12</b> by Janusz Wojciechowski to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Measures taken by the Polish Government with regard to legislation on GMOs	
Wersja polska .....	180
English version .....	181
<b>E-001718/12</b> by Janusz Wojciechowski to the Council	
<i>Subject:</i> Measures taken by the Polish Presidency with regard to legislation on GMOs	
Wersja polska .....	182
English version .....	183
<b>P-001719/12</b> by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Financial transaction tax	
English version .....	184
<b>E-001720/12</b> by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Council	
<i>Subject:</i> Risk-sharing instruments	
Versión española .....	185
English version .....	186
<b>E-001722/12</b> by Ana Miranda to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — The Falkland Islands conflict and its impact on bilateral European Union-Mercosur relations	
Versión española .....	187
English version .....	188

<b>E-001723/12</b> by Ana Miranda to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — The European Union's mediation in the conflict regarding the sovereignty of the Falkland Islands between the United Kingdom and the Argentine Republic	
Versión española .....	189
English version .....	190
<b>E-001725/12</b> by Emilie Turunen to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Foreign homeless persons	
Dansk udgave .....	191
English version .....	192
<b>E-001726/12</b> by Dan Jørgensen to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Prohibition of voluntary work in Greece	
Dansk udgave .....	193
English version .....	194
<b>E-001727/12</b> by Dan Jørgensen to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> European eco-labels	
Dansk udgave .....	195
English version .....	196
<b>E-001728/12</b> by Franz Obermayr to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Data protection on Facebook: infringement of EU legislation	
Deutsche Fassung .....	197
English version .....	199
<b>E-001729/12</b> by Konstantinos Poupakis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Abrogation of the social agreement and the results of social dialogue in Greece	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	201
English version .....	202
<b>E-001730/12</b> by Nikolaos Salavrakos to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Balancing the market in Greece	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	203
English version .....	204
<b>E-001731/12</b> by Nikos Chrysogelos to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Education of Roma children in the Prefecture of Karditsa	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	205
English version .....	207
<b>E-001732/12</b> by Marian Harkin to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Persecution of Mandaeans in Syria	
English version .....	209
<b>E-001733/12</b> by Diane Dodds to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> World Summit on Sustainable Development	
English version .....	210
<b>E-001734/12</b> by Catherine Stihler to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Harmonisation of legislation on the transport of corpses	
English version .....	211
<b>E-001735/12</b> by Diane Dodds to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> European School Milk Scheme	
English version .....	212

<b>E-001737/12</b> by Judith Sargentini, Jean Lambert, Raúl Romeva i Rueda, H�el�ene Flautre, Rui Tavares and Franziska Keller to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Construction of Evros border fence and possible impediments to the right to asylum	
Versi�n espa�ola .....	213
Deutsche Fassung .....	214
Version fran�aise .....	215
Nederlandse versie .....	216
Vers�o portuguesa .....	217
English version .....	218
<b>E-001740/12</b> by Graham Watson to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — The Jarawa people of the Andaman Islands	
English version .....	219
<b>E-001741/12</b> by Cristiana Muscardini, Gianluca Susta, Niccol� Rinaldi, Gianni Pittella and Roberta Angelilli to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Excessive urban concreting and environmental protection	
Versione italiana .....	220
English version .....	221
<b>E-001742/12</b> by Andrea Zanoni to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Extremely serious worsening of air quality in Verona foreseen if planned construction of Ca' del Bue incinerator is given the green light	
Versione italiana .....	222
English version .....	223
<b>E-001743/12</b> by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Schools for local agricultural development in the Euro-Mediterranean area	
Versione italiana .....	224
English version .....	225
<b>E-001744/12</b> by Alfredo Antoniozzi to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Expiry of Greek bonds, possible default and the consequent domino effect on the Member States of the European Union	
Versione italiana .....	226
English version .....	227
<b>P-001746/12</b> by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Possibility that banks receiving public aid may acquire other banking institutions	
Versi�n espa�ola .....	228
English version .....	230
<b>E-001747/12</b> by Marian-Jean Marinescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Website launched by Geert Wilders, leader of the Dutch Party for Freedom (PVV)	
Versiunea �n limba rom�n� .....	231
English version .....	232
<b>E-001748/12</b> by Niki Tzavela to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> New loan agreement for Greece	
Ελληνική �κδοση .....	233
English version .....	234
<b>E-001749/12</b> by Niki Tzavela to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Special account for Greece 2	
Ελληνική �κδοση .....	235
English version .....	236
<b>E-001750/12</b> by Konstantinos Poupakis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Minimum wage and measures to promote employment	
Ελληνική �κδοση .....	237
English version .....	239

<b>E-001751/12</b> by Konstantinos Poupakis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Risk of a massive increase in the auctioning of homes as a result of the possible elimination of the Social Housing Organisation (OEK)	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	241
English version .....	243
<b>E-001752/12</b> by Konstantinos Poupakis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The closure of the Greek Workers' Housing and Greek Workers' Home Organisations will have unfortunate economic and social consequences	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	241
English version .....	243
<b>E-001754/12</b> by Pino Arlacchi, Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă, Catherine Trautmann, Guido Milana, Silvia Costa, Mara Bizzotto, Ivo Vajgl, Rolandas Paksas, Nikolaos Salavrakos and Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The social dimension of the reform of the EU common fisheries policy	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	245
Version française .....	246
Versione italiana .....	247
Tekstas lietuvių kalba .....	248
Versiunea în limba română .....	249
Slovenska različica .....	250
English version .....	251
<b>E-001756/12</b> by Mario Borghezio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Pressure on Greece to purchase arms in exchange for financial support	
Versione italiana .....	252
English version .....	253
<b>E-001825/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Defence procurement in Greece	
Versione italiana .....	252
English version .....	253
<b>E-001757/12</b> by Aldo Patriciello to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Defective breast implants	
Versione italiana .....	254
English version .....	255
<b>E-001760/12</b> by Cătălin Sorin Ivan to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Transposition of Directive 2006/24/EC	
Versiunea în limba română .....	256
English version .....	257
<b>P-001761/12</b> by Daniel Hannan to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Conflicting figures for official EU contributions per country	
English version .....	258
<b>P-001763/12</b> by Jacek Saryusz-Wolski to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Monitoring of the situation regarding the rights of EU workers in the Netherlands	
Wersja polska .....	259
English version .....	260
<b>E-001764/12</b> by Reinhard Bütikofer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Use of PE pipes in storage facility water pipelines	
Deutsche Fassung .....	261
English version .....	262
<b>E-001765/12</b> by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Financial transaction tax	
Deutsche Fassung .....	263
English version .....	264



<b>E-001766/12</b> by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Next multiannual financial framework (MFF)/youth unemployment in Europe	
Deutsche Fassung .....	265
English version .....	266
<b>E-001767/12</b> by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Youth Opportunities	
Deutsche Fassung .....	267
English version .....	268
<b>E-001768/12</b> by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> European Quality Charter on Internships	
Deutsche Fassung .....	269
English version .....	270
<b>E-001770/12</b> by Konstantinos Poupakis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Forcible overturning of the institution of collective bargaining in Greece, protected by European law and international labour conventions	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	271
English version .....	273
<b>E-001771/12</b> by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime	
Deutsche Fassung .....	274
English version .....	275
<b>E-001773/12</b> by Niki Tzavela to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Implementation of Commission Recommendation 2010/191/EU	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	276
English version .....	277
<b>E-001774/12</b> by David Campbell Bannerman to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Iceland — information campaign on EU membership	
English version .....	278
<b>E-001776/12</b> by David Campbell Bannerman to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Iceland — funding to support EU membership	
English version .....	278
<b>E-001775/12</b> by David Campbell Bannerman to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Meeting with the Icelandic Government	
English version .....	279
<b>E-001777/12</b> by David Campbell Bannerman to the Council	
<i>Subject:</i> Syria — military intervention	
English version .....	280
<b>E-001778/12</b> by David Campbell Bannerman to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Syria — military intervention	
English version .....	281
<b>E-001779/12</b> by David Campbell Bannerman to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Syria — HCFA (humanitarian ceasefire agreement) and the Syrian Government	
English version .....	282
<b>E-001780/12</b> by Liam Aylward and Pat the Cope Gallagher to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Nutrition, health and dietary fibre claims	
Leagan Gaeilge .....	283
English version .....	284
<b>E-001781/12</b> by Liam Aylward and Pat the Cope Gallagher to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Economic impact of the regulation on nutrition and health claims	
Leagan Gaeilge .....	285
English version .....	286

<b>E-001782/12</b> by Liam Aylward and Pat the Cope Gallagher to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Basis for claims regarding the health benefits of hyaluronic acid	
Leagan Gaeilge .....	287
English version .....	288
<b>E-001783/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Risks of cannabis-impaired driving	
Versione italiana .....	289
English version .....	290
<b>E-001784/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Italian aid-worker kidnapped by the Taliban	
Versione italiana .....	291
English version .....	292
<b>E-001785/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Attacks against Israeli diplomats	
Versione italiana .....	293
English version .....	294
<b>E-001786/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Suicide of a Tibetan nun	
Versione italiana .....	295
English version .....	296
<b>E-001787/12</b> by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Silk microneedles	
Versione italiana .....	297
English version .....	298
<b>E-001788/12</b> by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Church torched by the Muslim community in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	
Versione italiana .....	299
English version .....	300
<b>E-001789/12</b> by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — The start of a new jihad in Syria	
Versione italiana .....	301
English version .....	302
<b>P-001790/12</b> by Chrysoula Paliadeli to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Commissioners' statements	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	303
English version .....	304
<b>E-001791/12</b> by Martin Ehrenhauser to the Council	
<i>Subject:</i> ACTA — transparency and provider liability	
Deutsche Fassung .....	305
English version .....	306
<b>E-001792/12</b> by Martin Ehrenhauser to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> ACTA — transparency and provider liability	
Deutsche Fassung .....	307
English version .....	308
<b>E-001793/12</b> by Werner Langen to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Action by the Commission in response to shortcomings in the implementation of the 'Waste Water Directive' (91/271/EEC)	
Deutsche Fassung .....	309
English version .....	310

<b>E-001795/12</b> by Salvatore Caronna, David-Maria Sassoli, Roberta Angelilli, Guido Milana, Roberto Gualtieri, Sergio Gaetano Cofferati, Vittorio Prodi, Andrea Zanoni, Vincenzo Iovine, Giommara Uggias, Debora Serracchiani, Silvia Costa, Rita Borsellino, Andrea Cozzolino, Mario Pirillo, Rosario Crocetta, Lorenzo Fontana, Claudio Morganti, Oreste Rossi, Gianni Vattimo, Francesca Balzani, Antonio Cancian, Marco Scurria, Pino Arlacchi, Pier Antonio Panzeri, Paolo De Castro, Gianni Pittella, Sonia Alfano, Leonardo Domenici, Lara Comi, Elisabetta Gardini, Luigi Berlinguer and Francesco De Angelis to the Council	
<i>Subject:</i> Important letters rogatory for the 'Ustica massacre' trial	
Versione italiana .....	311
English version .....	313
<b>E-001796/12</b> by Salvatore Caronna, David-Maria Sassoli, Roberta Angelilli, Guido Milana, Roberto Gualtieri, Sergio Gaetano Cofferati, Vittorio Prodi, Andrea Zanoni, Vincenzo Iovine, Giommara Uggias, Debora Serracchiani, Silvia Costa, Rita Borsellino, Andrea Cozzolino, Mario Pirillo, Rosario Crocetta, Lorenzo Fontana, Claudio Morganti, Oreste Rossi, Gianni Vattimo, Francesca Balzani, Antonio Cancian, Marco Scurria, Pino Arlacchi, Pier Antonio Panzeri, Paolo De Castro, Gianni Pittella, Sonia Alfano, Leonardo Domenici, Lara Comi, Elisabetta Gardini, Luigi Berlinguer and Francesco De Angelis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Important letters rogatory for the 'Ustica massacre' trial	
Versione italiana .....	315
English version .....	317
<b>P-001797/12</b> by Georgios Papastamkos to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Growth plan to help Greece overcome the crisis	
Ελληνική έκδοση .....	319
English version .....	320
<b>E-001800/12</b> by Jiří Havel to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Suspension of payments for three Operational Programmes in the Czech Republic (Transport, Environment and Regional OP Northwest)	
České znění .....	321
English version .....	322
<b>E-001801/12</b> by Martin Ehrenhauser to the Council	
<i>Subject:</i> European Data Protection Supervisor's inspection report	
Deutsche Fassung .....	323
English version .....	325
<b>E-001802/12</b> by Martin Ehrenhauser to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> European Data Protection Supervisor's inspection report	
Deutsche Fassung .....	326
English version .....	327
<b>E-001803/12</b> by Hermann Winkler to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Potential revision of Directive 2008/50/EC on ambient air quality and cleaner air for Europe/lack of efficiency in the implementation of measures such as low emission zones	
Deutsche Fassung .....	328
English version .....	329
<b>E-001804/12</b> by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — EU delegations	
English version .....	330
<b>E-001805/12</b> by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — EU delegations	
English version .....	331
<b>E-001806/12</b> by Franck Proust and Alain Cadec to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Aid schemes for businesses and Structural Funds	
Version française .....	332
English version .....	333
<b>E-001807/12</b> by Matteo Salvini to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Information relating to the exchange of national currency for the euro	
Versione italiana .....	334
English version .....	335

<b>E-001808/12</b> by Barry Madlener to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Spain falsifies its deficit figures	
Nederlandse versie .....	336
English version .....	337
<b>E-001809/12</b> by Tadeusz Cymański and Jacek Włosowicz to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> A single transport network (TEN-T)	
Wersja polska .....	338
English version .....	339
<b>E-001810/12</b> by Rareş-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Acts of xenophobia in The Netherlands	
Versiunea în limba română .....	340
English version .....	341
<b>E-001811/12</b> by Rareş-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Redirection of funds for rural development	
Versiunea în limba română .....	342
English version .....	343
<b>E-001812/12</b> by Ivailo Kalfin to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Commission initiative to assist Member States with high youth unemployment	
българска версия .....	344
English version .....	345
<b>E-001813/12</b> by Evgeni Kirilov to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Maximum permissible expenditure on remuneration under the 'Lifelong Learning' Programme for 2012 in the case of Bulgaria	
българска версия .....	346
English version .....	347
<b>E-001815/12</b> by Louis Grech to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The Costa Concordia tragedy	
Verżjoni Maltija .....	348
English version .....	349

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001612/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Niki Tzavela (EFD)**  
(9 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Επισιτιστική κρίση στην Υεμένη

Οι διεθνείς προσπάθειες να αποτραπεί μια κρίση επισιτισμού στην Υεμένη δυσχεραίνονται από την πολύ σοβαρή έλλειψη χρηματοδότησης, κατήγγειλε η διευθύντρια της οργάνωσης αρωγής Oxfam, κάνοντας λόγο περί εντεινόμενου κινδύνου να ξεσπάσει μεγάλη κλίμακας κρίση στη χώρα, τη φτωχότερη στην περιοχή.

«Είμαστε πολύ ανήσυχοι για δύο θέματα: το νέο επίπεδο των ανθρωπιστικών αναγκών και το επίπεδο της χρηματοδότησης και της προσοχής που δίνεται σε αυτή», δήλωσε στο Γαλλικό Πρακτορείο η Κολέτ Φίρσον της Όξφαμ.

Η έκκληση για τη συγκέντρωση κεφαλαίων την οποία είχαν κάνει για το 2012 οι μεγαλύτερες ανθρωπιστικές οργανώσεις οι οποίες δρουν στην Υεμένη απέφερε ένα ποσό που δεν επιτρέπει ως τώρα την κάλυψη παρά μόνο του 12 % των υφιστάμενων αναγκών, τόνισε.

Πρόσφατα στατιστικά στοιχεία του ΟΗΕ καταδεικνύουν «πολύ ανησυχητικά ποσοστά υποσιτισμού, ιδιαίτερα μεταξύ των παιδιών» και η κρίση έχει κλιμακωθεί για τους Υεμενίτες οι οποίοι ζουν σε περιοχές όπου σημειώνονται συγκρούσεις, υπογράμμισε.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή ποια είναι η επίσημη θέση της για την κατάσταση αυτή στην Υεμένη;

**Απάντηση της κας Georgïena εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(10 Απριλίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή ανησυχεί ιδιαίτερα για την επιδείνωση της ανθρωπιστικής κατάστασης στην Υεμένη, ιδίως για τα υψηλά ποσοστά υποσιτισμού. Το ενδιαφέρον της διεθνούς κοινότητας γι' αυτήν την κρίση είναι σχετικά χαμηλό.

Η Επιτροπή αύξησε σημαντικά την ανθρωπιστική χρηματοδότηση που διατέθηκε από τον προϋπολογισμό της ΕΕ για τη χώρα το 2011. Η αρχική χορήγηση στην αρχή του χρόνου ανήλθε στα 4 εκατομμύρια ευρώ. Με βάση την αξιολόγηση των αναγκών των ανθρωπιστικών εταιρών και τις συστάσεις των εμπειρογνομόνων, η χρηματοδότηση αυξήθηκε σταδιακά και έφθασε τα 25 εκατομμύρια ευρώ. Επιπλέον, η Επίτροπος Georgïena, υπεύθυνη για τη διεθνή συνεργασία, την ανθρωπιστική βοήθεια και την αντιμετώπιση των κρίσεων, επισκέφτηκε την Υεμένη στις αρχές του 2011. Επίσης, η ΕΕ ίδρυσε γραφείο στην Σαναά και ενισχύθηκε ο ανθρωπιστικός συντονισμός με τα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ.

Συνεπώς, οι ανθρωπιστικές προσπάθειες της Επιτροπής, παρά τις δυσχερείς δημοσιονομικές συνθήκες (οι κρίσεις στο Κέρας της Αφρικής και τη Λιβύη προστέθηκαν στην κρίση στο Σουδάν και σε άλλες εν εξελίξει μεγάλες κρίσεις), ήταν έγκαιρες και σημαντικές.

Για το 2012, έχει κινητοποιηθεί για ανθρωπιστική βοήθεια αρχικό ποσό 15 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ. Οι εμπειρογνώμονες της Επιτροπής επί ανθρωπιστικών θεμάτων στη Σαναά παρακολουθούν συνεχώς τις ανάγκες και τις δυνατότητες απορρόφησης των εταιρών, ώστε να διασφαλίσουν ότι η ανθρωπιστική χρηματοδότηση από τον προϋπολογισμό της ΕΕ εξακολουθεί να αντανακλά την ανθρωπιστική κατάσταση. Επιπλέον, η ΕΕ εξακολουθεί σταθερά να παρέχει βοήθεια στην Υεμένη για να αντιμετωπίσει η χώρα τις πολλές περαιτέρω προκλήσεις, είτε πολιτικές, είτε οικονομικές, είτε σχετικές με την ασφάλεια. Η ΕΕ θα συνεχίσει να στηρίζει την Υεμένη στις προσπάθειές της να οικοδομήσει ένα καλύτερο μέλλον για τους Υεμενίτες, συνεργαζόμενη με την κυβέρνηση και με όλους τους φορείς της κοινωνίας της Υεμένης, μαζί με περιφερειακούς και διεθνείς εταίρους, ώστε να βοηθήσει την Υεμένη στην ανασυγκρότηση και τη μεταρρύθμιση των θεσμών και της οικονομίας της.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001612/12  
to the Commission  
Niki Tzavela (EFD)  
(9 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Food crisis in Yemen

International endeavours to ward off a food crisis in Yemen are being complicated by a very serious shortage of funding. This is the charge made by the director of the aid organisation Oxfam, speaking about the increasing risk of a large-scale crisis breaking out in the country, the poorest in the region.

'We are very concerned about two issues: the new level of humanitarian needs and the level of funding and attention being paid to this', Colette Fearon of Oxfam told the *Agence France-Presse*.

The fundraising appeal made for 2012 by the largest aid organisations working in Yemen has so far yielded a sum which does not allow more than 12 % of existing needs to be met, she emphasised.

Recent UN statistical data have highlighted 'very disturbing levels of malnutrition, particularly among children' and the crisis, she underlined, has escalated for Yemenis living in regions of conflict.

Will the Commission say what its official position is on this situation in Yemen?

**Answer given by Mrs Georgieva on behalf of the Commission  
(10 April 2012)**

The Commission is very concerned by the deterioration of the humanitarian situation in Yemen, in particular by the high level of malnutrition rates. Attention of the international community for this crisis is rather low.

The Commission significantly increased humanitarian funding from the EU budget for the country in 2011. The initial allocation at the beginning of that year was EUR4 million. Based on humanitarian partners' needs assessments and experts' recommendations, funding was gradually increased to reach EUR 25 million. In addition, Commissioner Georgieva, responsible for International Cooperation, Humanitarian Aid and Crisis Response, visited Yemen in early 2011, the EU opened an office in Sana'a and humanitarian coordination with EU Member States was strengthened.

The Commission's humanitarian efforts have thus, despite a difficult budgetary environment (Horn and Libya crises added to Sudan and other ongoing major crises), been timely and significant.

For 2012, an initial EUR 15 million for humanitarian assistance have been mobilised. The Commission's humanitarian experts in Sana'a are constantly monitoring needs and partner's absorption capacities to ensure that humanitarian financing from the EU budget continues to reflect the humanitarian situation. In addition, the EU remains closely involved in helping Yemen to face its many additional challenges, whether political, economic or security-related. The EU will continue to stand by Yemen in its efforts to build a better future for the Yemeni people, through working with the Government and all parts of the Yemeni society alongside regional and international partners, to help Yemen rebuild and reform its institutions and economy.

---

(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001613/12  
adresată Comisiei**

**Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**

(9 februarie 2012)

*Subiect:* Declarația Comisiei privind distribuirea de produse alimentare către persoanele cele mai defavorizate din Uniune

Cu privire la propunerea Comisiei de regulament al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului de modificare a Regulamentului (CE) nr. 1290/2005 și a Regulamentului (CE) nr. 1234/2007 ale Consiliului privind distribuirea de produse alimentare către persoanele cele mai defavorizate ale Uniunii, Comisia a emis o „declarație”, luând în considerare „opoziția puternică” a anumitor state membre „față de orice propunere legală sau financiară a unui astfel de program în viitor”. Ar putea clarifica Comisia temeiul juridic al acestei „declarații”?

**Răspuns dat de dl Ciolos în numele Comisiei**

(15 martie 2012)

Prin declarația la care face referire distinsul membru, Comisia a luat act de poziția unora dintre statele membre care s-au opus continuării programului de distribuire a produselor alimentare către persoanele cele mai defavorizate după 2013. Declarația ca atare nu are un anumit temei juridic așa cum se întâmplă în cazul unei propuneri legislative din partea Comisiei.

Îl putem asigura pe distinsul membru că, după cum se subliniază și în declarația respectivă, Comisia nu a renunțat la dreptul de inițiativă pe care îl are în temeiul tratatului.

\_\_\_\_\_

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-001613/12  
to the Commission**

**Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**

*(9 February 2012)*

*Subject:* Declaration of the Commission on the distribution of food products to the most deprived persons in the Union

With regard to the Commission's proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Council Regulation (EC) No 1290/2005 and Council Regulation (EC) 1234/2007 as regards distribution of food products to the most deprived persons in the Union, the Commission issued a 'declaration', taking into account the 'strong opposition' of certain Member States 'to any legal and financial proposal of such a programme in the future'. Could the Commission clarify the legal basis of this 'declaration'?

**Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission**

*(15 March 2012)*

With the declaration quoted by the Honourable Member, the Commission took note of the position of some Member States against the continuation of the food distribution programme for the most deprived people beyond 2013. As such, this declaration is not founded on a specific legal base in the same way as a legislative proposal from the Commission is.

The Honourable Member should remain ensured that, as highlighted in the declaration itself, the Commission has not given up its right of initiative according to the Treaty.

---



(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001614/12**  
**adresată Comisiei**  
**Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)**  
(9 februarie 2012)

*Subiect:* Implicații ale ACTA pentru drepturile fundamentale

În noiembrie 2010, Parlamentul, în rezoluția sa privind ACTA, a solicitat Comisiei să confirme că implementarea ACTA nu va avea impact asupra drepturilor fundamentale și asupra protecției datelor.

Comisia a afirmat atunci că ACTA „nu va duce la limitări ale drepturilor fundamentale”.

În vederea facilitării unei dezbateri publice pe tema ACTA și în scopul reasigurării numărului mare de cetățeni care sunt în mod evident îngrijorați în legătură cu acest acord comercial, Comisia va publica analiza completă pe care și-a întemeiat asigurările cum că ACTA nu va duce la nicio limitare a drepturilor fundamentale și, în special, a confidențialității?

**Răspuns dat de dl De Gucht în numele Comisiei**  
(23 martie 2012)

Comisia împărtășește preocuparea cu privire la necesitatea de a asigura protecția tuturor drepturilor fundamentale implicate în Acordul comercial de combatere a contrafacerii (ACTA), inclusiv a drepturilor de proprietate, în special a drepturilor de proprietate intelectuală, a dreptului la viață privată, a datelor cu caracter personal, a libertății de exprimare și de informare, a libertății de a desfășura activități comerciale și a dreptului la apărare.

La aceste drepturi fundamentale, precum și la alte principii-cheie se referă numeroase dispoziții din cadrul acordului ACTA, cum ar fi preambulul [referitor la echilibrul între drepturile titularilor drepturilor (de proprietate intelectuală), drepturile utilizatorilor și drepturile furnizorilor de servicii], articolul 2 alineatul (3) (referitor la sănătatea publică și alimentație), articolul 4 (referitor la viața privată, protecția datelor și divulgarea de informații), articolul 6 (referitor la un proces echitabil și la proporționalitate), articolul 11 (referitor la protecția confidențialității surselor de informații și a datelor personale), articolul 22 (referitor la viața privată și la confidențialitatea informațiilor), articolul 27 alineatele (2), (3) și (4) (referitor la libertatea de exprimare, la un proces echitabil și la viața privată) și articolul 32 (referitor la preocupările legate de mediu).

Studiul cuprinzător și detaliat comandat de Comisia pentru comerț internațional INTA a Parlamentului intitulat: „*The Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA): An Assessment*” [Acordul comercial de combatere a contrafacerii (ACTA): evaluare] nu identifică limitări ale drepturilor fundamentale.

Mai mult decât atât, pentru a obține o evaluare definitivă a acestui aspect de către cea mai înaltă autoritate judiciară a UE, Comisia a hotărât să solicite Curții Europene de Justiție emiterea unui aviz, în temeiul articolului 218 alineatul (11) din Tratatul privind funcționarea Uniunii Europene, cu privire la compatibilitatea ACTA cu tratatele UE și Carta drepturilor fundamentale.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001614/12  
to the Commission**

**Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)**

(9 February 2012)

*Subject:* Implications of ACTA for fundamental rights

In November 2010, Parliament, in its resolution on ACTA, called on the Commission to confirm that ACTA's implementation would have no impact on fundamental rights and data protection.

The Commission has since stated that ACTA 'will not lead to limitations of fundamental rights'.

In order to facilitate a public debate on ACTA, and in the interests of reassuring the many citizens who are clearly concerned about this trade agreement, will the Commission publish the full analysis on which it has based its assurances that ACTA will not lead to any limitations of fundamental rights, and of privacy in particular?

**Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission**

(23 March 2012)

The Commission shares the concerns about the need to protect all fundamental rights at stake in the ACTA Agreement, including the rights to property, in particular intellectual property, privacy, protection of personal data, freedom of expression and information, freedom to conduct business and the rights of defence.

Numerous provisions of the ACTA text refer to such fundamental rights and to other key principles, including the Preamble (balance of rights between [IP]right-holders, users and service providers), Articles 2.3 (public health and nutrition), 4 (privacy, data protection and disclosure of information), 6 (fair and equitable process, proportionality), 11 (protection of confidentiality of information sources and of personal data), 22 (privacy, confidentiality of information), 27.2, 27.3, 27.4 (freedom of expression, fair process, and privacy) and 32 (environmental concerns).

The extensive and detailed study commissioned by the INTA Committee of the Parliament entitled: 'The Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA): An Assessment' does not identify any limitations on fundamental rights.

More importantly, in order to obtain the definitive assessment of this issue by the highest judicial authority in the EU, the Commission has decided to request the European Court of Justice to provide an opinion, on the basis of Article 218(11) TFEU, about the compatibility of ACTA with the EU Treaties and the Charter of Fundamental Rights.

---

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001615/12**  
**aan de Commissie**  
**Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE)**  
(14 februari 2012)

*Betref:* Transparantie bij de selectie van NER 300-projecten

NER300 beoogt particuliere investeerders en EU-lidstaten ertoe aan te sporen te investeren in commerciële demonstratieprojecten ter bevordering van de milieutechnisch veilige afvang en geologische opslag van CO<sub>2</sub> en in demonstratieprojecten ter bevordering van innovatieve technologieën voor hernieuwbare energie. Zoals vastgelegd in Besluit 2010/670/EU moeten acht CCS-demonstratieprojecten en één project in elk van de 34 innovatieve RES-demonstratieprojectcategorieën worden gefinancierd. Projecten zullen naargelang van de kosten per prestatie-eenheid worden gerangschikt. De Europese Investeringsbank (EIB) heeft voor elk voorgesteld project een financieel en technisch vooronderzoek en een classificatie uitgevoerd en zal dit op donderdag 9 februari 2012 aan de Commissie voorleggen. De Commissie zal op basis van deze classificatie in de tweede helft van 2012 toekenningsbesluiten nemen.

1. Is de Commissie voornemens het door de EIB uitgevoerde vooronderzoek voor de 78 ingediende projecten beschikbaar te stellen voor het publiek en de wetgevers? Zo niet, hoe kan het Europees Parlement dan de garantie krijgen dat de toekenningsbesluiten in overeenstemming zijn met de in Besluit 2010/670/EU aangegeven criteria?
2. De Commissie heeft in het ENVI-debat in april 2010 aangegeven dat projecten op het gebied van hernieuwbare energie evenveel subsidie zullen ontvangen als CCS-projecten, indien het voor RES-projecten aangevraagde bedrag gelijk is aan het voor CCS-projecten aangevraagde bedrag. In het door de EIB uitgevoerde vooronderzoek worden de voor de „CCS-groep” en de „RES-groep” aangevraagde subsidiebedragen vermeld. Is de Commissie voornemens deze informatie beschikbaar te stellen voor het publiek en de wetgevers?
3. Gezien de lage CO<sub>2</sub>-prijs zullen er hoogstwaarschijnlijk onvoldoende middelen voorhanden zijn om alle 42 projecten (8 CCS- en 34 RES-projecten) te financieren. Hoe is de Commissie voornemens het aantal projecten in beide groepen terug te brengen zonder daarbij het evenwicht tussen beide te verstoren? Zal dit resulteren in een gelijke verhouding tussen de financiering van CCS-projecten en die van innovatieve RES-projecten?

**Antwoord van mevrouw Hedegaard namens de Commissie**  
(7 maart 2012)

1-2. Neen. Om te garanderen dat het aan de gang zijnde selectieprocedure niet wordt verstoord, zullen de op 9 februari 2012 door de EIB overgelegde resultaten van het vooronderzoek tijdens de selectieprocedure niet openbaar worden gemaakt. De Commissie zal waarborgen dat bij Besluit 2010/670/EU <sup>(1)</sup> (NER 300-besluit) vastgestelde criteria tijdens de afronding van het proces volledig worden nageleefd.

3. Indien de totale aanvraag voor financiering van beide groepen (afvang en opslag van CO<sub>2</sub> en innovatieve technologieën voor hernieuwbare energie) hoger ligt dan de beschikbare middelen, wordt het aantal geselecteerde projecten verlaagd overeenkomstig de in artikel 8, lid 3, van het NER 300-besluit vastgestelde methode.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> PBL 290 van 6.10.2010, blz. 39.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001615/12  
to the Commission  
Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE)  
(14 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Transparency of NER300 project selection

NER300 aims to encourage private sector investors and EU Member States to invest in commercial demonstration projects for the environmentally safe capture and geological storage of CO<sub>2</sub> and innovative renewable energy technologies. As laid down in Decision 2010/670/EU, eight CCS demonstration projects and one project in each of the 34 innovative RES demonstration project categories are to be funded. Projects will be ranked in increasing order of cost-per-unit performance. The European Investment Bank (EIB) has performed the financial and technical due diligence assessments on the proposed projects, including their ranking, and will send this to the Commission on Thursday 9 February 2012. The Commission will make award decisions, based on this ranking, in the second half of 2012.

1. Will the Commission make the due diligence assessment performed by the EIB on the 78 submitted projects available to the public and the legislators? If not, how can the European Parliament be assured that the award decisions are consistent with the criteria as laid down in 2010/670/EU?
2. The Commission stated in the ENVI debate in April 2010 that renewable projects will get an equal share of the funding as CCS projects, if the amount requested for RES projects is equal to the amount requested by CCS projects. In the EIB's due diligence assessment the amount of funding requested for the 'CCS group' and the 'RES group' are given. Will the Commission make this information available to the legislators and the public?
3. Given the low CO<sub>2</sub> price, there will most likely be insufficient funds to cover all 42 projects (8 CCS and 34 RES). How will the Commission reduce projects from both groups 'while preserving the balance between them'? Will this result in an equal relation between funding for CCS and innovative RES projects?

**Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission  
(7 March 2012)**

1 and 2. No. To ensure respect for the ongoing competitive process, the results of the due diligence assessment provided by the EIB on 9 February 2012 will not be made public during the ongoing competitive process. The Commission will ensure full respect of the criteria set out in Commission Decision 2010/670/EU<sup>(1)</sup> (NER 300 Decision) in the finalisation of the process.

3. Where the total available funds are lower than the total funding request of the two groups (carbon capture and storage as well as innovative renewables), the number of selected projects will be reduced in accordance with the methodology set out in Article 8(3) of the NER 300 Decision.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 290, 6.10.2010, p. 39.

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001616/12**

**à Comissão**

**Ana Gomes (S&D) e Marita Ulvskog (S&D)**

(9 de fevereiro de 2012)

**Assunto:** Deterioração da situação dos direitos humanos na Etiópia: legislação antiterrorismo e lei relativa às sociedades e associações de beneficência

O Governo da Etiópia tem vindo a adotar leis cada vez mais restritivas cuja execução implica a extinção gradual das liberdades fundamentais dos etíopes. No âmbito da proclamação antiterrorismo de 2009, o conceito de terrorismo foi definido em sentido de tal maneira lato que isso afeta gravemente a liberdade de expressão, tendo sido, por isso, invocado para deter e julgar jornalistas, ativistas dos direitos humanos e opositores ao regime de Zenawi.

De acordo com o gabinete do Alto-Comissário das Nações Unidas para os Direitos Humanos, três jornalistas e dois opositores políticos foram recentemente condenados a penas de prisão que vão desde 14 anos a prisão perpétua, ao abrigo da legislação antiterrorista da Etiópia. Tal vem na sequência da condenação de dois jornalistas suecos a 11 anos de prisão, em 27 de dezembro de 2011. Outros 24 arguidos deverão comparecer perante o tribunal no dia 5 de março de 2012 sob diversas acusações, ao abrigo da legislação antiterrorista, sendo que, em caso de condenação sem um julgamento justo, vários deles estarão sujeitos à pena de morte. Segundo as notícias divulgadas, os jornalistas suecos, tal como os restantes prisioneiros, estão detidos em condições aterradoras.

Além disso, a lei relativa às sociedades e associações de beneficência, de 2009, teve um efeito prejudicial para as organizações de direitos humanos do país, sobretudo para o Conselho de Direitos Humanos, a ONG para os direitos humanos mais antiga da Etiópia, cujas contas bancárias foram congeladas. O Conselho de Direitos Humanos viu-se obrigado a encerrar nove dos seus doze gabinetes no país e os seus funcionários foram alvo de ameaças, ataques e detenções.

O Comissário do Desenvolvimento, Andries Piebalgs, revelou no ano passado a agenda para a mudança <sup>(1)</sup>, que coloca os direitos humanos no cerne da sua política de desenvolvimento. Tendo em conta esta evolução, afigura-se evidente que o diálogo político entre a UE e o Governo na Etiópia não melhorou a situação dos direitos humanos no país.

Tendo em conta que a ajuda da UE à Etiópia entre 2006 e 2013 se cifra em 644 milhões de euros e que abrange a segurança alimentar, o desenvolvimento rural e as infraestruturas e governança rodoviárias, tencionará a Comissão:

1. Condenar publicamente as restrições que afetam as atividades no domínio dos direitos humanos, bem como o direito à liberdade de expressão e à liberdade de imprensa na Etiópia?
2. Apelar à alteração da lei relativa às sociedades e associações de beneficência, incluindo a supressão das disposições que restringem as atividades de ONG nacionais e internacionais no domínio dos direitos humanos, e que conduzem, na realidade, à proibição e criminalização de grande parte do trabalho efetuado pelos ativistas dos direitos humanos, jornalistas, bloguistas, opositores políticos e outros?
3. Solicitar especificamente o descongelamento das contas bancárias do Conselho dos Direitos Humanos (Etiópia) e da Associação Etíope de Mulheres Juristas e a autorização, a favor destas duas instituições, de acesso ilimitado aos respetivos fundos?

**Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão**

(9 de março de 2012)

A UE acompanha de perto a situação dos direitos humanos e da sociedade civil na Etiópia, incluindo a aplicação da proclamação antiterrorismo. A lei, que permite uma interpretação lata do terrorismo, tem impacto sobre a liberdade de imprensa e de expressão. A UE tem vindo igualmente a manter um intenso diálogo com o Governo etíope sobre as questões relacionadas com a sociedade civil, em especial no que se refere à aplicação da proclamação da sociedade civil. A UE teve um papel decisivo na criação de um Grupo de Trabalho da Sociedade Civil que reúne representantes do Governo, da sociedade civil e das agências doadoras e é copresidido pelo Ministro dos Assuntos Federais e pela Delegação da UE na Etiópia. É neste fórum que estão a ser debatidas a lei sobre a sociedade civil e as suas diretrizes de aplicação. Na sua última reunião, em 30 de janeiro de 2012, o Governo aceitou reconsiderar algumas das disposições da lei.

<sup>(1)</sup> (<http://www.guardian.co.uk/global-development/2011/oct/13/eu-focus-human-rights-aid>).

A questão específica das contas congeladas das duas organizações de defesa dos direitos humanos, o Conselho dos Direitos Humanos (CDH) e a Associação Etíope de Mulheres Juristas, tem sido regularmente abordada no Fórum de Alto Nível entre o Grupo de Ajuda ao Desenvolvimento e o Ministro das Finanças e do Desenvolvimento Económico.

As negociações entre Governo e a UE tiveram como resultado o reconhecimento do Fundo da Sociedade Civil da UE (FSC) como «fonte interna» desde abril de 2010. Isto significa que o FSC pode apoiar atividades relacionadas com os direitos humanos e a boa governação sem qualquer limitação de financiamento. As organizações de defesa dos direitos humanos, tais como o Conselho dos Direitos Humanos e a Associação Etíope de Mulheres Juristas terão agora a possibilidade de aceder a este mecanismo de financiamento.

A União Europeia prosseguirá o diálogo com o Governo sobre os direitos humanos e a sociedade civil, de acordo com as orientações aqui descritas, incluindo os casos das organizações de defesa dos direitos humanos, como o Conselho dos Direitos Humanos e a Associação Etíope de Mulheres Juristas.

---

(Svensk version)

**Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-001616/12  
till kommissionen  
Ana Gomes (S&D) och Marita Ulvskog (S&D)  
(9 februari 2012)**

*Angående:* Den försämrade situationen för mänskliga rättigheter i Etiopien: lagstiftningen mot terrorism och lagen om frivilligorganisationer (Charities and Societies Proclamation)

Etiopiens regering har antagit en alltmer restriktiv lagstiftning som successivt tillintetgör etiopiernas grundläggande friheter. Lagstiftningen mot terrorism från 2009 ger en så bred definition av terrorism att det allvarligt påverkar yttrandefriheten. Lagstiftningen har därför åberopats för att fängsla och åtala journalister, människorättsförfvarare och motståndare till Zenawis regim.

Enligt FN:s högkommissarie för mänskliga rättigheter dömdes nyligen tre journalister och två oppositionspolitiker i enlighet med Etiopiens lagstiftning mot terrorism till fängelsestraff som sträcker sig från 14 år till livstids fängelse. Detta följer på domen som avkunnades den 27 december 2011 mot två svenska journalister, som dömdes till 11 års fängelse. Ytterligare 24 tilltalade ska enligt planerna inställa sig inför domstol den 5 mars 2012 för olika anklagelser enligt lagstiftningen mot terrorism, och flera av de anklagade kan dömas till döden om de fälls, utan någon rättvis rättegång. Medierna rapporterar om att de svenska journalisterna, liksom de övriga intagna, hålls fångna under bedrövliga förhållanden.

Dessutom har lagen om frivilligorganisationer från 2009 haft en negativ inverkan på människorättsorganisationerna i landet, och i synnerhet Ethiopian Human Rights Council, den äldsta icke-statliga människorättsorganisationen i Etiopien, som fått sina bankkonton frysta. Ethiopian Human Rights Council har också tvingats stänga nio av sina tolv kontor i landet och dess anställda har utsatts för hot, attacker och arresteringar.

Förra året presenterade EU:s kommissionsledamot med ansvar för utvecklingsbistånd, Andris Piebalgs, EU:s agenda för förändring<sup>(1)</sup>, som sätter de mänskliga rättigheterna i centrum för unionens utvecklingspolitik. Med tanke på denna utveckling verkar det uppenbart att den politiska dialogen mellan EU och Etiopiens regering inte har förbättrat situationen för de mänskliga rättigheterna i landet.

Med tanke på att EU:s bistånd till Etiopien mellan 2006 och 2013 var totalt 644 miljoner euro, och omfattade livsmedelstrygghet, landsbygdens utveckling, väginfrastruktur och förvaltning, vill vi be kommissionen svara på följande:

1. Kommer kommissionen att offentligt fördöma restriktionerna som påverkar arbetet för de mänskliga rättigheterna och rätten till yttrandefrihet och tryckfrihet i Etiopien?
2. Kommer kommissionen att uppmana till en ändring av lagen om frivilligorganisationer och lagstiftningen mot terrorism, inklusive en strykning av de bestämmelser som begränsar de icke-statliga organisationernas arbete för de mänskliga rättigheterna både lokalt och internationellt, och som faktiskt förbjuder och kriminaliserar mycket av det arbete som människorättsförfvarare, journalister, bloggare, politiska motståndare och övriga utför?
3. Kommer kommissionen att specifikt begära att frysningen av bankkontona för Ethiopian Human Rights Council och Etiopiens förbund för kvinnliga advokater (Ethiopian Women's Lawyers Association) upphävs och att de två organisationerna får obegränsad tillgång till sina medel?

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.guardian.co.uk/global-development/2011/oct/13/eu-focus-human-rights-aid>.

**Svar från den höga representanten/vice ordföranden Catherine Ashton på kommissionens vägnar**  
(9 mars 2012)

EU följer noga villkoren i Etiopien för det civila samhället, situationen i landet när det gäller de mänskliga rättigheterna och tillämpningen i detta av proklamationen om terrorismbekämpning. Proklamationen ger utrymme för en vid tolkning av begreppet terrorism och inverkar på yttrandefriheten och mediefriheten. EU för en intensiv dialog med den etiopiska regeringen om frågor som rör det civila samhället, särskilt om tillämpningen av proklamationen om det civila samhället. EU spelade en viktig roll vid inrättandet av den arbetsgrupp för det civila samhället som består av företrädare för regeringen, det civila samhället och givarorganisationerna och har ministern för federala frågor och chefen för EU-delegationen i Etiopien som ordförande. Verkningarna av proklamationen om det civila samhället och av riktlinjerna för genomförandet av denna diskuteras i arbetsgruppen. Vid det senaste mötet i arbetsgruppen, den 30 januari 2012, gick företrädarna för regeringen med på att ta en del av de berörda bestämmelserna under förnyat övervägande.

Frågan om de frysta bankkontona för de två organisationerna som försvarar de mänskliga rättigheterna – Ethiopian Human Rights Council och Ethiopian Women Lawyers Association – har tagits upp regelbundet i högnivåforumet för Development Assistance Group och ministern med ansvar för finansfrågor och ekonomisk utveckling.

Förhandlingar mellan regeringen och EU har lett till att fonden för det civila samhället (Civil Society Fund) i Etiopien sedan april 2010 erkänns som "inhemsk källa", vilket innebär att fonden kan understödja verksamhet som har att göra med de mänskliga rättigheterna och samhällsstyrningen utan inskränkningar av finansieringen. Organisationer som försvarar de mänskliga rättigheterna (t.ex. de båda ovan nämnda organisationerna) kommer därför att kunna få tillgång till medel från fonden.

EU kommer att fortsätta dialogen med den etiopiska regeringen om de mänskliga rättigheterna och det civila samhället enligt de linjer som dragits upp ovan, även i fråga om försvarare av de mänskliga rättigheterna såsom Ethiopian Human Rights Council och Ethiopian Women Lawyers Association.

---



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001616/12  
to the Commission  
Ana Gomes (S&D) and Marita Ulvskog (S&D)  
(9 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Deteriorating human rights situation in Ethiopia: anti-terrorism laws and the Charities and Societies Proclamation

The Ethiopian government has adopted increasingly restrictive laws whose implementation is progressively exterminating Ethiopians' basic freedoms. The anti-terrorism proclamation of 2009 defines terrorism in so wide a fashion as to gravely affect freedom of expression, and has therefore been invoked to detain and try journalists, human rights defenders and opponents of the Zenawi regime.

According to the office of the UN Commissioner for Human Rights, three journalists and two opposition politicians were recently given prison sentences ranging from 14 years to life imprisonment under Ethiopia's anti-terrorism laws. This follows the sentencing of two Swedish journalists to 11 years in prison on 27 December 2011. Another 24 defendants are scheduled to appear before the court on 5 March 2012, on various charges under the anti-terrorism law: several of these may face the death penalty if convicted, without a fair trial. Media reports have claimed that the Swedish journalists are, like all the other prisoners, being held in appalling conditions.

Moreover, the Charities and Societies Proclamation of 2009 has had a detrimental impact on human rights organisations in the country, and in particular on the Human Rights Council (HRCO), the oldest human rights NGO in Ethiopia, whose bank accounts have been frozen. HRCO has also been forced to close 9 of its 12 offices across the country, and its employees have been subjected to threats, attacks and arrests.

The EU development Commissioner, Andris Piebalgs, last year unveiled the Union's agenda for change <sup>(1)</sup>, putting human rights at the heart of its development policy. Considering these developments, it seems clear that the political dialogue between the EU and the Ethiopian government has not improved the human rights situation in the country.

Considering that EU aid to Ethiopia between 2006 and 2013 totalled EUR 644 million, covering food security, rural development, road infrastructure and governance, will the Commission:

1. publicly condemn the restrictions affecting human rights activities and the right to freedom of expression and of the press in Ethiopia;
2. call for the amendment of the Charities and Societies Proclamation and the Anti-Terrorism Proclamation, including deletion of the provisions which restrict human rights activities by NGOs, both local and international, and in effect prohibit and criminalise much of the work of human rights defenders, journalists, bloggers, political opponents and others;
3. call, specifically, for the bank accounts of the Human Rights Council (Ethiopia) and the Ethiopian Women's Lawyers Association to be unfrozen and for the two organisations to be allowed unrestricted access to their funds?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission  
(9 March 2012)**

The EU is following very closely the human rights and civil society situation in Ethiopia, including the application of the Anti Terrorism Proclamation. This allows for a wide interpretation of terrorism and has an impact on freedom of media and expression. The EU is also conducting an intensive dialogue with the Ethiopian Government on civil society issues, especially regarding the application of the Civil Society Proclamation. The EU was instrumental in the creation of a Civil Society Working Group bringing together Government and representatives of civil society and donor agencies, co-chaired by the Minister of Federal Affairs and the EU Delegation to Ethiopia. This is the forum where the impact of the Civil Society Law and its implementing guidelines are being discussed. In the last meeting on 30 January 2012, the Government accepted to reconsider some of these provisions.

The particular issue of the frozen accounts of the two Human Rights Defender organisations, the Human Rights Council (HRC) and the Ethiopian Women's Lawyers Association (EWLA), has been regularly addressed in the High Level Forum between the Development Assistance Group (DAG) and the Minister of Finance and Economic Development.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.guardian.co.uk/global-development/2011/oct/13/eu-focus-human-rights-aid>.

Negotiations between Government and the EU resulted in the acknowledgement of the EU Civil Society Fund (CSF) as 'domestic source' since April 2010. This means that the CSF is able to support human rights and governance related activities without any limitation of funding. Human Rights Defender organisations, such as the Human Rights Council and the Ethiopian Women's Lawyers Association, will therefore be able to access this funding window.

The EU will pursue dialogue with government on human rights and civil society along the lines outlined here, including on the case of Human Rights Defenders such as HRC and EWLA.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-001617/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**Fiona Hall (ALDE)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Internet freedom in Belarus

As a result of amendments to the law which came into force on 6 January 2012, it seems that the authorities in Belarus now have powers to prosecute Internet cafés if their users visit any foreign sites without being monitored by the owner. Belarusians who allow friends to use their Internet connection at home are responsible for the sites they visit. The fine for visiting banned sites is half a month's wages for a single view. The Belarusian list of banned websites includes all the main ones belonging to the opposition, and the founders of those sites are facing threats and intimidation.

- Can the Vice-President/High Representative confirm these recent developments and their likely effect on the ordinary citizen?
- In the light of the European Neighbourhood Policy, the Eastern Partnership and the EU's decision to pass sanctions against Belarus in June 2011, what action will the Vice-President/High Representative take on these latest worrying developments in that country?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**

(27 March 2012)

The EU is well aware of recent changes to the Belarusian Internet regulation, in force since 6 January 2012. All the elements of information submitted by the Honourable Member cannot however be confirmed. There have already earlier been governmental attempts to regulate the free expression on the Internet and access to it. The recent amendments add certain further measures that could be used to this effect. The EU will remain vigilant to what extent the recent amendments will negatively impact on the freedom of expression and free access to information online in Belarus.

The changes to the Internet regulation fit into a bigger picture of increased repression in Belarus. In its conclusions of 27 February 2012, the Council reiterated its grave concern about the continued lack of respect for human rights, democracy and rule of law in Belarus and regretted that further respective measures have taken place. Against the background of the further deterioration of the situation, the Council also decided on further additions to the list of those designated to its restrictive measures. The Council reiterated that the EU's restrictive measures remain subject to constant review.

---

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001618/12  
do Komisji**

**Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)**

(9 lutego 2012 r.)

*Przedmiot:* Dyskryminacyjne prawo w Ugandzie

Dnia 7 lutego 2012 r. w mediach pojawiła się informacja o wznowieniu prac nad kontrowersyjną ustawą antyhomoseksualną w Ugandzie. Premier David Bahati zapowiedział wszczęcie prac parlamentarnych nad ustawą.

Kontrowersje wokół ustawy, która za homoseksualizm przewidywała nawet karę śmierci, rozpoczęły się w 2009 r. Dzięki interwencji społeczności międzynarodowej rząd Ugandy wycofał się z prac nad ustawą. Projekt wznowionych prac legislacyjnych przewiduje długoletnie kary więzienia dla par homoseksualnych oraz dożywocie w przypadku, gdy jedna ze stron jest osobą nieletnią lub zarażoną wirusem HIV (bądź w przeszłości została skazana za akt homoseksualny). Niepokojący jest również fakt, że ustawa ma nakładać na obywateli obowiązek informowania władz o wszelkich przejawach homoseksualizmu.

W związku z powyższym zwracam się zapytaniem:

- Czy Komisja ma zamiar zareagować w sprawie kontrowersyjnego projektu?
- Jakie kroki Komisja zamierza podjąć, aby przeciwdziałać ewentualnemu wprowadzeniu tego prawa?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel i Wiceprzewodniczącą Komisji Catherine Ashton  
w imieniu Komisji**  
(31 maja 2012 r.)

UE jest bardzo zaniepokojona faktem zamknięcia warsztatów na temat praw osób LGBT w Entebbe w Ugandzie w dniu 14 lutego 2012 r. i wznowieniem prac nad projektem ustawy przeciwko homoseksualizmowi przez parlament Ugandy.

Stanowisko UE na temat praw osób LGBT jest jednoznaczne. Uznanie homoseksualizmu za przestępstwo, jak przewiduje projekt ugandyjskiej ustawy, jest sprzeczne z międzynarodowym prawem dotyczącym praw człowieka. Projekt ustawy jest również niezgodny ze wspieraną przez UE deklaracją ONZ na temat orientacji seksualnej i tożsamości płciowej z dnia 18 grudnia 2008 r.

UE poruszyła tę kwestię z rządem ugandyjskim kilkakrotnie, w tym również z prezydentem Musevenim.

UE będzie w dalszym ciągu wyrażać swoje zastrzeżenia w związku z projektem ustawy przeciwko homoseksualizmowi oraz w związku z innymi działaniami mającymi na celu prześladowanie osób LGBT w Ugandzie przy każdej stosownej okazji w kontaktach z rządem tego kraju. Ponadto UE będzie nadal wspierać lokalne organizacje praw człowieka w ich działaniach zmierzających do zmiany podejścia do powyższych kwestii w Ugandzie.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001618/12  
to the Commission  
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)  
(9 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Discriminatory bill in Uganda

On 7 February 2012 information on the resumption of work on the controversial anti-homosexual bill in Uganda appeared in the media. Minister David Bahati announced the initiation of parliamentary work on the bill.

The controversy around the bill which provides for the death penalty for homosexuality began in 2009. Thanks to the intervention of the international community, Uganda's government halted work on the bill. The reinstated draft legislation provides for long-term imprisonment for homosexual couples and life imprisonment if one party is a minor, or is infected with HIV (or has previously been convicted of a homosexual act). Also disturbing is the fact that the bill is to impose on citizens the obligation to inform the authorities of any instances of homosexuality.

With this in mind:

- Does the Commission intend to respond to this controversial bill?
- What steps does the Commission intend to take to oppose the possible introduction of this bill?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission  
(31 May 2012)**

The EU is very concerned about the closure of a workshop on LGBT rights in Entebbe, Uganda on 14 February 2012 and the re-introduction of the Anti-Homosexuality Bill in the Ugandan Parliament.

The EU position on LGBT rights is very clear. The criminalisation of homosexuality, as foreseen in the draft Uganda bill, goes against international human rights law. The draft bill also goes against the EU-supported UN declaration on sexual orientation and gender identity of 18 December 2008.

The EU has raised this issue with the Ugandan Government on several occasions, including with President Museveni.

The EU intends to keep raising its concerns in relation to the draft 'Anti-Homosexuality Bill' as well as other actions to persecute LGBT people in Uganda on every suitable occasion in dialogue with the government. In addition the EU will continue to support local human rights organisations in their efforts to change attitudes in the country.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001621/12  
to the Commission**

**Catherine Bearder (ALDE)**

(9 February 2012)

*Subject:* Misuse of the Hague Convention in combination with Brussels II on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction

The Hague Convention in combination with the Brussels II Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction is an important and vital convention for the protection of children across the world. Conventions such as this one play an important role in the prevention of child abduction and ensuring that those who are abducted are returned safely to their families and home countries.

With this in mind, however, I have recently heard reports from one barrister that approximately 80 % of the cases brought to UK courts that he deals with under this convention are not cases where an abduction has actually taken place or where a child has been withheld from a parent. I acknowledge that regulations, legislation and conventions are essential in a democratic society and, as they can be open to different interpretations, misuse can occur. However, 80 % is an extremely high statistic, especially given the psychological trauma that these court cases can have on a child.

- In light of this can the Commission confirm whether this is something that they are aware of?
- Additionally will they or have they taken any steps to address this issue?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission**

(11 April 2012)

The Commission is not aware of the facts reported by the Honourable Member. The aim of The Hague 1980 Convention on Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction Convention, to date ratified by 87 countries, including all EU Member States, is to restore the status quo by means of the prompt return of wrongfully removed or retained children through a system of cooperation among central authorities.

Council Regulation (EC) No 2201/2003 of 27 November 2003 concerning jurisdiction and the recognition and enforcement of judgments in matrimonial matters and the matters of parental responsibility<sup>(1)</sup> (the Brussels IIa regulation) introduces even stricter rules on parental child abduction which apply between Member States from 1 March 2005.

It is for the national court to determine in the specific cases before it whether the 1980 Hague Convention is correctly invoked in the course of judicial proceedings.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 338, 23.12.2003, p. 1.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001622/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(9 febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: Danni all'agricoltura pugliese

Nella prima settimana di febbraio, le abbondanti nevicate hanno provocato in Puglia danni pari quasi a 20 milioni di euro, una cifra che vale il 5 % del PIL agricolo regionale. È quanto sostengono le associazioni di categoria che hanno stimato i danni provocati dal maltempo.

Allo stato attuale permangono condizioni di elevato e incombente rischio, tali che gli agricoltori hanno chiesto lo stato di calamità naturale. Risulta distrutto il 50 % degli ortaggi di autunno, cavoli, verze, cicorie, carciofi, radicchio e broccoli. Tra gli ingenti danni sono stati distrutti 12 allevamenti in agro di Deliceto, 3 a Bovino, 6 ad Anzano e 17 a Troia.

Alla luce dei fatti sopraesposti, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. è a conoscenza dei danni provocati dal maltempo all'agricoltura pugliese?
2. Considerando la richiesta delle associazioni agricole per l'ottenimento di aiuti a causa delle calamità naturali, rivolta al sistema nazionale, vi è la possibilità che l'Italia faccia presente la situazione di emergenza alla Commissione per usufruire del Fondo Europeo Agricolo per lo Sviluppo Rurale (FEASR), avvalendosi così di politiche di ripristino del potenziale produttivo agricolo danneggiato da calamità naturali?

**Risposta data da Dacian Cioloș a nome della Commissione**

(8 marzo 2012)

L'onorevole parlamentare chiede se la Commissione sia a conoscenza dei danni causati dalle abbondanti nevicate che hanno colpito la Puglia nella prima settimana di febbraio. Tali nevicate hanno provocato ingenti danni alle produzioni orticole autunnali (cavolo, verza, cicoria, radicchio e broccoli).

La Commissione è a conoscenza delle nevicate in questione. Tuttavia, nonostante alcuni programmi di sviluppo rurale italiani per il periodo di programmazione 2007-2013 prevedano un sostegno per il ripristino del potenziale agricolo danneggiato da calamità naturali, il programma di sviluppo rurale della Puglia non contempla una misura di sostegno di questo tipo.

Nell'ambito del programma di sviluppo rurale regionale, infatti, le autorità regionali pugliesi non hanno mai richiesto l'attivazione di detta misura. Se le autorità regionali avanzassero tale richiesta, la Commissione provvederebbe sicuramente a valutarla nel più breve tempo possibile, tenendo conto della normativa in materia di sviluppo rurale.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001622/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(9 February 2012)

*Subject:* Damage to agriculture in Apulia

Heavy snowfalls during the first week of February caused damage in Apulia totalling almost EUR 20 million, approximately 5 % of the regional agricultural GDP, according to associations in the sector and based on their estimates of the damage caused by the bad weather.

The situation currently remains high risk and farmers have called for a state of natural disaster to be declared. Fifty per cent of the autumn vegetables (cabbage, Savoy cabbage, chicory, artichokes, radicchio and broccoli) have been destroyed. The enormous damage also includes 12 farms that were wiped out in Deliceto, as were 3 in Bovino, 6 in Anzano and 17 in Troia.

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

1. Is it aware of the damage suffered by farmers in Apulia as a result of the bad weather?
2. In regard to the agricultural associations' request to the national government for natural disaster aid, is it possible for Italy to draw the emergency situation to the Commission's attention in order to obtain aid from the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD), and thereby avail itself of policies on restoring agricultural production potential damaged by natural disasters?

**Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission**

(8 March 2012)

The Honourable Member asks whether the Commission is aware of the damage caused by heavy snowfalls which occurred during the first week of February in Apulia. The snowfalls caused serious damage to the autumn vegetables (cabbage, savoy cabbage, chicory, artichokes, radicchio and broccoli).

The Commission is aware of the snowfalls, but although some Italian Rural Development Programmes for the programming period 2007-2013 foresee support for the restoration of agricultural potential damaged by natural disasters, the regional Rural Development Programme for Puglia does not include this measure.

The Regional Authorities of Apulia have never requested activation of this measure under the regional Rural Development Programme. If such a request is introduced by the Regional Authorities, the Commission will certainly evaluate such demand within the shortest time possible taking into account the legislation on rural development.

---



(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001623/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(9 febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: Crisi e piano di aiuto europeo ad Atene

Questa settimana doveva essere decisiva per il nuovo megaprestito della BCE, dell'UE e del Fondo monetario internazionale alla Grecia. Alcune delle conseguenze saranno il taglio del 20-22 % dello stipendio minimo e l'eliminazione della tredicesima anche nel settore privato. Da 750 euro lordi al mese si scenderebbe a 580. Con l'aggiunta di altre decurtazioni mostruose del numero di dipendenti pubblici.

In numerose aziende private, soprattutto le più piccole, sono decine di migliaia i dipendenti che già non ricevono lo stipendio da mesi. Tuttavia continuano a lavorare quasi gratuitamente per salvare almeno l'illusoria certezza di non perdere il posto. Un po' di sollievo poteva venire dalla caccia agli evasori, che sono un'enormità, proprio come in Italia. Ma il problema è che non ci sono le strutture, le forze, e soprattutto la volontà di andarli a scovare.

Molti dichiarano di essere pronti a emigrare in Australia, in Germania, altri non hanno alcuna intenzione di muoversi da Atene, costi quel che costi.

Ciò premesso, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. a quanto ammonta il piano di aiuti europeo alla Grecia, e in che modo e con quali fondi sarà finanziato?
2. Si sta già discutendo di eventuali altri piani di aiuto a Stati membri afflitti da gravi difficoltà economiche?

**Risposta data da Olli Rehn a nome della Commissione**

(26 aprile 2012)

Il 14 marzo 2012 i ministri delle Finanze degli Stati membri dell'area dell'euro hanno approvato il secondo piano di risanamento economico a favore della Grecia, fondato sui principi che seguono:

- i principali obiettivi del nuovo piano consistono nel garantire la sostenibilità del debito e nel ripristinare la competitività dell'economia greca <sup>(1)</sup>;
- il nuovo piano prevede un volume totale di finanziamenti pari a 164,5 miliardi di euro fino al 2014 e consiste nei fondi non utilizzati del primo piano di aiuti (34,5 miliardi di euro, di cui 10,1 miliardi provenienti dall'FMI e 24,4 miliardi provenienti dallo strumento di prestito a favore della Grecia) e in ulteriori fondi fino a 130 miliardi di euro.

I dettagli del nuovo piano di assistenza finanziaria sono stati finalizzati dopo aver ottenuto garanzie circa la ristrutturazione del debito <sup>(2)</sup>.

La necessaria riduzione dei costi del lavoro deve essere integrata da un programma di riforme strutturali dei mercati dei prodotti e dei servizi intese a promuovere la concorrenza interna e ad accrescere la produttività. In questo contesto, la Commissione, insieme ad altre parti interessate, sta mettendo a punto un'importante assistenza tecnica, da erogare attraverso la TFGR <sup>(3)</sup>. Si sta inoltre lavorando attivamente per promuovere l'attuazione dei fondi strutturali UE a favore della crescita e dell'occupazione. In questo spirito, la BEI <sup>(4)</sup> ha recentemente avviato la creazione di un fondo di garanzia specifico a sostegno delle PMI <sup>(5)</sup> in Grecia, in grado di erogare prestiti fino a 1 miliardo di euro attingendo ai fondi strutturali destinati alla Grecia e non utilizzati.

Per assistere gli Stati membri non sono stati presi in esame eventuali altri piani di aiuto specifici. Qualora necessario, tuttavia, il meccanismo europeo di aiuti può ricorrere allo strumento di sostegno della bilancia dei pagamenti, al MESF <sup>(6)</sup> e all'EFSF <sup>(7)</sup>, che sarà sostituito dal MES <sup>(8)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> Oltre ad un ingente stock del debito, nell'ultimo decennio la Grecia ha accumulato un forte divario di competitività rispetto agli altri Stati membri dell'area dell'euro.

<sup>(2)</sup> Per ulteriori informazioni: [http://ec.europa.eu/economy\\_finance/eu\\_borrower/greek\\_loan\\_facility/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/eu_borrower/greek_loan_facility/index_en.htm)

<sup>(3)</sup> Task Force per la Grecia.

<sup>(4)</sup> Banca europea per gli investimenti.

<sup>(5)</sup> Piccole e medie imprese.

<sup>(6)</sup> Meccanismo europeo di stabilizzazione finanziaria.

<sup>(7)</sup> Fondo europeo di stabilità finanziaria (European Financial Stability Facility).

<sup>(8)</sup> Meccanismo europeo di stabilità.

Il 2 marzo 2012 i capi di Stato e di governo degli Stati membri dell'area dell'euro hanno sottolineato ancora una volta la loro determinazione a fare tutto il necessario per garantire la stabilità finanziaria dell'area dell'euro nel suo complesso e la loro volontà di agire di conseguenza <sup>(\*)</sup>.

---

---

<sup>(\*)</sup> Cfr. la dichiarazione: [http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms\\_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/128521.pdf](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/128521.pdf)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001623/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(9 February 2012)

*Subject:* Athens — Crisis and European aid plan

This week was expected to be decisive for the new mega-loan from the ECB, the EU and the IMF to Greece. The consequences will include a 20-22 % cut in the minimum wage and the extension to the private sector of the abolition of the 'thirteenth month' bonus, resulting in a reduction in gross monthly terms from EUR 750 to EUR 580. In addition, there will be mass sackings of public-sector employees.

In a large number of private businesses, particularly smaller ones, tens of thousands of employees have not been paid for months. They continue, however, to work for almost nothing, at least to preserve the illusion of not losing their jobs. A little relief could perhaps have been provided by pursuing the many tax avoiders who exist in Greece as in Italy. However, the structures, the capacity and, above all, the desire to seek these people out simply do not exist.

Many people say they are willing to emigrate to Australia or Germany, but others have no intention of leaving Athens, whatever the cost.

In view of the above, can the Commission specify:

1. the total amount concerned by the European aid plan for Greece, specifying how and from what funds it will be financed;
2. whether any other potential aid plans are already being discussed with a view to assisting Member States in serious economic difficulty?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission**

(26 April 2012)

Euro area finance ministers approved the financing of the second Greek economic adjustment programme (14 March 12). Its parameters are:

- The main goals of the new programme are ensuring debt sustainability and restoring competitiveness of the Greek economy <sup>(1)</sup>.
- The new programme has a total financing volume of EUR 164.5 billion until 2014. It consists of the undisbursed funds from the first programme (EUR 34.5 billion, of which EUR 10.1 billion from the IMF and EUR 24.4 billion from the Greek Loan Facility) and additional funds of up to EUR 130 billion.

The details of the new financial assistance programme were finalised after a successful debt exchange had been secured <sup>(2)</sup>.

The necessary reduction in labour costs needs to be complemented by a programme of structural reforms in product and services markets which increase internal competition and increase productivity. Against this background, the Commission together with other stakeholders is mobilising substantial technical assistance via the TFGR <sup>(3)</sup>. Furthermore, strong efforts are underway to boost up the implementation of the EU Structural Funds in favour of growth and employment. In this vein, the EIB <sup>(4)</sup> recently launched the creation of a dedicated guarantee fund supporting lending up to EUR 1 billion to SME <sup>(5)</sup> in Greece by using unabsorbed Structural Funds for Greece.

<sup>(1)</sup> Greece developed over the last decade a large competitiveness gap vis-à-vis the other euro-area Member States and accumulated a large debt stock.

<sup>(2)</sup> For more details: [http://ec.europa.eu/economy\\_finance/eu\\_borrower/greek\\_loan\\_facility/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/eu_borrower/greek_loan_facility/index_en.htm)

<sup>(3)</sup> Task Force Greece.

<sup>(4)</sup> European Investment Bank.

<sup>(5)</sup> Small and medium-sized enterprises.

No other specific potential aid plans are being considered to assist Member States. If need be, however, the current European firewall can count on the Balance-of-Payments Facility, the EFSM <sup>(6)</sup> and the EFSF <sup>(7)</sup> which will be succeeded by the ESM <sup>(8)</sup>.

Euro Area Heads of State and Government underlined once again on 2 March 2012 their determination to do whatever is needed to ensure the financial stability of the euro area as a whole, and their readiness to act accordingly <sup>(9)</sup>.

---

---

<sup>(6)</sup> European Financial Stabilisation Mechanism.

<sup>(7)</sup> European Financial Stability Facility.

<sup>(8)</sup> European Stability Mechanism.

<sup>(9)</sup> See statement: [http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms\\_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/128521.pdf](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/128521.pdf)

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-001625/12**  
**à la Commission**  
**Rachida Dati (PPE)**  
(14 février 2012)

*Objet:* Rôle du gaz dans le bouquet énergétique européen à l'horizon 2050

Le grand froid qui frappe l'Europe a rappelé un enjeu essentiel de notre futur énergétique: la sécurité d'approvisionnement. Les évolutions liées au changement climatique, à l'abandon du nucléaire dans certains pays et à l'augmentation de nos besoins en énergie posent la question du rôle central que jouera le gaz. Il est l'une des seules sources d'énergie capables de répondre aux trois enjeux que s'est fixés l'Union européenne dans le cadre de sa politique énergétique: la sécurité, la compétitivité et la durabilité.

Mais surtout, ces évolutions révèlent qu'il est irréaliste de nous concentrer essentiellement sur des objectifs à long terme (2050). Des solutions à ces objectifs doivent certes être trouvées, mais elles ne doivent pas faire oublier que c'est dès aujourd'hui que nous avons besoin de plus d'énergie. Les initiatives sur les énergies renouvelables, que cette vision à long terme met au devant de la scène, sont louables. Cependant, leurs limites techniques dans la provision d'énergie, leur durée de mise en place et leur coût élevé, qui risquent de pénaliser les consommateurs, nous obligent à les combiner à d'autres sources conventionnelles.

Le gaz s'intègre parfaitement dans une telle stratégie d'approvisionnement durable, sûr et compétitif, sans pour autant faire obstacle aux nécessaires évolutions technologiques et politiques en matière d'énergies renouvelables. Grâce à de nouvelles technologies, tel le CCS, il pourra également jouer un rôle dans une économie faiblement carbonée. La Commission considère d'ailleurs dans sa feuille de route sur l'énergie à l'horizon 2050 que le gaz jouera un rôle essentiel dans l'évolution du bouquet énergétique européen.

Les larges gisements récemment découverts (tel celui d'Absheron en Azerbaïdjan), ou encore la flexibilité offerte par le gaz naturel liquéfié, portent bon espoir que le gaz restera une source d'énergie fiable, et pour longtemps.

Pourtant, il semble que le gaz soit appréhendé essentiellement comme un outil permettant la transition vers les énergies renouvelables. À l'horizon 2050, la Commission considère qu'elles devraient être au cœur du bouquet énergétique européen.

Dans le contexte actuel rappelé ci-dessus, les citoyens européens attendent des réponses claires et chiffrées de la part de la Commission: un bouquet énergétique majoritairement composé d'énergies renouvelables sera-t-il à court, moyen et long termes, à même de répondre aux besoins croissants des consommateurs, aux pics de consommation, et ceci à des prix raisonnables?

**Réponse donnée par M. Oettinger au nom de la Commission**  
(2 mars 2012)

Les énergies renouvelables seront importantes non seulement à moyen et long terme mais aussi, et sensiblement, à court terme. Leur contribution connaît en effet une progression rapide: à titre d'exemple, elles représentaient en 2011 plus de 70 % de la totalité de la nouvelle capacité de production d'électricité installée dans l'UE. La part des énergies renouvelables dans la consommation finale brute d'énergie pourrait augmenter de manière substantielle d'ici à 2050.

Mais le gaz jouera effectivement un rôle crucial pour la transition. Avec les technologies existantes, le remplacement du charbon (et du pétrole) par le gaz à court ou moyen terme pourrait contribuer à réduire les émissions au moins jusqu'à 2030 ou 2035. Avec l'évolution des technologies, le gaz pourrait jouer un rôle de plus en plus important. Si le captage et le stockage du carbone (CSC) sont disponibles sur le marché et appliqués à grande échelle, le gaz pourrait même rejoindre les technologies à faible intensité de carbone. À mesure que la part de la production d'énergie à partir de sources renouvelables augmentera, il faudra également disposer des ressources plus flexibles comme capacité d'appoint dans le réseau électrique. À cet égard, le gaz jouera un rôle important comme capacité d'appoint et d'équilibrage flexible face à la variabilité des sources d'énergie renouvelables, en particulier en période de forte demande.

D'une manière générale, les marchés mondiaux du gaz sont en plein changement, notamment en raison de l'exploitation des gaz de schiste en Amérique du Nord. Le transport du gaz naturel liquéfié (GNL) étant moins dépendant des gazoducs, les marchés sont devenus de plus en plus internationaux. Les ressources gazières moins classiques pourraient devenir des nouvelles sources importantes d'approvisionnement en Europe ou autour de l'Europe. Cette évolution, ainsi que l'intégration du marché intérieur, pourrait atténuer les inquiétudes quant à la dépendance actuelle à l'égard d'un nombre restreint d'infrastructures pour les importations de gaz. Les scénarios de la feuille de route pour l'énergie à l'horizon 2050 font également apparaître que si l'on transforme le système énergétique, les coûts ne diffèrent pas sensiblement par rapport au maintien des politiques actuelles et peuvent même diminuer.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-001625/12  
to the Commission  
Rachida Dati (PPE)  
(14 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Role of gas in Europe's energy mix by 2050

The very cold weather affecting Europe is a reminder of a crucial issue in our future energy policy: security of supply. Developments related to climate change, the abandonment of nuclear power in some countries and the increase in our energy needs raise the issue of the central role which gas will play. It is one of the only energy resources capable of meeting the three aims that the European Union has set itself as part of its energy policy: security, competitiveness and sustainability.

These developments teach us above all that it is unrealistic to focus exclusively on long-term objectives (2050). Of course, we must find solutions for meeting these goals but they should not let us forget that it is now that we need more energy. Initiatives for renewable energies which this long-term view places in the forefront are commendable. However, technical limitations to the energy they supply, the time that it takes to install them and their high costs, which are likely to penalise consumers, means that we must combine them with other conventional sources of energy.

Gas fits perfectly into a strategy of sustainable, secure and competitive supply such as this, and does not stand in the way of the technological and political developments that are needed in renewable energies. Thanks to new technologies, such as Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS), it may also have a role to play in a low carbon economy. The Commission, in its energy road map for 2050, also believes that gas will play a key role in the development of Europe's energy mix.

The recently-discovered large gas fields (such as those in Absheron in Azerbaijan), and the flexibility provided by natural liquefied gas, give us reason to suppose that gas will remain a reliable source of energy for a considerable period to come.

However, it would appear that gas is essentially conceived as a tool that enables transition to renewable energies. By 2050, the Commission believes that these should be at the heart of Europe's energy mix.

In the current context outlined above, the citizens of Europe expect clear and quantified answers from the Commission: will an energy mix mainly composed of renewable energies be sufficient, in the medium and long term, to meet the growing needs of consumers, to cope with peak consumption and to do so at a reasonable cost?

**Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission  
(2 March 2012)**

Renewable energy will be important not just for the medium or long term but also very much for the short term: renewables are playing a rapidly increasing role and by way of example, in 2011 they represented more than 70 % of all new electricity generation capacity installed in the EU. The share of renewables could rise substantially, in gross final energy consumption in 2050.

However, gas will indeed be critical for the transition. Substitution of coal (and oil) with gas in the short to medium term could help to reduce emissions with existing technologies until at least 2030 or 2035. With evolving technologies, gas might play an even increasing role. If carbon capture and storage (CCS) is commercially available and applied at large scale, gas may even become a low-carbon technology. As the contribution of renewable generation increases, there is also a need for more flexible resources as back-up capacity in the power system. In this respect, gas will be important as a flexible back-up and balancing capacity where renewable energy supplies are variable, especially in times of peak demand.

In general, global gas markets are changing, notably through the development of shale gas in North America. With liquefied natural gas (LNG), markets have become increasingly global since transport has become more independent from pipelines. Unconventional gas sources have become potentially important new sources of supply in or around Europe. Together with internal market integration, these developments could reduce concerns related to gas imports' current dependency on a small number of infrastructures. The scenarios of the Energy Roadmap 2050 also show that the costs of transforming the energy system do not differ substantially from current policies and can even be lower.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-001626/12  
to the Commission  
Chris Davies (ALDE)  
(14 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Faulty breast implants

The UK Independence Party claims that EC law forbids the UK's Medicines and Healthcare Regulatory Agency from conducting checks on imported products that carry a CE (European Conformity) mark. Is this true?

Further, the party says that British authorities should be allowed to make quality control spot checks on products bearing a CE mark. Is there any EC law that would prevent a Member State from carrying out such checks?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission  
(6 March 2012)**

The Member States have a general obligation to take all necessary steps to ensure that medical devices may be placed on the market and/or put into service only if they comply with the requirements of Directives 90/385/EEC <sup>(1)</sup>, 93/42/EEC <sup>(2)</sup> or 98/79/EC <sup>(3)</sup> (Article 2 of each of these Directives).

The obligations of Member States to conduct market surveillance, including controls of imported products entering the Union market are detailed in Regulation (EC) No 765/2008 <sup>(4)</sup>. Article 27 of this regulation requires that the authorities of the Member States carry out appropriate checks on the characteristics of products entering the Union market on an adequate scale before those products are released for free circulation.

Article 19 of Regulation (EC) No 765/2008 requires national market surveillance authorities to perform appropriate checks of products on the market, on an adequate scale, which may include documentary, physical or laboratory checks, on the basis of adequate samples. Spot checks on products bearing the CE marking are therefore a necessary means of effective market surveillance required by EU legislation.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 189, 20.7.1990.  
<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 169, 12.7.1993.  
<sup>(3)</sup> OJ L 331, 7.12.1998.  
<sup>(4)</sup> OJ L 218, 13.8.2008.



*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-001630/12  
to the Commission  
Nicole Sinclaire (NI)  
(10 February 2012)**

*Subject:* iPads

Can the Commission state how many iPads have been provided for its staff, as well as the total cost of this provision?

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

As of mid-February 2012, the Commission had purchased 101 iPads for its staff, for a total cost of EUR 60.761.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001631/12  
to the Commission  
Nicole Sinclaire (NI)  
(10 February 2012)**

*Subject:* RTL/CLT-UFA

Could the Commission inform me about any contracts it has awarded to the broadcaster RTL or its CLT-UFA subsidiary since 1997?

Could the Commission further inform me about any concessions or licences that the companies may have been granted during the same period?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission  
(2 April 2012)**

According to the information available, the Commission has not awarded any contract to the broadcaster RTL group and its subsidiary CLT-UFA.

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its online database 'Financial Transparency System' <sup>(1)</sup> comprising the names of the beneficiaries of grants and other forms of support, awarded by the Commission every year since 2007.

The Commission is not aware of the possible licenses granted to RTL during the same period. The broadcaster falls within Luxembourg jurisdiction and the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the national competent authorities to enquire about this issue.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/beneficiaries/fts/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/beneficiaries/fts/index_en.htm)

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001632/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Charalampos Angourakis (GUE/NGL)**  
(10 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Εγκατάσταση και λειτουργία ανεμογεννητριών στο Όρος Βούρινο Σιάτιστας Κοζάνης

Αγανάκτηση προκαλεί σε φορείς και κατοίκους της Σιάτιστας Ν. Κοζάνης και της ευρύτερης περιοχής η αδειοδότηση για εγκατάσταση τριών αιολικών πάρκων στις ευαίσθητες για τη βιοποικιλότητα περιοχές της Ζώνης Ειδικής Προστασίας — ΖΕΠ (GR1330002 «Όρη βορείου Βούρινου και Μέλλια»), που περιβάλλουν την Ειδική Ζώνη Διατήρησης — ΕΖΔ (GR1330001 «Όρος Βούρινο — Κορυφή Ασπροβούνι») και όπου αναπαράγονται είδη αρπακτικών πτηνών, προστατευόμενα από το Παράρτημα Ι της Οδηγίας 79/409/ΕΟΚ, που κινδυνεύουν από την πρόσκρουση στα πτερύγια των ανεμογεννητριών και από τη διατάραξη του ενδιαιτήματός τους. Έρευνες για την ορνιθοπανίδα του Βούρινου (Hallmann 1996a-Μπουρδάκης 2005) δείχνουν υποβάθμιση, ενώ ειδικά καταγράφεται εξαφάνιση του ζευγαριού των Βασιλαετών, σταδιακή μείωση των αναπαραγόμενων ζευγαριών Χρυσαιτών από το 2004 έως το 2010 (είδη χαρακτηρισμού της ΖΕΠ). Οι δύο, με τα ίδια στοιχεία παρουσιαζόμενες, ΜΠΕ χωρίστηκαν, για να εμφανίζονται πιο ήπιες οι επιπτώσεις (salami slicing), πρακτική καταδικασμένη από την επιστημονική κοινότητα. Η αδειοδότηση των αιολικών πάρκων εντός της ΖΕΠ, που θα «διεμβολίσουν» από τρεις διαφορετικές κατευθύνσεις την υψηλής οικολογικής αξίας ΕΖΔ, χωρίς αξιολόγηση με Ειδική Περιβαλλοντική Μελέτη, έρχεται σε αντίθεση με την εθνική και κοινοτική νομοθεσία, υπηρετεί όμως τα κέρδη του κεφαλαίου. Το συμφέρον του κεφαλαιοκράτη επενδυτή ανάγεται σε «δημόσιο συμφέρον» και με αυτό τον τρόπο καθαγιαζονται οι πιο καταστροφικές για τα οικοσυστήματα παρεμβάσεις. Γι' αυτό η βιοποικιλότητα παρουσιάζει δραματική υποβάθμιση. Στην προκείμενη περίπτωση, η χωροθέτηση και εγκατάσταση των αιολικών πάρκων και των συνοδών τους έργων πριν την εκπόνηση της ΕΠΜ και του απαραίτητου Διαχ. Σχεδίου δημιουργεί τετελεσμένα γεγονότα με την εγκατάσταση βιομηχανικών εγκαταστάσεων μεγάλης κλίμακας στο μεγαλύτερο τμήμα της ΖΕΠ, σε άμεση επαφή με την ΕΖΔ, παραβιάζοντας την αρχή της πρόληψης και άλλους κανόνες της βιώσιμης διαχείρισης του περιβάλλοντος.

Συμφωνεί η Επιτροπή με την εγκατάσταση πλήθους ανεμογεννητριών σε μια από τις πιο ευαίσθητες ορνιθολογικά περιοχές του δικτύου Natura 2000; Είναι η πιο πάνω χωροθέτηση συμβατή με την υποχρέωση της Ελλάδας, όπως και κάθε άλλης χώρας της ΕΕ, για συμμόρφωση με τις διεθνείς της υποχρεώσεις για τη διατήρηση της βιοποικιλότητας και ειδικότερα της άγριας ορνιθοπανίδας; Συμφωνεί ότι πρέπει να παρθούν από τις ελληνικές αρχές συγκεκριμένα μέτρα προστασίας για τα προστατευόμενα είδη της συγκεκριμένης ΖΕΠ και ΕΖΔ που κινδυνεύουν από την λειτουργία των αιολικών σταθμών;

**Απάντηση του κ. Ροτοτσνίκ εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(30 Μαρτίου 2012)

Για τη χωροθέτηση των αιολικών πάρκων πρέπει να τηρούνται οι διατάξεις των οδηγιών της ΕΕ για τα άγρια πτηνά<sup>(1)</sup> και τους οικοτόπους (τα ενδιαιτήματα)<sup>(2)</sup>. Ειδικότερα, σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 6 παράγραφος 3 της οδηγίας για τους οικοτόπους, κάθε σχέδιο, μη άμεσα συνδεδεμένο ή αναγκαίο για τη διαχείριση τόπου Natura 2000, το οποίο όμως είναι δυνατόν να επηρεάζει σημαντικά τον εν λόγω τόπο εκτιμάται δεόντως, καθ'εαυτό ή από κοινού με άλλα σχέδια, ως προς τις επιπτώσεις του στον τόπο, λαμβανομένων υπόψη των στόχων διατήρησης του τόπου.

Ανάλογα με τα αποτελέσματα της προαναφερόμενης εκτίμησης επιπτώσεων, η αρμόδια αρχή είτε συμφωνεί με το σχέδιο, είτε λαμβάνει τα αναγκαία μέτρα για να μετριαστούν οι αρνητικές επιπτώσεις, ώστε να μην θίγεται η ακεραιότητα του τόπου. Η Επιτροπή έχει εκδώσει κατευθυντήριες γραμμές σχετικά με τον καλύτερο τρόπο για να εξασφαλίζεται ότι οι εξελίξεις της αιολικής ενέργειας συμβιβάζονται με τις διατάξεις των οδηγιών για τους οικοτόπους και τα πτηνά<sup>(3)</sup>.

Είναι ευθύνη των αρμόδιων ελληνικών αρχών να εξασφαλίσουν συμμόρφωση με τις προαναφερόμενες διατάξεις. Η Επιτροπή δεν έχει ενημερωθεί σχετικά με τις ακριβείς συνθήκες που σχετίζονται με το έργο το οποίο αναφέρει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος. Η Επιτροπή είναι δυνατόν να παρέμβει σε περίπτωση που υπάρχουν αποδείξεις για παραβίαση των εν λόγω διατάξεων.

<sup>(1)</sup> Οδηγία 2009/147/ΕΚ (κωδικοποιημένη έκδοση που αντικαθιστά την οδηγία 79/409/ΕΟΚ), ΕΕ L 20 της 26.1.2010.

<sup>(2)</sup> Οδηγία 92/43/ΕΟΚ του Συμβουλίου, της 21ης Μαΐου 1992, για τη διατήρηση των φυσικών οικοτόπων καθώς και της άγριας πανίδας και χλωρίδας, ΕΕ L 206 της 22.7.1992.

<sup>(3)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/Wind\\_farms.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/Wind_farms.pdf).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001632/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Charalampos Angourakis (GUE/NGL)**  
(10 February 2012)

*Subject:* Installation and operation of wind turbines on Mount Vourinos, Siatista, Kozani

Civil organisations and individual citizens of Siatista in Kozani Prefecture and in the wider region are outraged by the granting of a permit to establish three wind parks in the biodiversity-sensitive Special Protection Area, SPA (GR1330002 'North Vourinos Mountains and Mellia') surrounding the 'Mount Vourinos — Asprovouni Summit' Special Area of Conservation SAC (GR1330001), which is a breeding area for birds of prey protected by Appendix I of Directive 79/409/EEC. These birds are endangered by the risk of colliding with the blades of the wind turbines and by the disturbance of their habitat. Studies of the bird fauna of Vourinos (Hallmann 1996a-Bourdakis 2005) indicate a deterioration in the situation, and have recorded, in particular, the disappearance of a pair of imperial eagles and a gradual diminution in the numbers of breeding pairs of golden eagles between 2004 and 2010 (designated species in the Special Protection Area). Two environmental impact assessments presented with the same data have been separated so that the impact appears milder ('salami slicing'), a practice which is condemned by the scientific community. Authorisation for the wind parks inside the Special Protection Area, breaching the ecologically valuable Special Area of Conservation from three different directions, without any valuation in a Special Environmental Study, violates national and Community legislation but serves capitalist profitability. The interests of the capitalist investor are elevated into the 'public interest' and in this way the most destructive disruptions of ecosystems are condoned. It is for this reason that society is witnessing a dramatic deterioration in biodiversity. In this particular case, the siting and installation of windparks and their ancillary works prior to the elaboration of the Special Environmental Study and the requisite long-term planning create *faits accomplis*, with the establishment of large-scale industrial installations over the greater part of the Special Protection Area and bordering directly on the Special Area of Conservation. This violates the principle of prevention and other rules of sustainable environmental management.

Does the Commission agree with the installation of a large number of wind turbines in one of the most sensitive ornithological reserves of the Natura 2000 network? Is the choice of the abovementioned site compatible with the duty of Greece, like that of every other EU country, to comply with its international obligations to conserve biodiversity, and in particular that of wild bird fauna? Does it agree that specific protective measures must be taken by the Greek authorities for the sake of the protected species of this Special Protection Area and Special Area of Conservation that are endangered by the functioning of wind parks?

**Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission**  
(30 March 2012)

The siting of wind farms must be in accordance with the provisions of the EU Birds <sup>(1)</sup> and Habitats <sup>(2)</sup> Directives. In particular, according to Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive, any plan or project not directly connected with or necessary to the management of a Natura 2000 site but likely to have a significant impact thereon shall be subject to an Appropriate Assessment, to evaluate the project's impact, alone or in combination with other projects, on the site's conservation objectives.

Depending on the findings of the abovementioned assessment, the competent authority either agrees to the plan or project or takes the measures necessary to mitigate negative effects, so that the integrity of the site is not affected. The Commission has issued guidance on how best to ensure that wind energy developments are compatible with the provisions of the Habitats and Birds Directives <sup>(3)</sup>.

It is the responsibility of Greek competent authorities to ensure compliance with the aforementioned provisions. The Commission has not been made aware of the precise circumstances related to the project referred to by the Honourable Member. It can intervene if it is provided evidence of breach of those provisions.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Directive 2009/147/EC (codified version replacing Directive 79/409/EEC), OJ L 20, 26.1.2010.

<sup>(2)</sup> 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.

<sup>(3)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/Wind\\_farms.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/Wind_farms.pdf)

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001633/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Georgios Papastamkos (PPE)**  
(10 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Προστατευόμενη Ονομασία Προέλευσης (ΠΟΠ) Καλαμάτα

Από τις 13.6.1997 έχει καταχωρισθεί στο μητρώο της ΕΕ η Προστατευόμενη Ονομασία Προέλευσης «Καλαμάτα» (PDO Kalamata). Στις 21.12.2009 υπεβλήθη αίτηση για την επέκταση της εν λόγω ΠΟΠ (με αριθμό φακέλου EL/PDO/0117/0037).

Σημειωτέον ότι πρόκειται για μία εξόχως σημαντική ΠΟΠ, όπως προκύπτει, μεταξύ άλλων, από τον αριθμό των ελαιοπαραγωγών, οι οποίοι την υποστηρίζουν, την παραγωγική τους ικανότητα (45 000 τόνοι ετησίως), και βεβαίως την ιδιαίτερος υψηλή ποιότητα του προϊόντος, του εξαιρετικά παρθένου ελαιολάδου.

Δεδομένου ότι έχει παρέλθει μεγάλο χρονικό διάστημα από την υποβολή της αίτησης, μπορεί να με ενημερώσει η Επιτροπή σε ποιο στάδιο βρίσκεται η εξέταση του φακέλου από τις υπηρεσίες της; Μπορεί να με διαβεβαιώσει ως προς την άμεση ολοκλήρωση της διαδικασίας;

**Απάντηση του κ. Cιολος εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(20 Μαρτίου 2012)

Η αίτηση καταχώρισης τροποποίησης των προδιαγραφών προϊόντος για το προϊόν με την Προστατευόμενη Ονομασία Προέλευσης (ΠΟΠ) «Καλαμάτα» ελήφθη από την Επιτροπή στις 21 Δεκεμβρίου 2009. Αφορά κυρίως επέκταση της γεωγραφικής περιοχής αλλά περιλαμβάνει επίσης αλλαγές στην περιγραφή του προϊόντος και στη μέθοδο παραγωγής.

Η εξέταση της αίτησης από την Επιτροπή κατέληξε στο συμπέρασμα ότι είναι απαραίτητες συμπληρωματικές πληροφορίες και, στις 16 Δεκεμβρίου 2010, απεστάλη στην Ελλάδα αίτημα για περαιτέρω πληροφορίες. Απαντήσεις στα ερωτήματα που έθεσε η Επιτροπή ελήφθησαν στις 30 Ιουνίου 2011 αλλά από την εξέτασή τους προέκυψε ότι απαιτούνται περαιτέρω διευκρινίσεις και απεστάλη νέο αίτημα για διευκρινίσεις στις 5 Δεκεμβρίου 2011. Οι απαντήσεις στα εν λόγω ερωτήματα ελήφθησαν στις 30 Δεκεμβρίου 2011.

Η Επιτροπή ολοκληρώνει τώρα την ανάλυση των απαντήσεων αυτών ώστε να εκτιμήσει εάν η αίτηση πληροί πλέον τις απαιτήσεις του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 510/2006 <sup>(1)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> Κανονισμός (ΕΚ) αριθ. 510/2006 του Συμβουλίου της 20ής Μαρτίου 2006 για την προστασία των γεωγραφικών ενδείξεων και των ονομασιών προέλευσης των γεωργικών προϊόντων και των τροφίμων (ΕΕ L 93 της 31.3.2006, σ. 12).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001633/12  
to the Commission**

**Georgios Papastamkos (PPE)**

(10 February 2012)

*Subject:* Protected Designation of Origin (PDO) Kalamata

Since 13 June 1997, the 'Kalamata' Protected Designation of Origin (PDO Kalamata) has been included in the EU register. On 21 December 2009, an application was submitted for an extension of that PDO (file number EL/PDO/0117/0037).

It should be noted that this is an extremely important PDO. This is clear, amongst other things, from the number of oil producers who support it, their production capacity (45 000 tonnes annually), and of course the particularly high quality of the product itself: extra virgin olive oil.

Given that there has been a considerable time lapse since the lodging of the application, can the Commission tell me what stage its services have reached in their examination of the file? Can it provide me with an assurance that the procedure will be promptly completed?

**Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission**

(20 March 2012)

The application for registration of an amendment of the product specification of the Protected Designation of Origin (PDO) 'Kalamata' was received by the Commission on 21 December 2009. It mainly concerns an increase of the geographical area but also includes changes to the description of the product and to the method of production.

The scrutiny of the application by the Commission concluded that complementary information was necessary and a request for further information was sent to Greece on 16 December 2010. Answers to our questions were received on 30 June 2011 but scrutiny showed that further clarifications were still necessary and a new request for clarification was sent on 5 December 2011. Answers to those questions were received on 30 December 2011.

The Commission is currently finalising the analysis of those replies to assess whether the application now fulfils the requirements of Regulation (EC) No 510/2006 <sup>(1)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Council Regulation (EC) No 510/2006 of 20 March 2006 on the protection of geographical indications and designations of origin for agricultural products and foodstuffs (OJ L 93, 31.3.2006, p. 12).

(българска версия)

**Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-001634/12**

до Комисията

**Филиз Хакъева Хюсменова (ALDE)**

(10 февруари 2012 г.)

Относно: Енергоспестяващи крушки

През септември 2012 г. изтича срокът за изтегляне от пазара на всички обикновени електрически крушки, с цел замяната им с енергоспестяващи. Още преди изтичане на този срок гражданите започнаха да се оплакват от качествата на някои енергоспестяващи крушки, които водят до натоварване на семейните бюджети, а също така има съмнение, че целите, които си постави ЕС чрез тези действия, е възможно да не бъдат постигнати.

Счита ли Комисията, че могат и следва да бъдат предприети допълнителни действия, които да повишат ефективността на провежданата политиката и да гарантират защита на правата на потребителите? Предвижда ли Комисията такива мерки и евентуално какви са те?

**Отговор, даден от г-н Йотингер от името на Комисията**

(30 март 2012 г.)

Преразглеждането на Регламента е предвидено за 2014 г. Комисията не планира преразглеждане преди тази дата.

Що се отнася до защитата на правата на потребителите, Комисията би искала да насочи вниманието на уважаемия член на Парламента към отговора, който е дала на писмен въпрос E-8792/10 на г-н Тарабела <sup>(1)</sup>. Освен изискванията за качеството и срока на експлоатация, за които се споменава в посочения отговор, по отношение на енергоспестяващите лампи, пускани на пазара в ЕС, се прилагат и законодателните актове на ЕС за защита на потребителите <sup>(2)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/>.

<sup>(2)</sup> Директивите, изброени в приложението към Директива 98/27/ЕО на Европейския парламент и на Съвета от 19 май 1998 година относно исковите за преустановяване на нарушения с цел защита на интересите на потребителите, ОВ L 166, 11.6.1998 г.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001634/12  
to the Commission**

**Filiz Hakaeva Hyusmenova (ALDE)**

(10 February 2012)

*Subject:* Energy saving light bulbs

In September 2012, the phase-out period for withdrawal of all ordinary light bulbs from the market expires, the goal being to replace them with energy saving ones. Even before the expiry of this period, the public has started to complain about the quality of some energy saving light bulbs, which has placed a burden on family budgets. Furthermore, there are doubts as to whether the targets which the EU is seeking to achieve through these measures are attainable.

Does the Commission believe that additional measures could and should be taken to increase the effectiveness of the policy being pursued and ensure that consumer rights are protected? Does the Commission envisage taking such measures and, if so, what form would these take?

**Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission**

(30 March 2012)

The revision of the regulation is scheduled for 2014. The Commission has no plans to revise the regulation before this date.

As regards the protection of consumer rights, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-8792/10 by Mr Tarabella <sup>(1)</sup>. In addition to the quality and lifetime requirements referred to in that answer, the EC laws on consumer protection <sup>(2)</sup> apply to the energy saving lamps placed on the market in the EU.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/>.

<sup>(2)</sup> Directives listed in the annex of Directive 98/27/EC of the Parliament and of the Council of 19 May 1998 on injunctions for the protection of consumers' interests, OJ L 166, 11.6.1998.



(Dansk udgave)

**Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-001636/12**  
**til Kommissionen**  
**Jens Rohde (ALDE)**  
(10. februar 2012)

Om: Retten til at strejke

Dagbladet Politiken skriver mandag den 6. februar 2012, at den er kommet i besiddelse af et udkast til en forordning fra Kommissionen som en del af en lovpakke om revideringen af reglerne for udstationerede arbejdstagere. Efter sigende vil forslaget til den nye forordning forpligte alle medlemsstater til at advare Kommissionen, hver gang der er optræk til arbejdskonflikter. I Danmark gælder den danske model, hvor fagforeninger og arbejdsgivere aftaler løn- og arbejdsvilkår, og kan de ikke nå til enighed, har de ansatte lov og ret til at strejke.

Forordningen vil også kunne gøre det muligt for Kommissionen at indbringe strejker for EU-domstolen, som herefter kan dømme en strejke ulovlig, hvis den krænker EU-traktatens artikel 45 om arbejdskraftens og kapitalens fri bevægelighed.

Der er udbredt bekymring både fra arbejdstager- og arbejdsgiverside over, at Kommissionen udkast ikke vil bringe øget juridisk klarhed om udstationerede arbejdstagere retsstilling i forhold til strejkeretten og den frie bevægelighed. Man er tværtimod bekymret over, at det vil forværre retssikkerheden.

Kan Kommissionen be- eller afkræfte ovenstående? Hvordan mener Kommissionen i bekræftende fald, at et sådan forslag ville være i overensstemmelse med både proportionalitets- og subsidiaritetsprincippet?

Kan Kommissionen garantere, at den i sit udkast til forordning vil respektere medlemsstaternes ret til at organisere deres arbejdsmarked fuldt ud, så aftalemodellen kan bestå i de lande, som har tradition herfor?

**Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af László Andor**  
(3. april 2012)

Den 21. marts 2012 vedtog Kommissionen en lovpakke for at forbedre beskyttelsen af udstationerede arbejdstagere <sup>(1)</sup>. Det overordnede mål med lovpakken er at forbedre anvendelsen af direktivet om udstationering af arbejdstagere fra 1996 <sup>(2)</sup> ved at gøre det lettere for arbejdstagerne at gøre deres rettigheder gældende, samtidig med at der i fuldt omfang tages hensyn til det indre marked, og hvordan det fungerer.

Kommissionen har fremsat et forslag til forordning om udøvelse af retten til kollektive skridt i henhold til reglerne om fri etableringsret og fri udveksling af tjenesteydelser <sup>(3)</sup>. Forslaget er helt i overensstemmelse med EU-Domstolens praksis <sup>(4)</sup>, idet det sikrer, at der til fulde tages hensyn til den grundlæggende ret til at tage kollektive skridt, herunder retten til at strejke, ved udøvelsen af etableringsretten og retten til at levere tjenesteydelser og omvendt til retten til at udøve disse økonomiske friheder ved udøvelsen af den grundlæggende ret til at tage kollektive skridt.

Forslaget berører på ingen måde de nationale bestemmelser om retten til at strejke og skaber ikke nye hindringer på europæisk plan for udøvelsen af retten til at strejke. Som det kræves i artikel 152 i traktaten om Den Europæiske Unions funktionsmåde, respekterer forslagene arbejdsmarkedsparternes rolle og uafhængighed, særlig hvad angår overenskomstforhandlinger. Det tager også hensyn til de nationale overenskomstsystemers forskelligartede karakter.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/12/267&format=HTML&aged=0&language=DA&guiLanguage=en>.

<sup>(2)</sup> Europa-Parlamentets og Rådets direktiv 96/71/EF af 16. december 1996 om udstationering af arbejdstagere som led i udveksling af tjenesteydelser.

<sup>(3)</sup> KOM(2012)0130 endelig.

<sup>(4)</sup> Dom af 11. december 2007, Viking, sag C-438/05; dom af 18. december 2007, Laval, sag C-341/05.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001636/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Jens Rohde (ALDE)**  
(10 February 2012)

*Subject:* The right to strike

On Monday 6 February 2012, the Danish daily newspaper *Politiken* wrote that it had obtained a draft regulation from the Commission forming part of a legislative package amending the rules for posted workers. The proposed new regulation reportedly requires all Member States to inform the Commission whenever an industrial dispute is in the offing. In Denmark, the Danish model applies: trade unions and employers agree on pay and working conditions; and if they are unable to reach an agreement, workers are entitled to strike.

The regulation would also make it possible for the Commission to refer strikes to the European Court of Justice, which may then rule that a strike is unlawful if it contravenes Article 45 TFEU concerning the free movement of workers and capital.

There is widespread concern on the part of both workers and employers that the Commission's draft will not increase legal clarity with regard to the legal position of posted workers in relation to the right to strike and free movement. On the contrary, there is concern that it will reduce legal certainty.

Can the Commission confirm or deny the above? How, in the view of the Commission, if it gives confirmation, would such a proposal be in line with both the proportionality principle and the subsidiarity principle?

Can the Commission guarantee that, in its proposal for a regulation, it will observe the right of Member States to organise their labour market in every respect, so that the collective bargaining model can remain in place in those countries that have traditionally applied it?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission**  
(3 April 2012)

On 21 March 2012, the Commission has adopted a legislative package to improve protection for posted workers <sup>(1)</sup>. The overall aim of the package is to improve the application of the posted workers directive from 1996 <sup>(2)</sup> by reinforcing the exercise of workers' rights while fully safeguarding the functioning of single market.

The Commission has put forward a proposal for a regulation on the exercise of the right to take collective action within the context of the freedom of establishment and the freedom to provide services <sup>(3)</sup>; the proposal is fully in line with the case law of the Court of Justice of the EU <sup>(4)</sup> by ensuring the full respect of the fundamental right to take collective action, including the right or freedom to strike, by the exercise of the freedom of establishment and the freedom to provide services and conversely the respect of these economic freedoms by the exercise of the fundamental right to take collective action.

The proposal leaves national law on the right to strike entirely unaffected and creates no additional obstacles at European level to the exercise of the right to strike. In accordance with Article 152 TFEU, the proposal respects the role and autonomy of social partners in particular with respect to collective bargaining. It moreover takes into account the differences in national industrial relation systems.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/12/267&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>.

<sup>(2)</sup> Directive 96/71/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 1996 concerning the posting of workers in the framework of the provision of services.

<sup>(3)</sup> COM(2012) 130 final.

<sup>(4)</sup> Judgment of 11 December 2007, *Viking*, Case C-438/05; judgment of 18 December 2007, *Laval*, Case C-341/05.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001637/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Alexander Graf Lambsdorff (ALDE)**  
(10. Februar 2012)

*Betrifft:* Einheitlicher Ansprechpartner

Mit der Dienstleistungsrichtlinie wurden die Mitgliedstaaten verpflichtet, einen „einheitlichen Ansprechpartner“ einzurichten. Dieser soll Behördengänge für Dienstleister auf der regionalen Ebene erheblich vereinfachen und beschleunigen. In Deutschland wird diese Stelle oft von mehreren Kreisen gemeinsam eingerichtet und verwaltet. Trotz der Zusammenlegung wird laut einem Bericht aus der Region Aachen die inhaltliche Funktion des einheitlichen Ansprechpartners nur sehr gering in Anspruch genommen. Im Monat gehen dort eine bis zwei Anfragen ein. Aus den Anfragen geht regelmäßig hervor, dass kein Standort innerhalb der Region favorisiert wird, sondern ein generelles Interesse an der Region besteht. Konkrete Antragsverfahren haben sich aus den Anfragen bislang nicht ergeben. Insgesamt ist die Arbeit des einheitlichen Ansprechpartners im Schwerpunkt administrativ.

1. Wie wird der einheitliche Ansprechpartner in anderen Mitgliedstaaten bzw. anderen Regionen Deutschlands organisiert?
2. Welche Erfahrungen hat die Kommission aus anderen Mitgliedstaaten bzw. anderen Regionen Deutschlands?
3. Inwieweit wird der einheitliche Ansprechpartner in anderen Mitgliedstaaten in Anspruch genommen?
4. Wurde der einheitliche Ansprechpartner bereits in allen Mitgliedstaaten eingerichtet?

**Antwort von Michel Barnier im Namen der Kommission**  
(2. April 2012)

Die Mitgliedstaaten konnten bei der Erfüllung ihrer Verpflichtung zur Schaffung funktionsfähiger „Einheitlicher Ansprechpartner“ gemäß der Dienstleistungsrichtlinie (2006/123/EG) frei über deren nationale Organisationsform entscheiden, einschließlich der Wahl zwischen einer zentralen Einrichtung oder verschiedenen einzelnen Ansprechpartnern. Die meisten Mitgliedstaaten entschieden sich für eine zentrale elektronische Form, manche richteten zusätzlich physische Ansprechpartner ein. In Deutschland verfügt jedes Bundesland über eine eigene Portallösung.

In allen Mitgliedstaaten wurde bereits ein „Einheitlicher Ansprechpartner“ eingerichtet oder befindet sich im Aufbau. Es gibt allerdings deutliche Unterschiede zwischen den Portalen, was die Zugänglichkeit, die Informationsqualität, den Entwicklungsstand, die Nutzbarkeit, die Benutzerfreundlichkeit und die Verfügbarkeit der elektronischen Verfahren angeht. Deutlicher Verbesserungsbedarf besteht noch bei der Erleichterung grenzüberschreitender Transaktionen, insbesondere in Bezug auf die verfügbaren Sprachversionen und die Akzeptanz von elektronischen Personalausweisen und elektronischen Signaturen. Die Benutzerzahlen variieren erheblich zwischen den einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten, je nachdem ob die „Einheitlichen Ansprechpartner“ fest in umfassendere elektronische Behördendienste eingebunden sind oder eher als Einzellösungen zur Erfüllung der Dienstleistungsrichtlinie konzipiert sind.

Zur Bewertung des ordnungsgemäßen Funktionierens der „Einheitlichen Ansprechpartner“ in allen Mitgliedstaaten wurde eine umfangreiche Studie durchgeführt, deren Ergebnisse in Kürze veröffentlicht werden. Was Deutschland angeht, so wurden in der Studie die „Einheitlichen Ansprechpartner“ dreier Bundesländer untersucht: Rheinland-Pfalz, Hessen und Brandenburg. Die Kommission wird außerdem mit dem nächsten Bericht zur Umsetzung der Dienstleistungsrichtlinie eine Vergleichsstudie zu den „Einheitlichen Ansprechpartnern“ vorlegen. Die Kommission ist der Ansicht, dass bei vielen Mitgliedstaaten immer noch Verbesserungen notwendig sind, um die volle Funktionsfähigkeit der „Einheitlichen Ansprechpartner“ zu erreichen.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001637/12  
to the Commission**

**Alexander Graf Lambsdorff (ALDE)**

(10 February 2012)

*Subject:* Points of single contact

The Services Directive required Member States to designate 'points of single contact'. These are intended to make it much easier and quicker for service providers to complete procedures on a regional level. In Germany, this office is often established and administered by several administrative districts acting together. Despite this pooling, a report from the Aachen region indicates that very little use is made of the single point of contact as regards content. Only one or two inquiries are received each month. Inquiries regularly indicate that there is no preference for a particular location within the region, but that a general interest in the region exists. To date there have been no specific applications following on from the inquiries. Overall, the work of the points of single contact is mainly administrative.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. How are the points of single contact organised in other Member States or in other regions of Germany?
2. What experience does it have from other Member States or other regions of Germany?
3. How much use is made of the services of the points of single contact in other Member States?
4. Have points of single contact already been established in all Member States?

**Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission**

(2 April 2012)

In fulfilling their obligations to establish operational Points of Single Contact (PSCs) under the Services Directive (Directive 2006/123/EC), Member States were free to decide how to organise the PSC in their territories, and to decide whether to either set up one single centralised body or to operate several PSCs. Most Member States opted for centralised electronic PSCs, some also set up complementary physical PSCs. In Germany, each federal state has its own portal solution.

A PSC has either been set up or is under development in all Member States. There are however noticeable differences between portals with regard to the accessibility, quality of information provided, level of sophistication, usability, user-friendliness and availability of electronic procedures. Significant improvements need to be made to facilitate cross-border transaction completion, in particular on language availability and the acceptance of eIDs and eSignatures. Usage levels differ considerably between Member States, depending largely on whether the PSCs are well integrated into wider e-Government services or act on a stand-alone basis for purposes of compliance with the Services Directive.

To assess the functioning of the PSCs in all Member States, a large study has just been carried out and its results will soon be published. In the case of Germany, the study analyses the PSCs of three *Länder*: Rhineland-Palatinate, Hessen and Brandenburg. The Commission will also include a comparative analysis of the Points of Single Contact in the forthcoming report on the implementation of the Services Directive. The Commission is of the opinion that significant efforts are still required from many Member States to achieve fully operational Points of Single Contact.

---

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001643/12  
a la Comisión**

**Maria Badia i Cutchet (S&D), Alejandro Cercas (S&D) y Inés Ayala Sender (S&D)**

(10 de febrero de 2012)

*Asunto:* Movilización del Fondo de Adaptación a la Globalización (FEAG) en el caso de Spanair

El pasado 27 de enero la compañía aérea Spanair —empresa con importante participación de la Generalitat de Catalunya— anunció el cese definitivo de operaciones y su solicitud de concurso de acreedores. La disolución de la compañía afectó a cerca de 22 000 pasajeros y dejó sin empleo a más de 2 600 trabajadores y trabajadoras.

La situación de la plantilla es incierta. El personal se encuentra, por el momento, en permiso retribuido y ha cobrado parte de la nómina de enero. No obstante, no dispone de ningún tipo de información sobre las posibilidades de recolocación, el cobro de indemnizaciones y la situación en que quedarán sus derechos para solicitar una prestación por desempleo.

En este contexto, la Unión Europea, en conformidad con el Reglamento (CE) n° 1927/2006, pone a disposición de los Estados miembros el Fondo Europeo de Adaptación a la Globalización (FEAG) para respaldar la reinserción de trabajadores en paro, afectados por despidos provocados por perturbaciones económicas graves derivadas de las transformaciones asociadas a la globalización.

A la luz de la situación de los trabajadores y trabajadoras afectados por la quiebra de Spanair:

¿Ha habido alguna medida de anticipación por parte de la Comisión ante este grave problema? ¿Piensa en el futuro ayudar a las autoridades regionales y nacionales? ¿Cree la Comisión oportuna la movilización del FEAG para este caso, como ya se ha hecho en algunos Estados miembros para diferentes sectores, desde la creación del fondo?

**Respuesta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión**

(29 de marzo de 2012)

La Comisión no tiene noticia de que las autoridades españolas estén preparando una solicitud de ayuda del Fondo Europeo de Adaptación a la Globalización (FEAG) para socorrer a los trabajadores que pueda despedir esta empresa. Si Su Señoría desea saber si está previsto presentar esa solicitud, le invitamos a que se dirija a la persona de contacto del FEAG en España <sup>(1)</sup>.

El Consejo no llegó a un acuerdo con respecto a la propuesta de la Comisión que ampliaba la posibilidad de solicitar financiación del FEAG para ayudar a hacer frente a los despidos ocasionados por la crisis financiera y económica mundial. Por tanto, tal posibilidad expiró al término de 2011. Si España presentara ahora una solicitud relativa a los trabajadores que puedan ser despedidos por Spanair, tendría que demostrar que existe un vínculo entre esos despidos y los cambios en las pautas del comercio mundial en el ámbito de la aviación.

---

(1) Las direcciones de contacto pueden consultarse en el sitio web del FEAG: <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=es>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001643/12  
to the Commission**

**Maria Badia i Cutchet (S&D), Alejandro Cercas (S&D) and Inés Ayala Sender (S&D)**

(10 February 2012)

*Subject:* Mobilisation of the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) for the case of Spanair

On 27 January 2012, the airline Spanair — a company in which the Autonomous Government of Catalonia is a major shareholder — announced permanent cessation of operations and that it would be filing for bankruptcy. The dissolution of the company affected nearly 22 000 passengers and left more than 2 600 workers unemployed.

The situation of the workforce is uncertain. For the moment, staff are on paid leave and have received part of their January salary. However, they have no information about relocation possibilities, receiving compensation, or the situation with regard to their right to apply for unemployment benefit.

In this context, the European Union, in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 1927/2006, makes the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) available to Member States to support the reintegration of workers made unemployed because of severe economic disruptions resulting from changes associated with globalisation.

In light of the situation of workers affected by the collapse of Spanair, has the Commission taken any anticipatory measure in the face of this serious problem? Does it intend to help regional and national authorities in the future? Does the Commission believe it appropriate to mobilise the EGF in this case, as has already been done in some Member States for different sectors, since the fund was created?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission**

(29 March 2012)

The Commission is not aware of any application being prepared by the Spanish authorities to request a contribution from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) in order to provide assistance to the workers who may be made redundant by this company. To find out whether there are plans to submit an application, the Honourable Member is advised to get in touch with the EGF contact person for Spain <sup>(1)</sup>.

The Council has failed to agree on the Commission proposal extending the possibility of submitting applications for EGF funding to help deal with the redundancies caused by the global financial and economic crisis. This possibility therefore expired at the end of 2011. Any application from Spain in respect of the workers who may be made redundant by Spanair would now have to demonstrate a link between these redundancies and changes in world trade patterns as regards aviation.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Contact details are available on the EGF website at <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=es>.

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001644/12  
à la Commission  
François Alfonsi (Verts/ALE)  
(10 février 2012)**

*Objet:* Simplification des dossiers de financement de projets culturels

La simplification des procédures est une priorité pour la programmation 2014-2020. En matière culturelle, il est regrettable que les procédures actuelles, lourdes et coûteuses, excluent de fait les bénéficiaires potentiels quand leurs projets sont de dimensions modestes.

Dès lors, les populations moins nombreuses, comme dans le monde rural et dans les régions relevant de l'article 174 du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union Européenne, ou encore lorsqu'il s'agit de peuples issus de cultures minoritaires, se trouvent privées du concours des fonds européens pour exercer leur droit à la culture.

Ainsi, l'auteur de la présente question souhaiterait connaître les mesures de simplification envisagées par la Commission pour que la constitution des dossiers ainsi que les procédures de sélection, de suivi et d'évaluation soient plus accessibles aux petits porteurs de projets, selon le principe de proportionnalité.

Que compte faire la Commission à ce sujet?

**Réponse donnée par Mme Vassiliou au nom de la Commission  
(12 avril 2012)**

La Commission tient à rappeler que le programme «Culture» actuel de l'Union européenne est accessible aux petites entités, tout comme le sera son successeur, le programme «Europe créative». Le rapport de la Commission du 10 janvier 2011 sur l'évaluation intermédiaire du programme montre qu'il est majoritairement utilisé par des organismes de petite ou moyenne taille: 55 % des bénéficiaires pour des projets de coopération ont moins de onze salariés et cette proportion passe à 63 % pour les maisons d'édition ayant obtenu des subventions pour la réalisation de traductions littéraires.

L'évaluation intermédiaire montre aussi que les bénéficiaires sont généralement satisfaits des simplifications apportées depuis 2007, telles que l'élaboration d'un guide précisant les délais et les informations stables, l'introduction de formulaires de demande en ligne ou le recours aux paiements forfaitaires. Le processus de sélection a aussi été rendu plus rapide grâce à une meilleure utilisation de la procédure de comitologie (comme la Commission l'a indiqué au Parlement européen dans sa lettre du 30 juillet 2010). Pour les projets sélectionnés en 2009, cela représente un gain de temps de 54,5 jours en moyenne par rapport à 2008, et de 117 jours par rapport à 2007.

Le programme «Europe créative» sera plus simple encore, avec une utilisation accrue des taux forfaitaires, des décisions de subvention et des conventions-cadres de partenariat. Le nombre d'appels à propositions du volet culture passera de neuf à quatre.

Pour la politique de cohésion, la Commission a proposé des changements profitant aux bénéficiaires modestes, comme l'extension du recours aux coûts simplifiés. La Commission cherche aussi à limiter leurs frais de contrôle et de rédaction de rapports.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001644/12  
to the Commission**

**François Alfonsi (Verts/ALE)**

(10 February 2012)

*Subject:* Simplifying funding for cultural projects

Simplifying procedures is a priority for the 2014-2020 programming period. With regard to culture, it is regrettable that current procedures, which are burdensome and costly, effectively exclude potential beneficiaries with small-scale projects.

This means that smaller population groups, such as those in rural areas and in the regions covered by Article 174 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, or even people from minority cultures, are deprived of European funding assistance to exercise their right to culture.

I therefore wish to know what simplification measures the Commission is considering to ensure that funding applications as well as selection, monitoring and evaluation procedures are more accessible to promoters of small-scale projects, according to the principle of proportionality.

What does the Commission intend to do with regard to this issue?

**Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission**

(12 April 2012)

The Commission would recall that the current EU Culture Programme is accessible to small organisations, as will be its proposed successor 'Creative Europe'. The Commission's report of 10 January 2011 on the interim evaluation of the programme shows that it is predominantly used by small and medium-sized organisations: 55 % of the organisations receiving cooperation support have less than 11 employees, and this share increases to 63 % for publishing houses who have benefitted from literary translation grants.

The interim evaluation also showed that beneficiaries are generally satisfied with the simplifications which have been made since 2007. These include a Programme Guide providing stable information and deadlines, online application forms and the use of lump sums. The selection process has also been shortened by a more optimal use of the comitology procedure (as reported by the Commission to the European Parliament by letter of 30 July 2010). The average time gain for project selections in 2009 was 54.5 days when compared to 2008 and 117 days over 2007.

Creative Europe will introduce further simplifications, such as greater use of flat rates, grant decisions and framework partnership agreements. The number of calls for proposals under the Culture Strand will be reduced from nine to four.

For cohesion policy, the Commission has proposed arrangements relevant for small beneficiaries e.g. extension in the use of simplified costs. The Commission also seeks to limit the audit and reporting burden of small beneficiaries.

---



(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001645/12  
alla Commissione  
Matteo Salvini (EFD)  
(10 febbraio 2012)**

Oggetto: Benzina in Italia

In Italia la benzina costa il 2 % in più della media dell'area dell'euro. In Spagna un litro di benzina verde costa il 21 % in meno, mentre in Svizzera si risparmia il 20 %.

L'emergenza benzina danneggia i consumatori, sia direttamente al momento del rifornimento, che indirettamente con il rincaro dei prodotti, in primis gli alimentari, che subiscono le fluttuazioni dei carburanti.

Il problema fondamentale è rappresentato dal peso delle accise per litro di benzina, percentuale che in Italia tocca il 60 %.

1. Ciò premesso, può la Commissione far sapere qual è l'incidenza delle tasse, delle accise e degli altri oneri fiscali e non per litro di benzina negli Stati membri?
2. Può la Commissione intervenire per tentare di limitare l'esponenziale aumento del costo di un bene così caro ai consumatori, ad esempio attraverso una direttiva sul riavvicinamento delle imposte sulla benzina?

**Risposta data da Algirdas Šemeta a nome della Commissione  
(26 marzo 2012)**

1. Le informazioni sulle aliquote IVA e di accisa applicate alla benzina in ogni Stato membro sono disponibili sul sito web della Commissione <sup>(1)</sup>.
2. La Commissione conferma che in Italia le aliquote applicabili alla benzina senza piombo sono passate da 613,20 euro per 1000 litri nel 2011 a 704,20 euro nel 2012, registrando il primo aumento dal 2005.

Attualmente la direttiva 2003/96/CE <sup>(2)</sup> stabilisce un certo grado di armonizzazione delle accise applicabili ai prodotti energetici e all'elettricità, fra l'altro stabilendo aliquote minime. Oltre a tali aliquote minime, gli Stati membri hanno la facoltà di fissare i livelli di imposizione ritenuti più opportuni, tenuto conto di considerazioni di politica nazionale. Il 13 aprile 2011 la Commissione ha presentato una proposta di revisione della direttiva in questione <sup>(3)</sup> al fine, tra l'altro, di allineare la tassazione dell'energia agli obiettivi dell'UE in materia di energia e cambiamenti climatici e, al contempo, di garantire il corretto funzionamento del mercato interno grazie a un trattamento fiscale coerente delle fonti energetiche.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Aliquote IVA e di accisa: pagina 9 del documento disponibile all'indirizzo:  
[http://ec.europa.eu/taxation\\_customs/resources/documents/taxation/excise\\_duties/energy\\_products/rates/excise\\_duties-part\\_ii\\_energy\\_products\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/taxation/excise_duties/energy_products/rates/excise_duties-part_ii_energy_products_en.pdf)

<sup>(2)</sup> GU L 283 del 31.10.2003.

<sup>(3)</sup> COM(2011)169 def.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001645/12  
to the Commission  
Matteo Salvini (EFD)  
(10 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Petrol in Italy

In Italy, petrol costs 2 % more than the Eurozone average. In Spain, a litre of unleaded petrol costs 21 % less, while the Swiss enjoy savings of 20 %.

The petrol emergency is harming consumers, both directly when refuelling and indirectly through the increased prices of goods, foodstuffs first and foremost, which are affected by fluctuating fuel prices.

The basic problem is the amount of excise duty charged per litre of petrol, a percentage that reaches 60 % in Italy.

1. In the light of the above, can the Commission disclose the incidence of the taxes, excise duties and other charges and costs per litre of petrol in the Member States?
2. Can the Commission intervene to try to limit the exponential increase in the cost of a commodity that is so expensive for consumers, for example by proposing a directive on the approximation of taxes on petrol?

**Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission  
(26 March 2012)**

1. Information on the rates of excise duty and VAT applied to petrol in all Member States is available on the website of the Commission <sup>(1)</sup>.
2. The Commission confirms that Italy increased the tax rate applicable to unleaded petrol from EUR 613.2 per 1 000 l in 2011 to EUR 704.20 in 2012, which was the first increase since 2005.

Currently Directive 2003/96/EC <sup>(2)</sup> provides for a certain degree of harmonisation of excise duty applicable to energy products and electricity, *inter alia* by setting minimum rates. Above these minima, Member States can fix levels of taxation as they see fit, taking into account national policy considerations. The Commission presented on 13 April 2011 a proposal for a revision of the directive <sup>(3)</sup> which aims *inter alia* at bringing energy taxation closer into line with the EU energy and climate change objectives whilst ensuring the proper functioning of the internal market, through a consistent tax treatment of energy sources.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Excise duty rates and VAT rates: page 9 of  
[http://ec.europa.eu/taxation\\_customs/resources/documents/taxation/excise\\_duties/energy\\_products/rates/excise\\_duties-part\\_ii\\_energy\\_products\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/taxation/excise_duties/energy_products/rates/excise_duties-part_ii_energy_products_en.pdf)

<sup>(2)</sup> OJL 283, 31.10.2003.

<sup>(3)</sup> COM(2011) 169.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001646/12  
alla Commissione  
Matteo Salvini (EFD)  
(10 febbraio 2012)**

Oggetto: Figura dell'odontoprotesista

Alcuni Stati membri riconoscono la figura professionale dell'«odontoprotesista». Questo non avviene in Italia.

1. Può la Commissione far sapere quali sono i paesi dell'Unione dove la professione dell'odontoprotesista è riconosciuta?
2. Quali paesi, in particolare, prevedono deduzioni fiscali sulle azioni preventive odontoiatriche?

**Risposta data da Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione  
(4 aprile 2012)**

Secondo le informazioni dell'*International Federation of Denturists* la professione di odontoprotesista è riconosciuta in Regno Unito, Danimarca, Paesi Bassi, Finlandia, Irlanda, Svezia e Svizzera.

L'articolo 132, paragrafo 1, lettera e), della direttiva IVA stabilisce che gli Stati membri esentano le prestazioni di servizi effettuate nell'esercizio della loro professione dagli odontotecnici, nonché le forniture di protesi dentarie effettuate dai dentisti e dagli odontotecnici; questi non possono quindi dedurre l'IVA pagata per i propri acquisti. Quando le condizioni di esenzione non sono soddisfatte, gli Stati membri possono, in alcuni casi, applicare alle forniture di un odontoprotesista un'aliquota IVA ridotta <sup>(1)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Articolo 98, in combinazione con la categoria 15 dell'allegato III della direttiva IVA.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001646/12  
to the Commission  
Matteo Salvini (EFD)  
(10 February 2012)**

*Subject:* The professional status of denturists/clinical dental technicians

Some Member States recognise the profession of dentist/clinical dental technician. This is not the case in Italy.

1. Can the Commission state which EU Member States recognise the profession of dentist/clinical dental technician?
2. Which countries provide for tax deductions in respect of preventive dentistry work?

**Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission  
(4 April 2012)**

Based on information from the International Federation of Denturists the Commission understands that the profession of 'dental prosthetist' (also known as 'denturist' or 'clinical dental technician') is recognised in the United Kingdom, Denmark, the Netherlands, Finland, Ireland, Sweden and Switzerland.

Article 132(1)(e) of the VAT Directive states that Member States shall exempt the supply of services by dental technicians in their professional capacity and the supply of dental prostheses by dentists and dental technicians. As a result, they cannot deduct VAT paid for their purchases. When the conditions to be exempt are not fulfilled, Member States are allowed, in some cases, to apply a reduced VAT rate on the supplies by denturist<sup>(1)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Article 98 in combination with Category c5 of Annex III to the VAT Directive.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001647/12  
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**

**Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)**

(10 febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Diritto di proprietà e situazione in Venezuela

Il diritto di proprietà, garantito nell'Unione europea dall'articolo 17 della Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea, oltre che da molte Costituzioni nazionali, in Venezuela sta scomparendo. I beni dei privati, con una legge approvata recentemente, possono passare allo Stato, come è successo a Cuba, senza indennizzo alcuno. Sono state espropriate forzosamente industrie, terreni agricoli, alberghi ed ora possono espropriare anche immobili, case d'abitazione comprese. È stato creato un ufficio apposito per queste espropriazioni, che lasciano le famiglie senza tetto e senza lavoro. Sono colpite in modo particolare le proprietà immobiliari di cittadini provenienti dall'Europa, oltre che dagli Stati Uniti.

Alla luce di quanto sopra, può il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante precisare quanto segue:

1. È al corrente della situazione?
2. Ha intrapreso iniziative per la tutela del diritto alla proprietà dei cittadini provenienti dall'Europa?
3. È in grado di coordinare l'azione dei consolati dei paesi dell'Unione per esercitare pressioni nei confronti del governo venezuelano ed evitare che molte famiglie vengano colpite da questo provvedimento iniquo, frutto di un'ideologia che ha già provocato danni immensi in molte parti del mondo?
4. Non ritiene opportuno affrontare questo argomento in occasione di eventuali negoziati con il Venezuela?

**Risposta data dall'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione**

(11 maggio 2012)

L'Unione europea segue attentamente la situazione politica ed economica in Venezuela, tramite la delegazione dell'UE a Caracas che sorveglia da vicino le nazionalizzazioni e le espropriazioni di beni in possesso delle imprese dell'UE.

In generale, in passato i casi di nazionalizzazione ed espropriazione di beni europei sono stati risolti in modo soddisfacente nel quadro di accordi bilaterali di promozione e di tutela degli investimenti, anche se di solito solo dopo lunghe trattative. Solo in pochi casi non è stato possibile raggiungere un accordo sull'indennizzo dei proprietari dei beni espropriati.

La questione dei cittadini (solitamente con la doppia nazionalità) che subiscono le cosiddette «azioni di salvataggio» e le invasioni di terreni (e più recentemente di immobili) è diversa e spesso più complessa. La tutela dei diritti dei cittadini europei in un paese terzo rimane comunque una questione di competenza degli Stati membri e viene pertanto affrontata a livello bilaterale attraverso l'azione consolare.

L'opportunità di discutere tale questione nel dialogo economico e commerciale attualmente in corso verrà tenuta in debita considerazione.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001647/12**  
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**  
**Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)**  
(10 February 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Property rights and the situation in Venezuela

The right to property, which is guaranteed in the European Union under Article 17 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, as well as by a great many national constitutions, is being eroded in Venezuela. A recently-adopted law allows private assets to be taken over by the state, as was the case in Cuba, with absolutely no compensation being provided. Industries, agricultural land and hotels have already been forcibly expropriated, and now the same can apply to buildings, including homes. A special department has been created for these expropriations, which leave families without a roof over their heads and without work. Properties owned by European and United States citizens are particularly vulnerable.

In light of the above, can the Vice-President/High Representative specify:

1. If she is aware of this situation?
2. Whether steps have been taken to protect European citizens' right to property?
3. Whether she can coordinate the action by EU Member State consulates to apply pressure on the Venezuelan Government and avoid a great many families being affected by this iniquitous provision, which stems from an ideology that has already caused immense damage in many parts of the world?
4. Whether she would consider it appropriate to discuss this matter at future negotiations with Venezuela?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**  
(11 May 2012)

The EU is following closely the political and economic situation in Venezuela.

Nationalisations and expropriations of assets owned by EU companies are being closely monitored by the EU Delegation in Caracas.

In general terms, past cases of nationalization and expropriation of European assets have been resolved satisfactorily using bilateral Investment Promotion and Protection Agreements, though usually following lengthy negotiations. In a few number of cases it has not been possible to agree on compensation to the owners of the expropriated assets.

The issue of citizens (normally with double nationality) affected by 'rescue actions' and invasion of land (and more recently of houses) is different and often more complicated. However, the protection of European citizens' rights in a third country remains a Member State competence, and as such is treated at bilateral level through consular action.

The opportunity of discussing such issue in the ongoing dialogue on trade and economic issues will be duly assessed.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001648/12  
alla Commissione  
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)  
(10 febbraio 2012)**

**Oggetto:** Situazione delle mutilazioni genitali femminili in Europa

In occasione della Giornata sulle mutilazioni genitali femminili lo scorso 6 febbraio, l'associazione *L'Albero della vita*, in collaborazione con *Nosotras*, ha presentato un rapporto sulla situazione che coinvolge tante bambine in Africa e, in anni recenti, anche in Europa. Si stima infatti che nell'Unione europea circa 500 000, tra donne e bambine residenti, ne siano state vittime. In Italia, in seguito ai flussi migratori degli ultimi anni, oltre 7 700 bambine per ragioni di età sono a rischio di mutilazioni genitali, di cui 1 500 residenti in Lombardia. L'89 % delle famiglie interpellate, però, si dichiara contraria alla pratica e il rimanente 11 % è composto da genitori che tentennano, con un 3 % appena che ritiene giusto attenersi alla tradizione. Questi risultati testimoniano la validità delle iniziative prese dalle istituzioni e dalle associazioni private per combattere le MGF.

Può pertanto la Commissione precisare quanto segue:

1. Con riferimento alla risoluzione approvata dal PE il 24 marzo 2009 sulle mutilazioni genitali femminili (P6\_TA(2009)0161) nell'UE a seguito della relazione da me presentata, può esporre le modalità con cui ha sviluppato le iniziative proposte in merito alla strategia per bandire le mutilazioni genitali femminili dall'UE e informare se è stato creato il protocollo sanitario europeo di monitoraggio?
2. Esiste infine una banca dati sul fenomeno, utile ai fini statistici?
3. Sono a sua disposizione i dati relativi alla situazione nell'Unione e tra questi quelli dell'Italia?
4. Quali azioni sono state svolte dall'Agenzia per i diritti fondamentali e dall'Istituto europeo per l'uguaglianza di genere tramite i relativi piani di lavoro pluriennali e/o annuali nella lotta alle mutilazioni genitali femminili?
5. Quali azioni intende intraprendere per continuare a sostenere le iniziative pubbliche e private al fine di stroncare del tutto in Europa questa inammissibile violenza?

**Risposta data da Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione  
(19 aprile 2012)**

Le mutilazioni genitali femminili sono un'inammissibile violazione dei diritti fondamentali e la Commissione è impegnata a dare una forte risposta politica contro qualsiasi forma di violenza ai danni delle donne, tra cui la mutilazione genitale, come confermano il Programma di Stoccolma e la Strategia per la parità tra donne e uomini (2010-2015).

La Commissione lavora per promuovere l'emancipazione delle donne, la sensibilizzazione, gli scambi di buone pratiche e il miglioramento della raccolta di dati sulla violenza contro le donne.

L'Istituto europeo per l'uguaglianza di genere conduce uno studio sul tema «Il punto della situazione e le tendenze in materia di mutilazione genitale femminile», i cui risultati dovrebbero essere disponibili nel secondo semestre del 2012. L'Agenzia europea per i diritti fondamentali svolge attualmente in tutta l'Unione un sondaggio sulla violenza contro le donne, i cui risultati verranno presentati nel 2013.

Il programma Daphne III fornisce sostegno finanziario alla realizzazione di progetti transnazionali promossi da organizzazioni di base impegnate a combattere tali pratiche attraverso azioni di sensibilizzazione e volte a modificare l'atteggiamento sociale.

La Commissione si sta inoltre attivando nel settore della giustizia penale con l'emanazione di norme sui diritti delle vittime di reato <sup>(1)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2011)275 definitivo, consultabile all'indirizzo:  
<https://webgate.ec.testa.eu/docfinder/extern/aHR0cDovLw==/ZXVvLWxleC5ldXJvcGEuZXU=/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0275:FIN:IT:PDF>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001648/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)**  
(10 February 2012)

*Subject:* Female genital mutilation in Europe

To mark the International Day Against Female Genital Mutilation on 6 February 2012, the association *L'Albero della Vita*, in conjunction with *Nosotras*, presented a report on the situation of numerous little girls in both Africa and — in recent years — Europe. It is estimated that some 500 000 women and children resident in the EU have fallen victim to this practice. As a result of migration flows in recent years, there are more than 7 700 little girls in Italy whose age puts them at risk of genital mutilation, 1 500 of whom are resident in Lombardy. However, 89 % of the families questioned say they are opposed to the practice; the remaining 11 % includes parents who are undecided, with just 3 % believing the tradition should be upheld. These findings validate the action taken by institutions and private associations to combat female genital mutilation.

Accordingly, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. With reference to Parliament's resolution of 24 March 2009 on combating female genital mutilation in the EU (P6\_TA(2009)0161), adopted in the light of my report on the subject, can it say what it has done to develop the initiatives proposed with regard to a strategy for banning female genital mutilation in the EU, and whether the European health protocol for monitoring purposes has been introduced?
2. Has a data bank on female genital mutilation finally been set up for statistical purposes?
3. Does it have data on the situation in the EU, including for Italy?
4. What steps have the Fundamental Rights Agency and the European Institute for Gender Equality taken to combat female genital mutilation under the relevant multiannual and/or annual work plans?
5. How does it intend to continue to support public and private initiatives with a view to eradicating this unacceptable form of violence throughout the EU?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission**  
(19 April 2012)

Female genital mutilation constitutes an unacceptable violation of fundamental rights and the Commission is committed to a strong policy response to combat all forms of violence against women, including female genital mutilation, as confirmed in the Stockholm Programme and the strategy for equality between women and men (2010-2015).

The Commission works for the empowerment of women, awareness raising, the promotion of exchanges of good practices and the improvement of collection of data on violence against women.

The European Institute for gender equality (EIGE) is carrying out a study on 'Mapping of current situation and trends of female genital mutilation'. The results should be available in the second half of 2012. The EU Agency for Fundamental Rights is carrying out an EU-wide survey on gender-based violence. The outputs will be made public in 2013.

The Daphne III Programme provides financial support for the implementation of transnational projects to grass roots organisations working to prevent such practices by raising awareness and changing social attitudes.

The Commission is also taking measures in the criminal justice area and has notably put in place legislation on the rights of victims of crime <sup>(1)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2011) 275 final. Available at:  
[http://ec.europa.eu/justice/policies/criminal/victims/docs/com\\_2011\\_275\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/justice/policies/criminal/victims/docs/com_2011_275_en.pdf)



(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001649/12**  
**do Komisji**  
**Lena Kolarska-Bobińska (PPE)**  
(10 lutego 2012 r.)

*Przedmiot:* Podział funduszy promocyjnych na pieczywo

Problem dotyczący nierównomiernego traktowania przez UE podziału funduszy promocyjnych na pieczywo.

Rozporządzenie Rady (WE) nr 3/2008 z dnia 17.12.2007 r. w sprawie działań informacyjnych i promocyjnych dotyczących produktów rolnych na rynku wewnętrznym i w krajach trzecich nie reguluje kwestii związanej z produkcją pieczywa. Regulacji tej doczekały się inne sektory, jak np. sektor mleczarski, warzywno-owocowy, tłuszczowy, które pojawiają się w reklamach telewizyjnych.

Aby kwestia pieczywa była objęta regulacją organizacje branżowe z Polski chciałyby wnioskować o likwidację podziału produktów rolnych na dwa etapy tworzenia pieczywa – pierwszy etap: przetworzenia mąki; drugi etap – produkcja pieczywa.

Dotychczasowy podział na dwa etapy przetworzenia jest podstawą do wykluczenia pieczywa z możliwości wsparcia promocji z funduszy unijnych oraz krajowych.

Art. 2 pkt. 3 Rozporządzenia Komisji (WE) nr 1/2004 z dnia 23.12.2003 r. w sprawie stosowania art. 87 i 88 Traktatu WE w brzmieniu: „przetwórstwo rolnego produktu oznacza operacje na produkcie rolnym, gdzie produkt będący wynikiem tej operacji jest również produktem rolnym”. Przyjmując tę interpretację produktem rolnym jest również pieczywo, niezależnie od tego czy jest przetworzone jedno czy dwukrotnie, dalej jest produktem rolnym.

1. Czy istnieje możliwość zniesienia podziału produktów na dwa etapy przetworzenia?
2. Czy pieczywo może liczyć na korzystanie z dotacji funduszu promocji artykułów żywnościowych?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Daciana Cioloşa w imieniu Komisji**  
(16 marca 2012 r.)

Artykuł 1 ust. 1 rozporządzenia Rady (WE) nr 3/2008 <sup>(1)</sup> w sprawie działań informacyjnych i promocyjnych dotyczących produktów rolnych na rynku wewnętrznym i w krajach trzecich stanowi, co następuje: „działania informacyjne i promocyjne dotyczące produktów rolnych i metod ich produkcji oraz artykułów spożywczych wytworzonych w oparciu o produkty rolne, prowadzone na rynku wewnętrznym lub w krajach trzecich (...) mogą być finansowane w całości lub częściowo z budżetu Wspólnoty na warunkach przewidzianych niniejszym rozporządzeniem”.

Rozporządzenie Komisji (WE) nr 501/2008 <sup>(2)</sup> ustanawiające szczegółowe zasady stosowania rozporządzenia Rady (WE) nr 3/2008 zawiera w art. 6 ust. 2 i w załącznikach wykaz produktów, które mogą być przedmiotem działań promocyjnych realizowanych w krajach trzecich. W związku z tym w ramach obecnego programu promocyjnego „przetwory ze zbóż i ryżu” kwalifikują się do działań promocyjnych w krajach trzecich, o których mowa w załączniku II rozporządzenia (WE) nr 501/2008. Produkty te nie kwalifikują się jednakże do działań promocyjnych na rynku wewnętrznym. Ponadto w obecnych ramach prawnych w odniesieniu do działań promocyjnych w krajach trzecich nie dokonuje się rozróżnienia dwóch etapów przetwarzania wspomnianych przez Szanowną Panią Poseł.

Reforma programu działań promocyjnych jest obecnie w toku. W ramach tego procesu ponownie zostanie rozważony wykaz produktów mogących być przedmiotem działań promocyjnych, zarówno w odniesieniu do rynku wewnętrznego, jak i krajów trzecich.

<sup>(1)</sup> Dz.U. L 3 z 5.1.2008, s. 1.

<sup>(2)</sup> Dz.U. L 147 z 6.6.2008, s. 3.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001649/12  
to the Commission**

**Lena Kolarska-Bobińska (PPE)**

(10 February 2012)

*Subject:* Allocation of promotional funds for bakery products

The problem relates to unequal treatment by the EU regarding the allocation of promotional funds for bakery products.

Council Regulation (EC) No 3/2008 of 17 December 2007 on information provision and promotion measures for agricultural products on the internal market and in third countries does not regulate matters concerning the production of bakery products. The aforementioned Regulation concerns *inter alia* the dairy, fruit and vegetable and fat sectors, all of which feature in television advertisements.

In order to ensure that bakery products are covered by regulatory measures, the trade associations in Poland wish to call for the abolition of the division of agricultural products in terms of the two stages of the baking process. The first of these is the processing of flour, and the second is the production of the actual bakery products.

The current division into the two stages of the process is used as grounds for excluding bakery products from potential promotional support sourced from EU or national funds.

Article 2(3) of Commission Regulation (EC) No 1/2004 of 23 December 2004 on the application of Articles 87 and 88 of the EC Treaty states that 'processing of an agricultural product means an operation on an agricultural product where the product resulting from the operation is also an agricultural product'. Pursuant to this explanation, bakery products are also agricultural products. Regardless of whether bakery products undergo one or two stages of processing, they remain agricultural products.

1. Might it be possible to abolish the division of products into two processing stages?
2. May bakery products expect to benefit from EU funds for the promotion of foodstuffs?

**Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission**

(16 March 2012)

Council Regulation (EC) No 3/2008 <sup>(1)</sup> on information provision and promotion measures for agricultural products on the internal market and in third countries provides in Article 1(1) that 'information and promotion measures for agricultural products and their method of production as well as for food products based on agricultural products carried out on the internal market or in third countries may be financed, fully or in part, by the Community budget subject to the conditions laid down in this regulation'.

Commission Regulation (EC) No 501/2008 <sup>(2)</sup> laying down detailed rules for the application of Council Regulation (EC) No 3/2008 provides in Article 6 (2) and subsequent annexes the list of products that may be covered by promotional measures to be implemented in third countries. Accordingly, in the current promotion scheme the 'products processed from cereals and rice' are eligible for promotion for the third countries, as stipulated in Annex II, of Regulation (EC) No 501/2008. However, these products are not eligible for promotional measures on the internal market. Moreover, the current legislative framework for the promotional measures in third countries does not make a differentiation between the two processing stages mentioned by the Honourable Member.

A reform of the promotion scheme is currently under way. In the context of this reform process, the list of the eligible products will be reconsidered, both for the internal market and the third countries.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 3, 5.1.2008, p. 1.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 147, 6.6.2008, p. 3.

*(Versão portuguesa)*

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001650/12**  
**à Comissão**  
**Edite Estrela (S&D)**  
*(10 de fevereiro de 2012)*

*Assunto:* Competição fiscal no seio da União Europeia

Tendo em conta que cada vez mais empresas da União Europeia têm vindo a transferir a sua sede para países como a Holanda, a fim de aí passarem a ser tributadas e assim pagarem menos impostos;

Considerando que países como Portugal, onde têm vindo a ser aplicadas rigorosas medidas de austeridade que impõem enormes sacrifícios aos cidadãos, perdem assim um contributo fiscal importante;

Pergunta-se à Comissão o seguinte:

- Pode a Comissão confirmar se as práticas fiscais de países como a Holanda, que introduzem uma competição fiscal no seio da União Europeia, não contrariam o projeto europeu, podendo pôr em causa a moeda única?
- O que pensa a Comissão fazer no sentido de criar uma maior harmonização fiscal na União Europeia?

**Resposta dada por Algirdas Šemeta em nome da Comissão**  
*(13 de março de 2012)*

A Comissão remete a Senhora Deputada para a resposta à pergunta escrita E-000499/2012 dos Deputados Rui Tavares e Bas Eickhout <sup>(1)</sup>.

\_\_\_\_\_

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EN>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001650/12  
to the Commission  
Edite Estrela (S&D)  
(10 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Fiscal competition within the EU

More and more EU businesses have moved their headquarters to Member States like the Netherlands, so as to be taxed there and thereby be eligible to pay lower taxes.

Meanwhile, Member States like Portugal, where citizens are being forced to make enormous sacrifices because of the strict austerity measures that have been introduced, are thereby losing significant amounts of tax revenue.

- Can the Commission confirm whether or not fiscal practices in countries like the Netherlands, which are introducing fiscal competition within the EU, conflict with the European project, thus possibly jeopardising the single currency?
- How does the Commission intend to establish greater fiscal harmonisation within the EU?

**Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission  
(13 March 2012)**

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-000499/2012 by Mr Rui Tavares and Mr Bas Eickhout <sup>(1)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EN>

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001651/12**

**à Comissão**

**Edite Estrela (S&D)**

(10 de fevereiro de 2012)

*Assunto:* Decisão do Governo português de suspender novas licenças de energias renováveis e cogeração

Tendo em conta a recente decisão do Governo português de suspender a atribuição de novas licenças para a produção de eletricidade em regime especial, o que afeta sobretudo a produção de energia elétrica a partir de energias renováveis ou de resíduos industriais, agrícolas ou urbanos, com exceção da energia hídrica, bem como em instalações de cogeração — dando um sinal negativo aos investidores e criando incertezas jurídicas;

Tendo em conta que o Governo português se comprometeu, na segunda revisão do memorando de entendimento com a troika, a analisar a eficiência dos regimes de apoio aos produtores de energia em regime especial até ao final de janeiro de 2012;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

- A decisão do Governo português de suspender novas licenças de energias renováveis e cogeração corresponde às exigências contidas no memorando de entendimento com a troika?
- Esta decisão contraria as políticas europeias estratégicas, pondo designadamente em causa os objetivos de redução das emissões de gases com efeito de estufa, de aumento da eficiência energética e de energias renováveis até 2020?

**Resposta dada por Günther Oettinger em nome da Comissão**

(29 de março de 2012)

O memorando de entendimento entre a Troika (UE/BCE/FMI) e Portugal não exige a suspensão de novas licenças para projetos de energias renováveis e de cogeração, mas impõe que o Governo português reveja a eficácia dos regimes de apoio a essas tecnologias.

Embora reconhecendo que Portugal está a enfrentar grandes restrições fiscais e poderá vir a ultrapassar os seus objetivos nacionais vinculativos de 31 % de energias renováveis até 2020, as reformas de regimes de apoio às energias renováveis e à cogeração devem ser realizadas na sequência de um processo transparente e voltado para o futuro, sem alterações retroativas e que procure implementar as melhores práticas em toda a Europa. Os Estados-Membros devem, assim, evitar abordagens intermitentes e esforçar-se por reduzir ao mínimo as situações geradoras de perturbação e confusão nos investidores e nos operadores de mercado.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001651/12  
to the Commission  
Edite Estrela (S&D)  
(10 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Portuguese government's decision to suspend new permits for renewable energies and cogeneration

Given the Portuguese government's recent decision to suspend the granting of new permits for the production of energy under a special regime, which particularly affects the production of electricity by means of renewable energies or industrial, agricultural or urban waste, with the exception of hydropower, as in cogeneration plants, thus sending out a negative signal to investors and creating legal uncertainty;

Given that the Portuguese Government has undertaken, in the second revision of the memorandum of understanding with the troika, to analyse the efficiency of support schemes for producers of energy under the special regime by the end of January 2012;

Can the Commission state:

- whether it believes the Portuguese government's decision to suspend new permits for renewable energy and cogeneration meets the requirements contained in the memorandum of understanding with the troika;
- whether it believes this decision to be contrary to EU strategic policies, in particular by jeopardising the goals of reducing greenhouse gas emissions and increasing energy efficiency and renewable energy use by 2020?

**Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission  
(29 March 2012)**

The EU/IMF Memorandum of Understanding with Portugal does not require suspension of new permits for renewable energy and cogeneration projects, although it does require the Portuguese Government to review the efficiency of the support schemes for these technologies.

Whilst acknowledging that Portugal is facing major fiscal constraints and is above the trajectory for achieving its binding national target of 31 % renewable energy by 2020, reforms to renewable energy support schemes and cogeneration should be undertaken following a transparent and forward-looking process that does not include retroactive changes and which seeks to implement best practice across Europe. Member States should thus avoid sudden stop-start approaches and strive to minimise disruption and confusion to investors and market players.

---

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001652/12**

**à Comissão**

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**

(10 de fevereiro de 2012)

*Assunto:* Políticas de proteção de mercado e de criação de emprego na UE

Os números do desemprego são um flagelo que atinge a Europa no atual cenário de crise. A manutenção e a criação de empregos depende largamente da capacidade de fixação das empresas no nosso espaço comum, demovendo a sua deslocalização para países emergentes, com enormes consequências laborais e sociais.

Os Estados Unidos decidiram claramente várias medidas protecionistas do seu mercado interno, beneficiando fiscalmente as empresas que se proponham produzir no território americano e agravando fiscalmente, por seu lado, a atividade das que optem por sair para outros países.

Na Europa, pelo contrário, a deslocalização das empresas e o encerramento de postos de trabalho vão acontecendo cada vez mais, sem que quaisquer medidas politicamente relevantes se conheçam, mesmo nos casos daquelas que anteriormente tenham beneficiado de fundos destinados a fixá-las no espaço europeu.

Pior do que isso, na Europa aceita-se a abertura do mercado a produtos produzidos em países emergentes, cujas empresas não cumprem as mesmas regras, nem suportam os mesmos custos administrativos, sociais e ambientais que são exigidos às empresas europeias, violando-se as normais regras de um mercado saudável e promovendo-se a concorrência mais desleal.

Paradoxalmente, exige-se aos países, principalmente aos intervencionados por planos de austeridade, que produzam mais e exportem mais, enquanto que pouco ou nada se faz, para assegurar a imposição das mesmas regras a todos quantos pretendam produzir e vender os seus produtos no nosso espaço comum.

Pergunto à Comissão:

- Pondera a Comissão fixar medidas de proteção do mercado comum equivalentes às decididas pela administração americana, no sentido de beneficiarem as empresas que optem por manter-se no território e penalizando-se, pelo contrário, as que pretendam sair, nomeadamente todas quantas anteriormente tenham beneficiado de ajudas comunitárias concedidas na expectativa da sua fixação na UE?
- Não considera a Comissão que é impossível pagar dívidas sem que se produza e criem postos de trabalho e que, desta forma, os EUA levarão avanço na resposta que é necessário dar para a saída da situação de crise em que todos os países se encontram, particularmente aqueles a quem foram impostos planos de austeridade?

**Resposta dada por Michel Barnier em nome da Comissão**

(3 de maio de 2012)

A UE vai continuar a promover mercados de contratos públicos justos e abertos a nível mundial, bem como a assegurar que as empresas europeias gozem de condições equitativas no acesso a esses mesmos mercados. O mercado de contratos públicos da UE é tradicionalmente muito aberto, o que nem sempre tem correspondência num nível semelhante de abertura por parte dos nossos parceiros comerciais. É importante aumentar os incentivos para que os parceiros comerciais da UE abram os seus mercados de contratos públicos aos candidatos da UE, de modo a que as empresas da UE possam competir no mercado interno com as empresas estrangeiras em pé de igualdade. Neste contexto, a Comissão propôs nomeadamente, em 21 de março, uma proposta de regulamento relativa ao acesso dos bens e serviços de países terceiros ao mercado de contratos públicos da UE <sup>(1)</sup>. A iniciativa aumentará as oportunidades de negócio para as empresas da UE, tanto na UE como a nível internacional, reforçará o potencial operacional das pequenas e médias empresas numa economia globalizada e aumentará o emprego e a inovação na UE.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/internal\\_market/publicprocurement/docs/international\\_access/COM2012\\_124\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/publicprocurement/docs/international_access/COM2012_124_en.pdf)

Para um regresso ao crescimento e à criação de emprego, a estabilidade financeira e a consolidação orçamental são necessárias, mas não suficientes. São igualmente fundamentais medidas que impulsionem o crescimento e o emprego. Em conformidade com a Estratégia Europa 2020, a Comissão apoia os esforços dos Estados-Membros para aumentarem a sua competitividade. As ações nacionais podem também ser complementadas a nível da UE. No seu inquérito anual sobre o crescimento de 2012, a Comissão identificou uma série de ações a nível da UE que, se forem adotadas rapidamente, poderão relançar de forma imediata o crescimento — entre elas, as 12 ações do Ato do Mercado Único, anunciadas pela Comissão e cuja adoção o Parlamento Europeu e o Conselho concordaram já em acelerar.

---



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001652/12  
to the Commission**

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**

(10 February 2012)

*Subject:* Policies for market protection and job creation in the EU

High unemployment is a scourge that now afflicts Europe in the current crisis scenario. The preservation and creation of jobs depend largely on the capacity to keep companies inside our common space, deterring their relocation to emerging countries, which has enormous labour and social consequences.

The US has decided on various protectionist measures in its domestic market, offering tax advantages to companies which intend to produce in American territory and, on the other hand, increasing tax on the activities of others which choose to leave for other countries.

In Europe, by contrast, the relocation of companies and the loss of jobs are occurring with increasing frequency, without any politically relevant measures being taken, even in the case of companies that have previously benefited from funds to keep them within Europe.

What is worse, in Europe it is accepted that the market is opened up to products made in other countries whose companies do not have to comply with the same rules and do not bear the same administrative, social and environmental costs as European companies, thus violating the normal rules of a healthy market and promoting unfair competition.

Paradoxically, it is demanded that Member States, especially those undergoing intervention in the form of austerity plans, should produce and export more, while little or nothing is done to ensure that the same rules govern all companies wishing to produce or sell their products in our common space.

- Has the Commission considered setting out protective measures for the common market, equivalent to those decided upon by the US administration, in order to benefit companies choosing to remain in the territory while penalising, on the other hand, those wishing to leave, including all those which have previously benefited from Community aid in the expectation of them remaining within EU territory?
- Does the Commission not agree that it is impossible to pay off debts without producing and creating jobs, and that the US is thus likely to register a significant advance in terms of the response needed in order to emerge from the crisis situation in which all countries find themselves, particularly those upon which austerity plans have been imposed?

**Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission**

(3 May 2012)

The EU will continue to promote fair and open worldwide public procurement markets and to ensure European businesses have fair access to them. The EU's public procurement market is traditionally very open. However, this is not always matched by a similar degree of openness by our trading partners. It is important to increase the incentives for the EU's trading partners to open up their public procurement markets to EU bidders so that EU companies can compete in the internal market with foreign companies on an equal footing. In this context, the Commission has notably proposed on March 21 a draft regulation on the access of third-country goods and services to the EU public procurement market<sup>(1)</sup>. This initiative shall increase business opportunities for EU companies, both in the EU and internationally; boost the potential for small and medium-sized enterprises to operate in a globalised economy; and increase employment and promote innovation in the EU.

Financial stability and fiscal consolidation are necessary for a return to growth and employment, but not sufficient. Action to foster growth and jobs is also crucial. Under the Europe 2020 strategy, the Commission supports Member States' efforts to strengthen their competitiveness. The EU level can also complement national actions. In its 2012 Annual Growth Survey the Commission has identified a series of EU actions which, if taken quickly, could give an immediate boost to growth. These include the 12 actions of the single market Act which the Commission announced and which the European Parliament and the Council have already agreed to fast track.

---

(1) [http://ec.europa.eu/internal\\_market/publicprocurement/docs/international\\_access/COM\\_2012\\_124\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/publicprocurement/docs/international_access/COM_2012_124_en.pdf)

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001653/12**

**à Comissão**

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**

(10 de fevereiro de 2012)

*Assunto:* Falta de crédito compromete empresas portuguesas

Os empresários portugueses receiam que a falta de crédito, concedido pelos bancos, possa comprometer o crescimento das exportações e, no pior dos cenários, causar o encerramento de algumas empresas. Noventa por cento do financiamento é feito pelas instituições bancárias, mas, com juros entre os cinco e os 7,5 %, as empresas poderão não resistir.

Segundo dados da Associação Industrial portuguesa, no terceiro trimestre deste ano, as exportações em Portugal cresceram, em termos globais, 15,2 %, o que perfaz um total de 55 mil milhões de euros.

O setor produtivo é fundamental para que Portugal possa sair o mais rapidamente da grave crise económica que atravessa, bem como honrar todos os compromissos assumidos com a Troika.

Pergunto à Comissão:

- Como é que a Comissão concilia os planos de austeridade com as necessidades de financiamento do setor produtivo dos países intervencionados?
- Faz ou não sentido condicionar a capitalização do setor bancário à prestação de garantias de continuidade de financiamento das empresas e do setor produtivo, a preços razoáveis?

**Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão**

(28 de março de 2012)

O programa português de ajustamento económico e financeiro tem por objetivo a criação de condições para a sustentabilidade orçamental e a estabilidade do mercado financeiro e tornar a economia portuguesa competitiva. O programa é acompanhado por importantes medidas de apoio financeiro por parte dos Estados-Membros da UE e do Fundo Monetário Internacional.

No que diz respeito ao fornecimento de crédito, o programa português está a tratar simultaneamente o elevado endividamento do setor público e a elevada alavancagem do setor privado. As empresas portuguesas estão entre as mais alavancadas da Europa. Com a ajuda dos planos de financiamento e de capital, o programa poderá conciliar o processo de redução da alavancagem com as necessidades de crédito das empresas viáveis. Ao abrigo deste programa, o setor bancário é convidado a recapitalizar, a fim de construir uma proteção razoável para futuros choques. O aumento da base de capital reforçará a confiança e criará uma base para aumentar a concessão de crédito pelos bancos, de acordo com as suas oportunidades comerciais.

Os bancos que receberem dinheiro através do mecanismo de apoio à solvência dos bancos estarão sujeitos a condições e regras sobre a forma de reembolso das injeções de capital do Estado.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001653/12  
to the Commission**

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**

(10 February 2012)

*Subject:* Portuguese companies at risk due to lack of access to credit

Portuguese entrepreneurs fear that a lack of access to credit through banks could hinder the growth of exports and, on a worst-case basis, lead to the closure of certain businesses. 90 %cent of the funding is provided by the banks, but businesses might be unable to cope with interest rates of between 5 % and 7.5 %.

According to the Associação Industrial Portuguesa (the Portuguese Industrial Association), Portugal's worldwide exports have increased by 15.2 % in the third quarter of this year, amounting to a total of EUR 55 billion.

The productive sector is vital in helping Portugal overcome, as quickly as possible, the economic crisis it is currently experiencing, as well as in honouring all the commitments it has made to the Troika.

- How is the Commission adapting its austerity plans to meet the funding needs of the productive sector in the Member States subject to intervention?
- Does the Commission agree that the capitalisation of the banking sector needs to be made conditional on the provision of guarantees for the continued funding of companies and the productive sector, at reasonable prices?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission**

(28 March 2012)

The Portuguese programme of financial and economic adjustment has the aim of creating the conditions for fiscal sustainability and financial market stability and making the Portuguese economy competitive. The programme is accompanied by substantial financial assistance from the EU Member States and the International Monetary Fund.

With regard to credit supply, the Portuguese programme is tackling both high public sector indebtedness and high private sector leverage. Portuguese companies are amongst the most leveraged in Europe. With the help of funding and capital plans, this should reconcile a necessary deleveraging with credit needs of viable companies. Under the programme the banking sector is asked to recapitalise in order to build up a reasonable cushion for future shocks. The increased capital base will boost confidence and form a basis to extend loans which banks will grant according to their commercial opportunities.

Those banks that will receive money through the Banking Solvency Support Facility (BSSF) will be subject to conditionality and rules on how to reimburse the state capital injection.

---

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001654/12**

**à Comissão**

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**

(10 de fevereiro de 2012)

Assunto: Lixo hospitalar

Segundo notícias veiculadas na imprensa, em países da UE, o lixo hospitalar está a ser utilizado para fins comerciais, nomeadamente tecidos, transformados em peças de vestuário posteriormente vendidos em feiras, mercados, e até exportados para países da América Latina.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Que dados possui acerca da situação descrita?

**Resposta dada por Janez Potočnik em nome da Comissão**

(30 de março de 2012)

As disposições da Diretiva 2008/98/CE relativa aos resíduos <sup>(1)</sup>, nomeadamente o artigo 13.º, são aplicáveis aos resíduos médicos:

«Os Estados-Membros tomam as medidas necessárias para assegurar que a gestão de resíduos seja efetuada sem pôr em perigo a saúde humana nem prejudicar o ambiente, nomeadamente:

- (a) Sem criar riscos para a água, o ar, o solo, a flora ou a fauna;
- (b) Sem provocar perturbações sonoras ou por cheiros; e
- (c) Sem produzir efeitos negativos na paisagem rural ou em locais de especial interesse.»

A Comissão não considera que a situação descrita pelo Senhor Deputado seja representativa da gestão dos resíduos médicos na UE. A Comissão adota ações adequadas sempre que tem conhecimento de casos de gestão irregular de resíduos.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> JO L 312 de 22.11.2008.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001654/12  
to the Commission  
Nuno Melo (PPE)  
(10 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Hospital waste

According to press reports, hospital waste in EU countries is to be used for commercial purposes. Specifically, it is reported that tissues are to be made into items of clothing for sale at fairs and markets, and even exported to Latin American countries.

Can the Commission explain:

What information does it have regarding the situation described?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission  
(30 March 2012)**

The provisions of Directive 2008/98/EC on waste <sup>(1)</sup> and in particular Article 13 thereof are applicable to medical waste:

'Member States shall take the necessary measures to ensure that waste management is carried out without endangering human health, without harming the environment and, in particular:

- (a) without risk to water, air, soil, plants or animals;
- (b) without causing a nuisance through noise or odours; and
- (c) without adversely affecting the countryside or places of special interest.'

The Commission does not believe that the situation described by the Honourable Member is representative of medical waste management in the EU. Whenever the Commission becomes aware of cases of unlawful waste management, the Commission takes action as appropriate.

\_\_\_\_\_

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 312, 22.11.2008.

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001655/12**  
**à Comissão**  
**Nuno Melo (PPE)**  
(10 de fevereiro de 2012)

*Assunto:* Bruxelas investiga Johnson & Johnson e Novartis por potencial cartel

A Comissão Europeia disse, em comunicado, que está a investigar se algumas disposições contratuais entre as duas empresas «têm como objetivo ou efeito criar obstáculos à entrada no mercado de versões genéricas de Fentanyl», um analgésico para alívio das dores crónicas.

O Comissário europeu da Concorrência, Joaquín Almunia, referiu publicamente o seguinte: «Vejo o setor como uma prioridade em termos de cumprimento das regras da concorrência, dada a importância que tem para os consumidores e para as finanças e para as finanças públicas (...) Pagar a um concorrente para se manter fora do mercado é uma restrição que a Comissão não vai tolerar».

A UE tem vindo a desenvolver diversos inquéritos ao setor farmacêutico, desde que um relatório veio demonstrar que o número de genéricos no mercado caiu um terço desde o ano 2000.

Pergunto à Comissão:

- Sabendo que os cidadãos da UE se confrontam com sérios problemas socioeconómicos, pelo aumento do custo de vida, devido em grande parte à escalada das matérias-primas que inflacionam os preços dos bens alimentares, e tendo em conta que o setor farmacêutico tem também um peso importantíssimo para a qualidade de vida de muitas famílias, de que forma pensa intervir perante as empresas que, neste setor, se prove que estejam a cometer tais ilegalidades?
- Que grau de importância dá a Comissão ao medicamento genérico?

**Resposta dada por Joaquín Almunia em nome da Comissão**  
(23 de março de 2012)

A Comissão utiliza diversos instrumentos para assegurar que a concorrência não é falseada, de modo a que os consumidores da UE tenham acesso a medicamentos seguros e inovadores a preços acessíveis. No domínio do direito da concorrência, a Comissão observa essencialmente as infrações presentes ou passadas. Portanto, não pode intervir antes de uma infração ocorrer, mas pode intervir enquanto ocorre. A Comissão pode, em última análise, aplicar coimas às empresas devido a um comportamento anticoncorrencial ilegal no mercado farmacêutico e impor que se abstenham de tal comportamento. O objetivo de tais coimas é o de punir as infrações e de dissuadir as empresas de adotarem comportamentos ilegais no futuro. A Comissão pode também impor medidas corretivas, a fim de evitar que as empresas continuem em infração.

Os medicamentos genéricos são essenciais para a União Europeia, uma vez que asseguram tratamentos mais baratos para os doentes e permitem reduzir os custos de cuidados de saúde nos Estados-Membros. Os doentes, por conseguinte, beneficiam de medicamentos a preços acessíveis.

No domínio da concorrência, a Comissão está atualmente a investigar diferentes ações por parte de empresas que podem ter retardado a entrada de genéricos no mercado. Tais ações incluem comportamentos unilaterais pelas empresas dominantes, bem como comportamentos multilaterais entre as empresas fabricantes de medicamentos originais e de genéricos.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001655/12  
to the Commission**

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**

(10 February 2012)

*Subject:* Brussels investigates Johnson & Johnson and Novartis as a potential cartel

The Commission has issued a statement that it is investigating whether some of the contractual arrangements between the two companies Johnson & Johnson and Novartis 'may have had the object or effect of hindering the entry on to the market of generic versions of Fentanyl', a strong painkiller for chronic pain.

The Commissioner for Competition, Joaquín Almunia, has declared publicly: 'I regard this sector as a priority in terms of enforcement of competition rules given its importance for consumers and for governments' finances (...). Paying a competitor to stay out of the market is a restriction of competition that the Commission will not tolerate'.

The EU has carried out several enquiries into the pharmaceutical sector, after a report that showed that the number of generic drugs on the market had fallen by a third since 2000.

Can the Commission state:

- given that the EU's citizens are facing serious socioeconomic problems due to the rise in the cost of living, in large part thanks to increases in the cost of raw materials that are inflating food prices, and taking into account that the pharmaceutical sector is also very important for the quality of life of a large number of families, what action it intends to take against companies in this sector which are acting illegally;
- how much importance it attaches to generic drugs?

**Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission**

(23 March 2012)

The Commission uses a number of instruments to ensure that competition is not distorted so that EU consumers have access to safe and innovative medicines at affordable prices. In the area of competition law, the Commission essentially looks at past or present infringements. Thus, it cannot intervene before an infringement has taken place but it may intervene while the infringement is taking place. The Commission can ultimately impose fines on companies for illegal anticompetitive conduct on the pharmaceutical market and impose on them to refrain from such conduct. The purpose of such fines is both to punish the infringements and to deter companies from engaging in illegal conduct in the future. The Commission can also impose remedies in order to prevent the companies from perpetuating the infringement.

Generic medicines are essential for the European Union as they provide cheaper treatment for patients and allow reducing healthcare costs in Member States. Patients hence benefit from affordable medicines.

In the area of competition, the Commission is at present investigating different actions by companies that may have delayed generic entry. Such actions include unilateral behaviour by dominant companies as well as multilateral conduct between originator and generic companies to that effect.

---

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001658/12**

**à Comissão**

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**

(10 de fevereiro de 2012)

*Assunto:* Surto de malária na Grécia

É considerado o maior surto autóctone desde a erradicação da malária na União Europeia. Na Grécia, entre 21 de maio e 26 de outubro, 61 pessoas foram infetadas com malária, mas o surto estará controlado e as possibilidades de contágio limitadas a uma área e população específicas.

Pergunto à Comissão:

- A Comissão tem acompanhado a evolução da doença na Grécia?
- Qual o grau de risco inerente a outros países da UE?

**Resposta dada por John Dalli em nome da Comissão**

(20 de março de 2012)

A Comissão, o Centro Europeu de Prevenção e Controlo das Doenças (CEPCD) e a Organização Mundial de Saúde (OMS) têm trabalhado em estreita colaboração com as autoridades de saúde pública gregas no que se refere à forma de responder aos casos de malária no país. Foram efetuadas duas missões de avaliação para acompanhar a situação e apresentar às autoridades de saúde gregas opções para prevenir e controlar a propagação da doença. Os resultados destas missões estão disponíveis no sítio Web do CEPCD: ([http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/Publications/Forms/ECDC\\_DisForm.aspx?ID=759](http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/Publications/Forms/ECDC_DisForm.aspx?ID=759)).

A Comissão continua a vigiar de perto a situação na Grécia visto que a malária é uma das doenças transmissíveis abrangidas pela vigilância da UE.

De acordo com a avaliação epidemiológica do CEPCD, de dezembro de 2011, o risco de introdução da malária no restante território da UE em resultado dos acontecimentos na Grécia é considerado, atualmente, reduzido.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001658/12  
to the Commission  
Nuno Melo (PPE)  
(10 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Malaria outbreak in Greece

The present outbreak of malaria in Greece is considered to be the biggest local manifestation of this disease since its eradication EU-wide. In Greece, between 21 May and 26 October 2011, 61 people were infected with malaria. The outbreak is, however, under control, and the possibility of infection is limited to a specific area and population.

- Has the Commission been monitoring the development of this disease in Greece?
- Can it state what level of risk is posed to other EU countries?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission  
(20 March 2012)**

The Commission, the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) and the World Health Organisation (WHO) have worked closely together with the Greek public health authorities on how to address the malaria cases in the country. Two assessment missions have been undertaken to follow up the situation and to provide the Greek health authorities with options for preventing and controlling the spread of the disease. Results are available at ECDC's homepage: [http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/Publications/Forms/ECDC\\_DisForm.aspx?ID=759](http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/Publications/Forms/ECDC_DisForm.aspx?ID=759)

The Commission continues to monitor the situation in Greece closely since malaria is one of the communicable diseases that are covered by EU surveillance.

According to the ECDC epidemiological assessment of December 2011 the risk for introduction of malaria into the remainder of the EU as a result of the events in Greece is considered low at present.

---

*(Versão portuguesa)*

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001659/12**  
**à Comissão**  
**Nuno Melo (PPE)**  
*(10 de fevereiro de 2012)*

*Assunto:* Redes chinesas levam o cobre roubado

Segundo notícia recente da imprensa portuguesa, a maior parte do cobre furtado em Portugal tem como destino privilegiado a China.

De acordo com o veiculado, só no ano passado foram furtadas em Portugal 500 toneladas de fio de cobre, tendo 200 toneladas rumado à China, com um valor aproximado de 1,6 milhões de euros.

Ainda segundo a mesma notícia, os empresários chineses são os principais importadores de cobre roubado e o transporte até à China faz-se de Portugal para Espanha ou Itália, por via terrestre, até aos portos de Cádiz ou Nápoles, respectivamente, e depois por via marítima, em contentores, com a carga a ser registada em nome de outros produtos.

Disponará a Comissão de dados que confirmem a aludida informação?

**Resposta dada por Cecilia Malmström em nome da Comissão**  
*(14 de março de 2012)*

A Comissão agradece ao Senhor Deputado as informações fornecidas sobre o roubo de cobre em Portugal. A Comissão tem conhecimento de que o roubo de metais, em geral, e de cobre, em particular, está a aumentar em vários Estados-Membros da UE. De momento, a Comissão não dispõe de um conhecimento aprofundado da situação em cada um dos 27 Estados-Membros e não pode, por conseguinte, confirmar os dados comunicados pelo Senhor Deputado. No entanto, de acordo com os poucos dados de que dispomos, tudo indica que o número de incidentes está claramente relacionado com o preço do cobre no mercado internacional.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001659/12  
to the Commission  
Nuno Melo (PPE)  
(10 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Copper stolen through Chinese networks

According to a recent report in the Portuguese press, the final destination of the majority of the copper stolen in Portugal is China.

According to the report, last year alone 500 tonnes of copper wire were stolen in Portugal, of which 200 tonnes, worth around EUR 1.6 million, went to China.

It was also reported that Chinese entrepreneurs are the main importers of stolen copper which leaves Portugal overland to Spain or Italy and thence to the ports of Cadiz or Naples respectively and then by sea in containers, with the cargo registered as other products.

Does the Commission have any data confirming this information?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission  
(14 March 2012)**

The Commission would like to thank the honourable member for the information provided on copper theft in Portugal. The Commission is aware that metal theft in general and copper theft in particular is on the rise in a number of EU Member States. At this moment, it does not possess a comprehensive overview of the situation in each of the 27 Member State and can therefore not confirm the data provided. However, the few figures at our disposal indeed indicate that the number of incidents is closely related to the price of copper on the international market.

---

*(Versão portuguesa)*

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001661/12  
ao Conselho**

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**  
*(10 de fevereiro de 2012)*

*Assunto:* Van Rompuy defende limitação da soberania nos Estados incumpridores

Foi divulgado que o Presidente do Conselho Europeu, Herman Van Rompuy, sugere que uma das formas de combater a crise na zona euro seria retirar, temporariamente, o direito de voto na União Europeia aos países incumpridores, como a Grécia, Portugal ou a Irlanda. Um jornal português precisa que Van Rompuy, numa carta enviada aos líderes europeus, sugeriu a necessidade de um novo regime de punições supervisionado por instituições da UE, a quem seriam dados poderes extraordinários entre os quais um «controlo mais intrusivo das políticas orçamentais nacionais».

Pergunto ao Conselho:

Como avalia e classifica esta vontade do Presidente do Conselho?

**Resposta**  
*(19 de março de 2012)*

O Conselho não debateu esta questão.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001661/12**  
**to the Council**  
**Nuno Melo (PPE)**  
(10 February 2012)

*Subject:* Van Rompuy in favour of restricting sovereignty in countries that fail to meet obligations

It has been reported that the President of the European Council, Herman Van Rompuy, is suggesting that one of the ways to combat the crisis in the euro area would be to temporarily withdraw the voting rights of EU countries that fail to meet obligations, such as Greece, Portugal and Ireland. A Portuguese newspaper reported that Mr. Van Rompuy suggested the need for a new system of punishments to be overseen by the EU institutions, which would be granted extraordinary powers including, *inter alia*, more intrusive control over national budgetary policies.

The Council is asked:

What is the Council's evaluation and assessment of the President of the Council's pleas?

**Reply**  
(19 March 2012)

The Council has not discussed the issue.

---

(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001665/12**  
**adresată Comisiei**  
**Ioan Enciu (S&D)**  
(10 februarie 2012)

*Subiect:* Website discriminatoriu și rasist promovat de Partidul Libertății din Olanda (PVV)

Recent, Partidul Libertății din Olanda (Partij voor de Vrijheid (PVV)), unul dintre susținătorii guvernului din această țară, a lansat un website (<http://www.meldpuntmiddenenooosteuropaanen.nl/>) care își propune să colecteze posibile plângeri privind imigranții provenind din statele membre din Europa Centrală și de Est, în special Polonia, România și Bulgaria. În mesajul postat pe acest website, liderii PVV încurajează cetățenii olandezi să raporteze dacă „și-au pierdut locul de muncă din cauza unui polonez, român, bulgar sau a altui est-european”, publicând în același timp articole de presă defăimătoare la adresa cetățenilor din statele membre din Europa Centrală și de Est. Scopul acestui website este, conform PVV, acela de a dezvolta o analiză asupra problemelor cauzate de cetățenii est-europeni în termeni de crime, infracțiuni, alcoolism, consum de droguri sau prostituție.

Având în vedere caracterul profund discriminatoriu, rasist și insultător al acestei inițiative, care instigă la ură rasială și la etichetarea profund negativă a tuturor cetățenilor din statele membre din Europa Centrală și de Est,

1. Cum evaluează Comisia această inițiativă a Partidului Libertății în termeni de respectare a drepturilor fundamentale și în special a principiului nediscriminării?
2. Ce măsuri intenționează să ia Comisia față de inițiativa creării acestui website?

**Răspuns dat de dna Reding în numele Comisiei**  
(2 aprilie 2012)

Comisia dorește să aducă în atenția onorabilului membru declarația făcută în cadrul ședinței plenare din 13 martie 2012 <sup>(1)</sup>. Comisia sprijină pe deplin rezoluția comună adoptată de Parlamentul European la 15 martie 2012 <sup>(2)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=CRE&reference=20120313&secondRef=ITEM-012&language=EN>.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P7-TA-2012-0087+0+DOC+XML+V0//RO>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001665/12  
to the Commission**

**Ioan Enciu (S&D)**

(10 February 2012)

*Subject:* Racist and discriminatory website promoted by the Dutch Freedom Party (PVV)

Recently the pro-government Dutch Freedom Party (Partij voor de Vrijheid — PVV) launched a website (<http://www.meldpuntmiddenoosteuropaanen.nl/>) on which to register any complaints regarding immigrants from Member States in central and eastern Europe, in particular Poland, Romania and Bulgaria. In the message posted on this website, the PVV leaders urge Dutch citizens to contact the site if 'they have lost their job because of a Pole, Romanian, Bulgarian or other Eastern European' and also publish press articles disparaging citizens of the Central and Eastern European Member States. According to the PVV, the purpose of this website is to investigate in depth the level of involvement of Eastern European citizens in crimes, misdemeanours, alcoholism, drug-taking and prostitution.

In view of the profoundly discriminatory, racist and insulting character of this initiative, which instigates racial hatred, and the profoundly negative image projected regarding all citizens of Member States in central and eastern Europe:

1. What view does the Commission take regarding this initiative of the Freedom Party in terms of respect for fundamental rights, especially the principle of non-discrimination?
2. What measures does the Commission intend to take in response to the creation of this website?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission**

(2 April 2012)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to the statement made in the plenary debate on 13 March 2012 <sup>(1)</sup>. The Commission fully supports the joint resolution adopted by the European Parliament on 15 March 2012 <sup>(2)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=CRE&reference=20120313&secondRef=ITEM-012&language=EN>.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P7-TA-2012-0087+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN&language=EN>.

(българска версия)

**Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор P-001666/12**

**до Комисията**

**Илиана Иванова (PPE)**

(10 февруари 2012 г.)

Относно: Дискриминационно отношение на нидерландски сайт към източноевропейци

От 8 февруари 2012 г. нидерландската крайнодясна партия PVV е лансирала специален сайт <sup>(1)</sup>, на който нидерландските граждани да могат да подават жалби и оплаквания от източноевропейски работници, пребиваващи на територията на Кралство Нидерландия. Темите, по които гражданите на Кралство Нидерландия са насърчени да подават жалби, са: противообществени прояви, замърсяване с отпадъци, отнемане на работните им места и проблеми, свързани с интеграцията и неприятности в жилищните зони. По този начин умишлено се насажда омраза и страх по отношение на гражданите от Централна и Източна Европа, те умишлено са представени като заплаха и проблем за нидерландското население.

Сайтът на крайнодясната партия PVV насажда расизъм и ксенофобия сред нидерландските граждани, предизвиква необосновани страхове и подстрекава към дискриминация срещу хората от Централна и Източна Европа. Намираме, че тази проява от страна на партията PVV е в противоречие с европейските ценности и солидарността между държавите членки. Това е поредният пример за дискриминационно отношение към български граждани в Кралство Нидерландия. ЕК беше вече уведомена за системни оплаквания на български граждани относно неиздаването на декларациите VAR за дружества, представени от български граждани в Нидерландия, като още една проява на дискриминация.

1. Считате ли, че информацията и призивите в този сайт нарушават основни принципи на Европейския съюз, най-вече принципа за недискриминация, който е заложен в първичното законодателство на ЕС — в Хартата на основните права на ЕС, която вече е част от Лисабонския договор, както и в член 13 от Договора от Амстердам?
2. Какво ще предприеме Комисията в защита на ценностите на Европейския съюз? Каква позиция ще заеме ЕК по темата? Ще поиска ли Комисията от нидерландското правителство да разследва случая и да бъдат взети своевременни мерки?

**Отговор, даден от г-жа Рединг от името на Комисията**

(26 март 2012 г.)

Комисията препоръчва на уважания член на Парламента да се запознае със становището, изразено в пленарния дебат на 13 март 2012 г. Комисията изцяло подкрепя общата резолюция, приета от Европейския парламент на 15 март 2012 г.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.meldpuntmiddenenooosteuropaanen.nl/>.



(English version)

**Question for written answer P-001666/12  
to the Commission  
Iliana Ivanova (PPE)  
(10 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Discriminatory attitude of Netherlands website towards Eastern Europeans

On 8 February 2012, the Dutch far-right Party for Freedom (PVV) launched a special website <sup>(1)</sup> where citizens of the Netherlands can submit complaints and grievances about Eastern European workers residing in the Kingdom of the Netherlands. The subjects about which citizens of the Kingdom of the Netherlands are encouraged to submit complaints are: antisocial behaviour, fouling with refuse, loss of their jobs and problems relating to integration and trouble in residential areas. This allows hatred and fear to be deliberately instilled towards citizens from Central and Eastern Europe who are being deliberately portrayed as a threat and a problem to the Dutch public.

The website of the far-right PVV is instilling racism and xenophobia among Dutch citizens, stirring up groundless fears and inciting discrimination against people from Central and Eastern Europe. We feel that this action by the PVV is at odds with European values and solidarity between Member States. This is yet another example of the discriminatory attitude towards Bulgarian citizens in the Kingdom of the Netherlands. The European Commission has already been informed of systematic grievances from Bulgarian citizens about the refusal to issue VAR declarations for companies represented by Bulgarian citizens in the Netherlands, as yet another display of discrimination.

1. Does the Commission not consider the information and calls on this website to violate the fundamental principles of the European Union, in particular the principle of non-discrimination that is enshrined in the primary legislation of the EU — the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union — which is already part of the Treaty of Lisbon, as well as in Article 13 of the Treaty of Amsterdam?
2. What action will the Commission take to defend the values of the European Union? What stance will the Commission adopt on this subject? Will the Commission ask the Netherlands Government to investigate cases and ensure that timely measures are taken?

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

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to the statement made in the plenary debate on 13 March 2012. The Commission fully supports the joint resolution adopted by the European Parliament on 15 March 2012.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.meldpuntmiddenenooستeuropeanen.nl/>.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001667/12  
alla Commissione  
Mario Borghezio (EFD)  
(10 febbraio 2012)**

Oggetto: Lactalis & C. contro i produttori lattieri baschi

La possibilità che la Cooperativa Lechera del País Vasco (CLPB) creasse una propria struttura di produzione casearia per la produzione di prodotti DOC ha fatto sì che i gruppi industriali lattieri Lactalis, Bongrain, MLC e Andros, ovvero i maggior acquirenti di materia prima minacciassero, tramite il loro portavoce Jean Claude Mirassou, di non acquisire più la produzione di latte da tale Cooperativa.

Ciò in concreto ha comportato che 1,35 milioni di litri di latte della Cooperativa siano rimasti invenduti e che 8,5 milioni di litri siano stati venduti a prezzo ribassato al di fuori della regione di origine.

Il ricatto ha altresì comportato che 14 aziende su 84 siano state costrette ad abbandonare la CLPB per poter vendere il loro latte a tali multinazionali e poter quindi sopravvivere.

È la Commissione a conoscenza della situazione?

Quali misure di tutela ha messo in atto per proteggere tali produttori locali dalle pressioni delle lobby casearie che cercano in ogni modo di sbarazzarsi dei piccoli produttori?

**Risposta data da Dacian Cioloș a nome della Commissione  
(9 marzo 2012)**

La Commissione è a conoscenza, in particolare grazie al lavoro del gruppo di esperti di alto livello sul latte <sup>(1)</sup>, che gli squilibri nel livello di concentrazione dei produttori e dei trasformatori possono portare a pratiche commerciali sleali.

È proprio per risolvere tali squilibri e per rafforzare il potere contrattuale dei produttori di latte che il 9 dicembre 2010 la Commissione ha presentato il cosiddetto pacchetto latte <sup>(2)</sup>, in corso di finalizzazione sia al Consiglio che al Parlamento europeo.

Il futuro regolamento consentirà agli Stati membri di rendere obbligatori i contratti scritti tra gli agricoltori e i trasformatori e di obbligare gli acquirenti di latte a garantire agli agricoltori una durata minima del contratto. Al fine di rafforzare il potere contrattuale dei produttori di latte, gli agricoltori potranno raggrupparsi in organizzazioni di produttori per poter negoziare collettivamente le condizioni dei contratti, tra cui il prezzo del latte crudo.

Considerata l'importanza dei formaggi a denominazione di origine protetta (DOP) o a indicazione geografica protetta (IGP), su richiesta delle organizzazioni di produttori, delle organizzazioni interprofessionali o dei gruppi DOP/IGP gli Stati membri potranno applicare norme per disciplinare la fornitura di tali formaggi.

Sono queste alcune delle misure contenute nel pacchetto latte, che indicano che la Commissione è a conoscenza dei problemi esistenti nella catena di approvvigionamento del latte e che ha preso le opportune misure per risolverli.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/markets/milk/hlg/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/markets/milk/hlg/index_en.htm)

<sup>(2)</sup> Proposta di regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio recante modifica al regolamento (CE) n. 1234/2007 per quanto riguarda i rapporti contrattuali nel settore del latte e dei prodotti lattiero-caseari, COM(2010)728 del 9 dicembre 2011, [http://wcmcom-ec-europa-eu-wip.wcm3vue.cec.eu.int:8080/agriculture/milk/index\\_en.htm](http://wcmcom-ec-europa-eu-wip.wcm3vue.cec.eu.int:8080/agriculture/milk/index_en.htm)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001667/12  
to the Commission**

**Mario Borghezio (EFD)**

(10 February 2012)

*Subject:* Lactalis and others against Basque milk producers

The possibility of the Milk Cooperative of the Basque Country (Cooperativa Lechera del País Vasco — CLPB) setting up its own production facility for the production of DOC cheeses has led to the industrial dairy groups Lactalis, Bongrain, MLC and Andros, which are the major buyers of the raw product, threatening, through their spokesman Jean Claude Mirassou, to no longer buy the milk production of the Cooperativa.

In practice, this has meant that 1.35 million litres of the Cooperativa's milk have remained unsold and 8.5 million litres have been sold at a reduced price outside the region of origin.

This blackmail has also resulted in 14 firms out of 84 being obliged to leave the CLPB in order to be able to sell their milk to those multinationals and therefore survive.

Is the Commission aware of this situation?

What protective measures has it put in place to protect local producers from the pressures of the cheese manufacturing lobby, which is trying by all means to get rid of small producers?

**Answer given by Mr Ciołoş on behalf of the Commission**

(9 March 2012)

The Commission is aware, notably thanks to the work of the High Level Experts' Group on Milk <sup>(1)</sup>, that imbalances in the concentration level of producers and processors may lead to unfair commercial practices.

It is notably to address those imbalances and strengthen the bargaining power of milk producers that the Commission tabled on 9 December 2010 the so-called Milk Package <sup>(2)</sup>, which is in the process of finalisation both at Council and European Parliament level.

The future regulation will grant Member States the possibility to make written contracts between farmers and processors compulsory and to oblige purchasers of milk to offer farmers a minimum contract duration. In order to reinforce the bargaining power of milk producers, farmers will have the possibility to join together in producer organisations that can negotiate collectively the contracts terms including the price of the raw milk.

In view of the importance of cheeses with a protected designation of origin (PDO) or protected geographical indications (PGI), Member States will be allowed to apply rules to regulate the supply of those cheeses upon request of producer organisations, an interbranch organisation or a PDO/PGI group.

These are some of the measures contained in the Milk Package, which show that the Commission is aware of problems in the milk supply chain and has taken the necessary steps to address them.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/markets/milk/hlg/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/markets/milk/hlg/index_en.htm)

<sup>(2)</sup> Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Council Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 as regards contractual relations in the milk and milk products sector, COM(2010) 728, 9 December 2011, [http://wcmcom-ec-europa-eu-wip.wcm3vue.cec.eu.int:8080/agriculture/milk/index\\_en.htm](http://wcmcom-ec-europa-eu-wip.wcm3vue.cec.eu.int:8080/agriculture/milk/index_en.htm)

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001668/12**

**à Comissão**

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**

(10 de fevereiro de 2012)

*Assunto:* Medicamento experimental permite reduzir em 38 % o risco do cancro da mama

Segundo notícia veiculada no jornal Sol, o grupo farmacêutico suíço Roche desenvolveu um medicamento experimental contra o cancro da mama, que permite prolongar a vida das pacientes.

O cancro da mama é a primeira causa de morte das mulheres — cerca de 450 mil por ano —, responsável pela morte de 20 % das mulheres europeias, e que o medicamento em causa permitirá reduzir em 38 % o risco de a doença se agravar ou provocar a morte em doentes.

Assim, pergunta-se à Comissão:

- Tem conhecimento do desenvolvimento deste medicamento experimental?
- Sendo que o cancro da mama é a primeira causa de morte das mulheres, especificamente a causa de 20 % das mortes de mulheres europeias, e que o medicamento em causa permitirá reduzir em 38 % o risco de a doença se agravar ou provocar a morte das doentes, tomou ou pretende tomar algumas medidas de apoio às investigações em curso deste medicamento ou à sua comercialização na UE?

**Resposta dada por Máire Geoghegan-Quinn em nome da Comissão**

(2 de abril de 2012)

A Comissão tem conhecimento do medicamento experimental a que o Senhor Deputado se refere. O produto em causa — o pertuzumab — é um medicamento constituído por anticorpos monoclonais humanizados que visam especificamente os recetores positivos da proteína HER2 presentes num subtipo de cancro da mama. Os resultados do estudo clínico Cleopatra revelaram sobrevivência significativa sem progressão ao utilizar-se o produto, em combinação com dois outros medicamentos, como tratamento de primeira linha das doentes com cancro da mama metastático e análise positiva à proteína HER-2 <sup>(1)</sup>.

Embora o 7.º Programa-Quadro de Investigação e Desenvolvimento Tecnológico 2007/2013 não esteja a apoiar nenhum trabalho de investigação especificamente relacionado com o pertuzumab, foram destinados 18,5 milhões de euros ao estudo de terapias que visem os recetores da proteína HER2 <sup>(2)</sup>, no âmbito do esforço de investigação no domínio do cancro da mama <sup>(3)</sup>. Globalmente, desde 2007 foram atribuídos cerca de 120 milhões de euros para apoiar a investigação nesse domínio.

A Comissão não promove a comercialização de medicamentos na UE, embora avalie os pedidos de autorização de comercialização apresentados pelas entidades que os desenvolvem. As decisões positivas que a Comissão toma em conformidade com a legislação da UE aplicável aos medicamentos <sup>(4)</sup> são válidas em todos os Estados-Membros da União Europeia. Os processos subsequentes relativos ao acesso dos doentes aos medicamentos, incluindo o preço e o reembolso, são da competência dos Estados-Membros.

<sup>(1)</sup> Baselga et al. N Engl J Med 2012;366:109-19; DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa1113216, Pertuzumab plus Trastuzumab plus Docetaxel for Metastatic Breast Cancer; (<http://www.4-traders.com/ROCHE-Holding-LTD-9364975/news/ROCHE-Holding-LTD-FDA-grants-Roche-s-pertuzumab-Priority-Review-for-previously-untreated-HER2-positi-14010213/>).

<sup>(2)</sup> (<http://www.ratherproject.com/index.php>, [http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/87612\\_en.html](http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/87612_en.html)).

<sup>(3)</sup> ([http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/health/home\\_en.html](http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/health/home_en.html)), ([http://ec.europa.eu/research/health/biotechnology/diagnostics/projects-fp7\\_en.html](http://ec.europa.eu/research/health/biotechnology/diagnostics/projects-fp7_en.html)).

<sup>(4)</sup> Regulamento (CE) n.º 726/2004 e Diretiva 2001/83/CE, sucessivamente alterados.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001668/12  
to the Commission**

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**

(10 February 2012)

*Subject:* Investigational medicinal product may reduce the risk of breast cancer by 38 %

According to an article in the Portuguese newspaper *Sol*, Swiss pharmaceutical group Roche has developed an investigational medicinal product against breast cancer, which may prolong the life of patients.

Breast cancer is the primary cause of death among women, leading to around 450 000 deaths every year, and is responsible for the death of 20 % of women in Europe. The medicinal product in question may reduce the risk of the condition worsening or causing death in patients by 38 %.

Therefore, in view of the above:

- Is the Commission aware of the development of this investigational medicinal product?
- Given that breast cancer is the primary cause of death among women, and is the specific cause of death of 20 % of women in Europe, and that the medicinal product in question may reduce the risk of the condition worsening or causing death in patients by 38 %, has the Commission taken or does it intend to take any measures to support the current research into this medicinal product or its marketing throughout the EU?

**Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission**

(2 April 2012)

The Commission is aware of the investigational medicinal product mentioned by the Honourable Member. This product, pertuzumab, is a humanised monoclonal antibody drug specifically targeting HER2-positive receptors, present in a subtype of breast cancer. Results from the CLEOPATRA clinical study showed significant progression-free survival when this product was used, in a specific combination with two other drugs, as first-line treatment for those patients who do have a HER2-positive metastatic breast cancer <sup>(1)</sup>.

Although no specific research related to pertuzumab is currently supported by the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013), EUR 18.5 million are devoted to the study of therapies targeting HER2 receptors <sup>(2)</sup>, as part of breast cancer research efforts <sup>(3)</sup>. Overall, some EUR 120 million have been allocated to support breast cancer research for the period 2007 to present time.

The Commission does not promote the marketing of medicinal products in the EU, though it does assess marketing authorisation application submitted by developers. Should a positive Commission decision be issued in accordance with the EU pharmaceutical legislation <sup>(4)</sup>, it will be valid in all EU Member States. Subsequent processes related to access to a medicinal product for patients, including pricing and reimbursement fall within the competence of the Member States.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Baselga et al. *N Engl J Med* 2012; 366:109-19. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1113216, 'Pertuzumab plus Trastuzumab plus Docetaxel for Metastatic Breast Cancer': <http://www.4-traders.com/ROCHE-HOLDING-LTD-9364975/news/ROCHE-HOLDING-LTD-FDA-grants-Roche-s-pertuzumab-Priority-Review-for-previously-untreated-HER2-positi-14010213/>.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.ratherproject.com/index.php>, [http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/87612\\_en.html](http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/87612_en.html)

<sup>(3)</sup> [http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/health/home\\_en.html](http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/health/home_en.html), [http://ec.europa.eu/research/health/biotechnology/diagnostics/projects-fp7\\_en.html](http://ec.europa.eu/research/health/biotechnology/diagnostics/projects-fp7_en.html)

<sup>(4)</sup> Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 and Directive 2001/83/EC as amended.

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001669/12**

**à Comissão**

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**

(10 de fevereiro de 2012)

Assunto: Nova droga — Crocodilo

Segundo o serviço federal russo antidrogas, na Rússia existem cerca de 6 milhões de usuários de drogas ilícitas. E a cada ano morrem, em virtude do consumo, 100 mil toxicodependentes, 70 % deles com menos de 30 anos de idade.

No entanto, este quadro está em vias de se agravar face à proliferação de uma nova droga apelidada de «crocodilo» que, pelo seu baixo custo (cerca de três vezes inferior ao da heroína), possibilita aos usuários da heroína passarem a consumi-la em substituição.

A mesma fonte alerta ainda para os efeitos devastadores provocados por esta nova droga que, ao que tudo indica, mata os seus usuários entre 1 e 3 anos.

Pergunto à Comissão:

- Quais os dados que possui acerca da dimensão da utilização desta nova droga?
- A mesma consta das listas de substâncias ilícitas na U.E?

**Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão**

(9 de março de 2012)

A Comissão remete o Senhor Deputado para a sua resposta à pergunta escrita E-010694/2011 <sup>(1)</sup>, na qual explicava a situação do estupefaciente conhecido como «crocodilo» e precisava a sua posição.

Segundo as informações, a droga contém como principal substância psicoativa a desomorfina, um opiáceo controlado pela Convenção Única das Nações Unidas sobre Estupefacientes (1961).

---

<sup>(1)</sup> (<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2011-010694&language=EN>).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001669/12  
to the Commission  
Nuno Melo (PPE)  
(10 February 2012)**

*Subject:* New drug — Krokodil

According to the Federal Drug Control Service of Russia, there are around six million users of illegal drugs in Russia. Every year, 100 000 drug addicts die from drug abuse; 70 % of them are younger than 30 years of age.

However, this situation is worsening because of the rapid spread of a new drug called 'Krokodil', which may be used as a substitute for heroin because it is available to users at a cost almost three times lower than that of heroin.

The same source also warns about the devastating effects of this new drug, which appears to kill its users within one to three years.

In view of the above, I ask the Commission:

- What information does it have on the scale of the use of this new drug?
- Is this drug listed as an illegal substance in the EU?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission  
(9 March 2012)**

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-010694/2011 <sup>(1)</sup>, in which the situation with the narcotic drug called 'crocodile' was explained and the Commission's response outlined.

It has been reported that the drug contains, as the main psychoactive substance, desomorphine, an opiate which is controlled by the 1961 UN Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2011-010694&language=EN>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001670/12  
to the Commission  
Nicole Sinclair (NI)  
(10 February 2012)**

*Subject:* EU property transactions

Could the Commission state whether the EU has, in the last 15 years, bought or leased property or land from any of the following Luxembourg-based companies?

General Mediterranean Holding SA, Luxembourg

Continental Real Estate Company SA, Luxembourg

Foncière Générale d'Investissements Immobiliers SA, Luxembourg

Immobilière Beaumont SA, Luxembourg

Immobilière de Gestion Financière SA, Luxembourg

Immobilière du Quartier K SA, Luxembourg

Immobilière Royale SA, Luxembourg

Le Domaine Sàrl, Luxembourg

Louisiane SA, Luxembourg

Marial Immobilière, SA Luxembourg

Mediterranean Holding, SA Luxembourg

Parcip SA, Luxembourg

Union Financière Immobilière Luxembourgeoise SA, Luxembourg

Compagnie Internationale de Participations Bancaires et Financières SA, (Cipaf) Luxembourg

Luxembourg Real Estate Company SA, Luxembourg

Cobeton SA, Luxembourg

**Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission  
(2 April 2012)**

During the last 15 years, the Commission did not buy or lease property or land from any of the Luxembourg-based companies referred to by the Honourable Member.

---



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001671/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**Nicole Sinclaire (NI)**

(10 February 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Commonwealth Heads of Government Conference

Further to my previous Question E-011445/2011:

- Can the Vice-President/High Representative confirm that she left the Commonwealth Heads of Government Conference before it had finished, travelling to Melbourne with her husband for a private holiday?
- Can she please advise me of the cost to the taxpayer of her journey to Perth?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**

(15 June 2012)

HR/VP was invited to the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (CHOGM) in Perth, Australia, as a Special Guest of the Secretary General of the Commonwealth, from 26 to 28 October 2011, to attend the sessions with Foreign Ministers. In addition she was invited to attend the opening ceremony of the formal meeting with Heads of Government. The HR/VP did not participate in the Heads of Government sessions, given that these are restricted to Commonwealth Heads of Government. Her programme continued on 31st October with meetings with the Australian Government in Canberra as a guest of the Government.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001672/12  
to the Commission  
Nicole Sinclair (NI)  
(10 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Grants to the Institute for Global Financial Integrity (IGFI)

Can the Commission provide information on any EU grants ever awarded to the Luxembourg-based Institute for Global Financial Integrity?

**Answer given by Mr Lewandowski on behalf of the Commission  
(20 March 2012)**

The Commission has no records of grants or other funding awarded to the Legal Entity 'Institute for Global Financial Integrity' based in Luxembourg. However, it is worth noting that the official name of an organisation does not always match the one it commonly uses in the public domain. A confirmation of the organisation's official legal name might be pertinent in order to obtain from the Commission's systems further information about funding granted.

The Commission would like to recall the Honourable Member that it makes available through the Financial Transparency System (FTS) <sup>(1)</sup> information from 2007 on all beneficiaries of EU funds implemented under centralised direct and centralised indirect management modes, and by Executive Agencies under the centralised indirect management mode. It allows search by criteria such as the name of the beneficiary, its country, the Commission department which gave the grant or contract, the relevant budget line or the amount.

Information regarding other management modes (decentralised, shared, and joint) can be found in the relevant management authority's website <sup>(2)</sup>. Information for year 2011 will be made available at the end of the first semester 2012.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/beneficiaries/fts/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/beneficiaries/fts/index_en.htm)

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/beneficiaries/fts/beneficiaries\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/beneficiaries/fts/beneficiaries_en.htm)

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-001673/12  
do Komisji**

**Paweł Robert Kowal (ECR)**

(10 lutego 2012 r.)

*Przedmiot:* Przejrzystość negocjacji nad umową ACTA w państwach członkowskich

Oficjalny tekst umowy ACTA został udostępniony opinii publicznej w 2010 r., podczas gdy prace nad umową zaczęły się w 2007 r. Z opublikowanych dokumentów wynika, że przebieg negocjacji był w Polsce bez jakiegokolwiek podstawy prawnej ukrywany, a w każdym razie była intencja ukrywania przed opinią publiczną przebiegu negocjacji a zatem i potencjalnych skutków umowy dla obywateli. Sprawa jest na tyle ważna, że dotyczy licznych użytkowników internetu.

- Czy ten sposób postępowania jest zgodny z traktatami, innymi dokumentami i duchem UE?
- Czy proces negocjacji był przejrzysty na poziomie europejskim?
- Czy procedury negocjacyjne podobne do polskich zdarzyły się w innych państwach członkowskich?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Karela De Guchta w imieniu Komisji**

(13 marca 2012 r.)

W dniu 14 kwietnia 2008 r. Komisja i rotacyjna prezydencja UE zostały należycie upoważnione przez państwa członkowskie do podjęcia negocjacji w sprawie ACTA. W dniu 16 grudnia 2011 r. wszystkie państwa członkowskie poparły umowę i upoważniły UE do jej podpisania. Podstawę prawną do zawarcia ACTA stanowi art. 207 ust. 4 w związku z art. 218 ust. 5 TFUE. Legalność tych negocjacji nigdy nie została zakwestionowana.

ACTA była negocjowana przez Komisję oraz – w zakresie przepisów dotyczących egzekwowania prawa karnego – przez rotacyjną prezydencję UE, ponieważ jest to dziedzina, w której kompetencje są dzielone między UE a jej państwa członkowskie. Przedstawiciele państw członkowskich uczestniczyli we wszystkich negocjacjach. ACTA będzie musiała zostać ratyfikowana nie tylko przez UE, ale także przez poszczególne państwa członkowskie.

Podczas negocjacji ACTA Komisja w należyty sposób informowała Parlament o ich przebiegu zgodnie ze swoimi zobowiązaniami wynikającymi z traktatu lizbońskiego oraz zmienionego porozumienia ramowego w sprawie stosunków między Parlamentem a Komisją Europejską z 2010 r.

Podczas negocjacji Komisja przedstawiła Parlamentowi 24 dokumenty dotyczące negocjacji, a jednocześnie ACTA była przedmiotem obszernych dyskusji podczas debat publicznych z posłami do Parlamentu Europejskiego, zarówno na posiedzeniach plenarnych, jak i na poziomie komisji. Unijni negocjatorzy uwzględnili uwagi otrzymane od członków Parlamentu Europejskiego i odnieśli się do nich, a wiele z tych uwag zostało uwzględnionych w ostatecznym tekście ACTA. Ponadto w ramach spotkań z zainteresowanymi stronami oraz sprawozdań przedstawianych przy okazji rund negocjacyjnych w sprawie ACTA przeprowadzono konsultacje ze społeczeństwem obywatelskim.

Dalsze szczegóły dotyczące kwestii przejrzystości są dostępne na stronie internetowej Komisji:  
[http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2012/february/tradoc\\_149103.pdf](http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2012/february/tradoc_149103.pdf).

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-001673/12  
to the Commission**

**Paweł Robert Kowal (ECR)**

(10 February 2012)

*Subject:* Transparency of negotiations concerning the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA) in Member States

The official text of the ACTA agreement was made available to the public in 2010, yet work on the agreement had commenced in 2007. Published documents reveal that the negotiating process was kept confidential in Poland, though there was no legal basis whatsoever for doing so. It certainly was the intention to ensure that the public was not informed of the course of the negotiations and would therefore not be aware either of the potential consequences of the agreement for citizens. This is an important matter, as it affects many Internet users.

- Is this way of proceeding in line with the Treaties, with other documents and with the very spirit of the EU?
- Was the negotiating process transparent at European level?
- Did other Member States handle the negotiating process in a similar way to how it was dealt with in Poland?

**Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission**

(13 March 2012)

The Commission and the rotating EU Presidency were duly authorised by Member States on 14 April 2008 to negotiate ACTA. On 16 December 2011, all Member States endorsed the Agreement and authorised the EU to sign it. The legal basis for the conclusion of ACTA are Articles 207(4), in conjunction with Article 218(5) of the TFEU. The legality of these negotiations has never been called into question.

ACTA was negotiated by the Commission and, as far as its provisions on criminal enforcement were concerned, by the rotating Presidency of the EU, since this concerns competences which are shared between the EU and its Member States. Representatives of the Member States attended all the negotiations. ACTA will have to be ratified not only by the EU, but also by all its Member States individually.

Throughout the negotiations of ACTA, the Commission has duly informed Parliament of the conduct of the negotiations, in line with its obligations under the Lisbon Treaty and the 2010 revised Framework Agreement for Relations between Parliament and the European Commission.

During the negotiations, the Commission has shared with Parliament 24 negotiating documents, whilst ACTA was extensively discussed in public debates with Members of the European Parliament both at plenary and Committee level. The EU negotiators took into consideration and addressed the comments received from Members of the European Parliament, and many of these comments are reflected in the final text of ACTA. In addition, civil society was consulted through stakeholder meetings and debriefings at the occasion of ACTA negotiating rounds.

Further details on the issue of transparency are available on the Commission's website:  
[http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2012/february/tradoc\\_149103.pdf](http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2012/february/tradoc_149103.pdf)

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001674/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**Linda McAvan (S&D)**

(10 February 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Children shot in Gaza

I am writing on behalf of a number of constituents who have raised concerns over the reported shooting of Palestinian children by Israeli soldiers close to the Eastern Gaza Border.

Allegedly in less than a year 30 children were shot, the majority of whom were collecting gravel to sell to builders for concrete. In most of these cases the child reported that they were outside of the exclusion zone.

— Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of these shootings? What action is the Vice-President/High Representative taking or intending to take for the protection of these children?

**Question for written answer E-001675/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**Julie Girling (ECR)**

(10 February 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — 'Children of the Gravel' — Gaza

Can the Vice-President/High Representative explain what action is being taken to tackle the inexcusable shooting of children by Israeli soldiers near the Eastern Gaza border?

The majority of these children are collecting gravel to sell to builders for making concrete and are known as the 'Children of the Gravel'.

**Question for written answer E-001739/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — 'Children of the Gravel' and shootings into Gaza

The report 'Children of the Gravel' by the independent non-governmental organisation Defence for Children International (DCI) cites 28 cases, between 26 March 2010 and 3 October 2011, of children being shot at by the border fence between Israel and the Gaza Strip whilst gathering building materials, such as gravel, or working by the fence line. On 27 December 2011, a 12-year-old boy was shot in the leg when he was one kilometre away from the border.

— Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the DCI dossier and the cases cited in the report?

— What representations have been made to the Israeli Government regarding shootings into Gaza, including at children?

**Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**

(1 June 2012)

High Representative /Vice-President Ashton is fully aware of this issue. She has shown unequivocal support for the children of Gaza, in particular during her frequent visits there. Possible infringement on the rights of children by Israel is a matter of serious concern which is closely monitored by the European External Action Service, in particular via the EU Delegation in Tel Aviv and the EU Office for the West Bank and Gaza Strip.

The EU has reported on the situation of Palestinian children in the annual European Neighbourhood Policy Progress Reports on Israel. These matters are regularly and thoroughly discussed in bilateral contacts with the Israeli authorities at working level, most recently during the September 2011 EU-Israel informal working group on human rights and the December 2011 EU-Israel sub-committee on political dialogue and cooperation, and at political level, in the framework of the EU-Israel Association Council last held in February 2011. The EU has urged Israel to address shortcomings and possible violations of the rights of Palestinian children.

These matters are and will remain a high priority among the human rights issues that the EU follows in its relations with Israel.

---

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001676/12  
à la Commission**

**Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE), Renate Weber (ALDE), Louis Michel (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE) et Cecilia Wikström (ALDE)**

(10 février 2012)

Objet: Les Hongrois demandeurs d'asile au Canada

En 2010, la Hongrie représentait le pays ayant introduit le plus de demandes d'asile au Canada, avec 2 297 dossiers transférés à la Commission de l'immigration et du statut de réfugié du Canada et pas moins de 2 545 demandeurs hongrois sur les neuf premiers mois de 2011 <sup>(1)</sup>. Entre mars 2008 et novembre 2011, le Canada a reçu plus de 9 100 demandes d'asile de la part de ressortissants hongrois, dont 3 900 entre janvier et novembre 2011.

1. La Commission a-t-elle conscience du fait que la grande majorité des demandeurs d'asile au Canada sont originaires de Hongrie depuis l'assouplissement du régime des visas pour les ressortissants hongrois en 2008?
2. Pourrait-elle fournir des chiffres précis sur le nombre de demandes d'asile introduites au Canada par des Hongrois qui ont été accordées?
3. Comment évalue-t-elle la situation?
4. Comment explique-t-elle que des citoyens de l'Union constituent la majorité des demandeurs d'asile au Canada?
5. Estime-t-elle que cette tendance exerce une quelconque influence sur l'image de l'Union européenne en ce qui concerne le respect des droits fondamentaux sur son territoire?

**Réponse donnée par Mme Malmström au nom de la Commission**

(11 avril 2012)

La Commission est consciente du fait qu'un grand nombre de citoyens des États membres de l'Union européenne ont présenté une demande d'asile au Canada au cours de ces dernières années. Le nombre élevé de demandes d'asile en provenance de la République tchèque, en particulier, a incité le Canada à réintroduire une obligation de visa pour tous les citoyens tchèques en 2009. Le nombre de demandes d'asile venues de Hongrie et, dans une moindre mesure, de Slovaquie a également augmenté de façon significative.

Les autorités canadiennes estiment qu'au cours des dernières années, plus de 95 % des demandes d'asile déposées par des ressortissants de l'UE ont fait l'objet d'un retrait, d'un désistement ou d'un rejet. La Commission ne connaît pas les chiffres exacts concernant les demandes d'asile émanant de citoyens hongrois qui ont été approuvées par le Canada.

Son gouvernement a présenté, le 16 février 2012, un projet de «loi visant à protéger le système d'immigration du Canada», dont l'objectif est, entre autres, d'éviter l'usage abusif de son système d'immigration et d'asile et de supprimer la pression exercée sur ledit système par les demandes d'asile illégitimes <sup>(2)</sup>. La Commission est en train d'évaluer, notamment en tirant parti des contacts directs qu'elle entretient avec les autorités canadiennes, l'impact que ce nouveau projet de loi pourrait avoir sur les dysfonctionnements actuels et examine en particulier si ce projet mettrait fin aux facteurs d'attraction importants que comporte la législation canadienne en matière d'asile. La Commission espère que le nouveau projet de loi amènera ainsi le Canada à décider de lever l'obligation de visa pour tous les citoyens tchèques.

La Commission n'est pas en mesure d'évaluer l'éventuelle incidence de cette situation sur l'image de l'Union européenne en ce qui concerne le respect des droits fondamentaux.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://www.embassymag.ca/dailyupdate/view/why\\_are\\_hungarian\\_roma\\_seeking\\_asylum\\_in\\_canada\\_12-19-2011](http://www.embassymag.ca/dailyupdate/view/why_are_hungarian_roma_seeking_asylum_in_canada_12-19-2011).

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.cic.gc.ca/francais/ministere/media/communiqués/2012/2012-02-16.asp>.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001676/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE), Renate Weber (ALDE), Louis Michel (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE) e Cecilia Wikström (ALDE)**

(10 febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: Richieste di asilo in Canada da parte di cittadini ungheresi

Nel 2010 l'Ungheria è stata la principale fonte di richieste di asilo in Canada, con 2 297 casi riferiti alla commissione canadese Immigrazione e rifugiati, e non meno di 2 545 richiedenti ungheresi nei primi nove mesi del 2011 <sup>(1)</sup>. Tra marzo 2008 e novembre 2011 il Canada ha ricevuto oltre 9 100 richieste d'asilo provenienti da cittadini ungheresi, con oltre 3 900 richieste ricevute tra gennaio e novembre 2011.

1. È la Commissione a conoscenza del fatto che la grande maggioranza dei richiedenti asilo in Canada sono cittadini ungheresi da quando il Canada ha abolito l'obbligo del visto per i cittadini ungheresi nel 2008?
2. Può la Commissione fornire cifre precise sul numero delle richieste di asilo in Canada da parte di cittadini ungheresi che sono state accettate?
3. In che modo la Commissione valuta questa situazione?
4. In che modo la Commissione spiega che i cittadini dell'Unione europea rappresentano il maggior numero dei richiedenti asilo in Canada?
5. Ritiene la Commissione che questa tendenza influenzi l'immagine dell'Unione europea relativamente al rispetto dei diritti fondamentali sul suo territorio?

**Risposta data da Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione**

(11 aprile 2012)

La Commissione è al corrente del fatto che, negli ultimi anni, i cittadini degli Stati membri dell'Unione europea hanno rappresentato un importante gruppo di richiedenti asilo in Canada. In particolare, l'elevato numero di domande di asilo provenienti dalla Repubblica ceca ha indotto il Canada a introdurre nuovamente nel 2009 l'obbligo del visto per tutti i cittadini cechi. Anche il numero di domande d'asilo provenienti dall'Ungheria e, in misura minore, dalla Slovacchia è aumentato in maniera significativa.

Le autorità canadesi stimano che negli ultimi anni le domande di asilo presentate da cittadini dell'UE siano state, per oltre il 95 % dei casi, ritirate, abbandonate o respinte. La Commissione non è a conoscenza del numero esatto di domande di asilo provenienti da cittadini ungheresi che il Canada ha approvato.

Il 16 febbraio 2012 il Canada ha introdotto un progetto di legge per la protezione del sistema d'immigrazione canadese («Protecting Canada's Immigration System Act»), il cui obiettivo è, fra l'altro, impedire gli abusi del suo sistema di immigrazione e di asilo e allentare la pressione che il sistema sopporta a causa delle domande di asilo illegittime <sup>(2)</sup>. La Commissione valuta a presente, fra l'altro mediante contatti diretti con le autorità canadesi, l'impatto che questo nuovo progetto di legge potrebbe avere sull'insoddisfacente situazione attuale e, in particolare, se esso sia in grado di eliminare i forti elementi di attrazione che presenta la legislazione canadese in materia di asilo. La Commissione auspica che il nuovo progetto di legge induca il Canada a revocare l'obbligo di visto per tutti i cittadini cechi.

La Commissione non è in grado di valutare il potenziale impatto di questa situazione sull'immagine dell'Unione europea relativamente al rispetto dei diritti fondamentali.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://www.embassymag.ca/dailyupdate/view/why\\_are\\_hungarian\\_roma\\_seeking\\_asylum\\_in\\_canada\\_12-19-2011](http://www.embassymag.ca/dailyupdate/view/why_are_hungarian_roma_seeking_asylum_in_canada_12-19-2011).

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/department/media/releases/2012/2012-02-16.asp>.



(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001676/12  
aan de Commissie**

**Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE), Renate Weber (ALDE), Louis Michel (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE) en Cecilia Wikström (ALDE)**  
(10 februari 2012)

*Betreft:* Asielverzoeken in Canada door Hongaren

In 2010 was Hongarije het belangrijkste land van herkomst van asielzoekers in Canada, waarbij 2 297 gevallen werden doorverwezen naar de Canadian Immigration and Refugee Board. In de eerste negen maanden van 2011 waren er niet minder dan 2 545 Hongaarse asielzoekers. Tussen maart 2008 en november 2011 ontving Canada meer dan 9 100 asielverzoeken van Hongaarse staatsburgers, waarbij er tussen januari en november 2011 meer dan 3 900 asielverzoeken werden ontvangen.

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van het feit dat de overgrote meerderheid van de asielzoekers in Canada Hongaarse staatsburgers zijn, aangezien Canada in 2008 de visumisen voor Hongaarse staatsburgers heeft afgeschaft?
2. Zou de Commissie exacte cijfers kunnen verschaffen over het aantal asielverzoeken door Hongaarse staatsburgers in Canada die zijn goedgekeurd?
3. Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie deze situatie?
4. Hoe verklaart de Commissie dat de meerderheid van de asielaanvragers in Canada bestaat uit burgers uit de Europese Unie?
5. Denkt de Commissie dat deze trend enige invloed heeft op het imago van de Europese Unie wat betreft het respect voor fundamentele rechten op haar grondgebied?

**Antwoord van mevrouw Malmström namens de Commissie**

(11 april 2012)

De Commissie is zich ervan bewust dat de burgers van de lidstaten van de EU de afgelopen jaren een belangrijke groep asielzoekers zijn geworden in Canada. Met name het grote aantal asielaanvragen van Tsjechische burgers heeft ertoe geleid dat Canada in 2009 opnieuw een visumplicht ingevoerd heeft voor alle Tsjechische burgers. Het aantal asielaanvragen van Hongaren en, in mindere mate, Slowaken is ook aanzienlijk toegenomen.

De Canadese autoriteiten schatten dat de afgelopen jaren meer dan 95 % van de asielaanvragen van EU-onderdanen werden ingetrokken, opgegeven of afgewezen. De Commissie beschikt niet over de exacte cijfers betreffende asielaanvragen van Hongaarse burgers die door Canada zijn goedgekeurd.

Op 16 februari 2012 heeft Canada de „Protecting Canada's Immigration System Act” ingevoerd, die onder meer tot doel heeft misbruik van het asiel- en immigratiesysteem te voorkomen en de druk van onwettige asielaanvragen op het systeem te verminderen <sup>(1)</sup>. De Commissie beoordeelt momenteel, onder meer door rechtstreekse contacten met de Canadese autoriteiten, de impact die dit nieuwe wetsontwerp kan hebben op de huidige onbevredigende situatie en bekijkt of dit de Canadese asielwetgeving beduidend minder aantrekkelijk zou maken. De Commissie hoopt dat dit nieuwe wetsontwerp ertoe zal leiden dat Canada de visumplicht voor alle Tsjechische burgers weer opheft.

De Commissie is niet in staat om de eventuele gevolgen van deze situatie voor het imago van de Europese Unie ten aanzien van de eerbiediging van de grondrechten te beoordelen.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/Department/media/releases/2012/2012-02-16.asp>.

(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001676/12  
adresată Comisiei**

**Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE), Renate Weber (ALDE), Louis Michel (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE) și Cecilia Wikström (ALDE)**

(10 februarie 2012)

*Subiect:* Cereri de azil în Canada din partea maghiarilor

În 2010 Ungaria reprezenta principala țară-sursă pentru Canada în ceea ce privește solicitările de azil, cu 2 297 de cazuri înaintate Comisiei pentru imigrație și refugiați din Canada, în primele nouă luni ale anului 2011 existând nu mai puțin de 2 545 de solicitări din partea maghiarilor <sup>(1)</sup>. În perioada martie 2008 — noiembrie 2011 Canada a primit peste 9 100 de cereri de azil din partea resortisanților maghiari, între ianuarie și noiembrie 2011 înregistrându-se mai mult de 3 900 de cereri.

1. Are Comisia cunoștință de faptul că marea majoritate a solicitanților de azil în Canada au fost de naționalitate maghiară, de când Canada a ridicat obligativitatea vizelor pentru resortisanții maghiari în 2008?
2. Ar putea furniza Comisia cifre exacte cu privire la numărul de cereri de azil în Canada din partea resortisanților maghiari, care au fost aprobate?
3. Cum evaluează Comisia această situație?
4. Cum explică Comisia faptul că cetățenii Uniunii Europene reprezintă majoritatea solicitanților de azil în Canada?
5. Consideră Comisia că are vreo influență acest curent asupra imaginii Uniunii Europene în ceea ce privește respectarea drepturilor fundamentale pe teritoriul său?

**Răspuns dat de dna Malmström în numele Comisiei**

(11 aprilie 2012)

Comisia este conștientă de faptul că, în ultimii ani, cetățenii din statele membre ale UE au reprezentat o mare parte a solicitanților de azil în Canada. În special, numărul mare de cereri de azil provenind din Republica Cehă a determinat Canada să reintroducă, în 2009, obligativitatea vizelor pentru toți cetățenii cehi. De asemenea, numărul cererilor de azil provenind din Ungaria și, într-o mai mică măsură, din Slovacia a crescut în mod semnificativ.

Autoritățile canadiene estimează că, în ultimii ani, peste 95 % din cererile de azil ale cetățenilor UE au fost retrase, abandonate sau respinse. Comisia nu cunoaște numărul exact al cererilor de azil introduse de cetățenii maghiari, pe care Canada le-a aprobat.

La data de 16 februarie 2012, Canada a introdus „Actul privind protejarea sistemului canadian de imigrație”, al cărui obiectiv este, printre altele, prevenirea abuzurilor legate de sistemul său de imigrație și de azil, precum și descongestionarea sistemului aflat sub presiune din cauza cererilor nelegitime de azil <sup>(2)</sup>. În prezent, Comisia evaluează, *inter alia* prin intermediul unor contacte directe cu autoritățile canadiene, impactul pe care acest nou proiect de lege l-ar putea avea asupra situației actuale nesatisfăcătoare și, în special, dacă acesta ar elimina factorii de atracție importanți din cadrul legislației canadiene în materie de azil. Comisia speră că noul proiect de lege va determina Canada să decidă eliminarea obligativității vizelor pentru toți cetățenii cehi.

Comisia nu este în măsură să evalueze impactul posibil al acestei situații asupra imaginii Uniunii Europene în ceea ce privește respectarea drepturilor fundamentale.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://www.embassymag.ca/dailyupdate/view/why\\_are\\_hungarian\\_roma\\_seeking\\_asylum\\_in\\_canada\\_12-19-2011](http://www.embassymag.ca/dailyupdate/view/why_are_hungarian_roma_seeking_asylum_in_canada_12-19-2011).

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/departement/media/releases/2012/2012-02-16.asp>.

(Svensk version)

**Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-001676/12  
till kommissionen**

**Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE), Renate Weber (ALDE), Louis Michel (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE) och Cecilia Wikström (ALDE)**  
(10 februari 2012)

Angående: Ungerska asylsökande i Kanada

År 2010 var Ungern det ursprungsland som de flesta asylsökande i Kanadas kom från, med 2 297 fall hänvisade till den kanadensiska invandrings- och flyktingnämnden, och under de första nio månaderna 2011 var det inte mindre än 2 545 ungerska sökande<sup>(1)</sup>. Mellan mars 2008 och november 2011 tog Kanada emot mer än 9 100 asylansökningar från ungerska medborgare, varav mer än 3 900 ansökningar togs emot mellan januari och november 2011.

1. Känner kommissionen till att en klar majoritet av alla asylsökande till Kanada är ungerska medborgare, sedan Kanada hävde visumtvånget för ungerska medborgare 2008?
2. Kan kommissionen lämna exakta siffror på antalet asylansökningar av ungerska medborgare i Kanada som har beviljats?
3. Hur bedömer kommissionen den här situationen?
4. Hur förklarar kommissionen att EU-medborgare står för majoriteten av asylansökningarna i Kanada?
5. Tror kommissionen att den här trenden påverkar Europeiska unionens anseende när det gäller grundläggande rättigheter på dess mark?

**Svar från Cecilia Malmström på kommissionens vägnar**  
(11 april 2012)

Kommissionen är medveten om att EU-medborgare har utgjort en väsentlig del av de asylsökande i Kanada de senaste åren. Det höga antalet asylansökningar från framförallt Tjeckien ledde till att Kanada återinförde viseringskravet för alla tjeckiska medborgare 2009. Antalet asylansökningar från Ungern och, i något mindre utsträckning Slovakien, har också ökat markant.

Kanadensiska myndigheter uppskattar att över 95 % av asylansökningarna från EU-medborgare de senaste åren har antingen dragits tillbaka, inte fullföljts eller fått avslag. Kommissionen har inga exakta siffror över antalet asylansökningar från ungerska medborgare som Kanada har beviljat.

Kanada införde lagförslaget *Protecting Canada's Immigration Act* den 16 februari 2012, med målet att bland annat förhindra missbruk av invandrings- och flyktingsystemet och att få bort den press som sätts på systemet i form av asylansökningar utan laglig grund<sup>(2)</sup>. Kommissionen bedömer för närvarande, genom bland annat direkta kontakter med de kanadensiska myndigheterna, hur det nya lagförslaget kan påverka dagens otillfredsställande situation och framförallt huruvida det kan hämma de viktiga attraktionsfaktorerna i Kanadas asyllagstiftning. Kommissionen hoppas att det nya lagförslaget leder till att Kanada beslutar att åter häva viseringskravet för alla tjeckiska medborgare.

Kommissionen har inte möjlighet att bedöma huruvida situationen kan påverka EU:s anseende i fråga om respekt för grundläggande rättigheter.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://www.embassymag.ca/dailyupdate/view/why\\_are\\_hungarian\\_roma\\_seeking\\_asylum\\_in\\_canada\\_12-19-2011](http://www.embassymag.ca/dailyupdate/view/why_are_hungarian_roma_seeking_asylum_in_canada_12-19-2011).

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/departement/media/releases/2012/2012-02-16.asp>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001676/12  
to the Commission**

**Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE), Renate Weber (ALDE), Louis Michel (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE) and Cecilia Wikström (ALDE)**  
(10 February 2012)

*Subject:* Applications for asylum in Canada by Hungarians

In 2010, Hungary was Canada's top source country for asylum-seekers, with 2 297 cases referred to the Canadian Immigration and Refugee Board, and in the first nine months of 2011 there were no fewer than 2 545 Hungarian applicants<sup>(1)</sup>. Between March 2008 and November 2011, Canada received over 9 100 asylum applications from Hungarian nationals, with over 3 900 applications received between January and November 2011.

1. Is the Commission aware of the fact that the great majority of asylum applicants to Canada have been Hungarian nationals, since Canada lifted visa requirements for Hungarian nationals in 2008?
2. Could the Commission provide exact figures on the number of asylum applications by Hungarian nationals in Canada which have been approved?
3. How does the Commission assess this situation?
4. How does the Commission explain that European Union citizens account for the majority of asylum applicants in Canada?
5. Does the Commission believe that this trend has any influence on the image of the European Union with regard to respect for fundamental rights on its soil?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission**  
(11 April 2012)

The Commission is aware that EU Member States' citizens have constituted an important group of asylum-seekers in Canada in recent years. The high number of asylum applications from the Czech Republic in particular, led Canada to re-introduce a visa requirement for all Czech citizens in 2009. The number of asylum applications from Hungary and, to a lesser extent, Slovakia has also significantly increased.

The Canadian authorities estimate that in recent years over 95 % of asylum applications from EU nationals were either withdrawn, abandoned or rejected. The Commission does not know the exact figures of asylum applications originating from Hungarian citizens approved by Canada.

Canada introduced on 16.2.2012 the 'Protecting Canada's Immigration System Act', whose objective is, among others, to prevent the abuse of its immigration and refugee system and to remove pressure imposed on the system by illegitimate refugee claims<sup>(2)</sup>. The Commission is currently assessing, *inter alia* through direct contacts with the Canadian authorities, the impact this new draft law could have on the current unsatisfactory situation and in particular whether it would negate the existing important pull factors in Canada's asylum legislation. The Commission hopes that the new draft law would consequently lead Canada to decide to lift again the visa requirement for all Czech citizens.

The Commission is not in a position to assess the possible impact of this situation on the image of the European Union with regard to respect for fundamental rights.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://www.embassymag.ca/dailyupdate/view/why\\_are\\_hungarian\\_roma\\_seeking\\_asylum\\_in\\_canada\\_12-19-2011](http://www.embassymag.ca/dailyupdate/view/why_are_hungarian_roma_seeking_asylum_in_canada_12-19-2011).

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/department/media/releases/2012/2012-02-16.asp>.

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001677/12**  
**à la Commission**  
**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**  
(10 février 2012)

*Objet:* Soutien de la Commission aux écoles de consommation régionales

La Commission vient de mettre un terme définitif au programme Dolceta d'éducation des consommateurs par Internet en raison de son inadaptation aux besoins des formateurs, de son manque de visibilité et de l'absence de visiteurs de ce site. La Commission reconnaît avoir dépensé plus de 9 millions d'euros pour cette initiative.

La Commission peut-elle faire savoir:

- si elle est informée de l'existence dans plusieurs régions des États membres d'écoles de consommation organisées à l'initiative d'autorités régionales, de communes ou d'organisations de consommateurs?
- si, le cas échéant, elle soutient ces initiatives qui remportent un grand succès, mais manquent de moyens pour se développer?
- dans le cas contraire, pour quelles raisons elle ne veut pas consacrer une partie du budget anciennement affecté à Dolceta afin d'aider ces écoles et d'en créer d'autres, avant la fin de 2013?

**Réponse donnée par M. Dalli au nom de la Commission**  
(22 mars 2012)

La Commission ne dispose pas d'informations actualisées sur les «écoles de consommation» ou d'autres initiatives d'éducation des consommateurs dans les États membres, étant donné que ceux-ci ne rendent pas compte de ces activités à la Commission.

La Commission sait que des autorités nationales ont réduit leurs financements pour certaines activités d'éducation des consommateurs. Toutefois, son rôle n'est pas de financer les activités des autorités nationales, mais de compléter celles-ci par des activités de l'Union européenne présentant une valeur ajoutée.

Sur la base de l'évaluation du programme Dolceta et d'autres initiatives d'éducation des consommateurs <sup>(1)</sup>, la Commission redéfinit son action dans ce domaine. Compte tenu de la diversité des initiatives de ce type dans les pays de l'Union, et conformément aux recommandations de l'OCDE <sup>(2)</sup>, les actions futures seront axées sur les moyens de faciliter l'échange de meilleures pratiques. Les matériels ayant servi à l'éducation des consommateurs dans le cadre du programme Dolceta ainsi que d'autres sources seront utilisés pour créer un site communautaire interactif destiné aux enseignants, sur lequel ces derniers pourront échanger points de vue, informations et idées sur l'intégration de l'éducation des consommateurs dans les programmes scolaires.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/strategy/docs/evaluation\\_consumer\\_education\\_report\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/strategy/docs/evaluation_consumer_education_report_en.pdf)

<sup>(2)</sup> Rapport de l'OCDE publié en 2009 intitulé «Promoting Consumer Education: Trends, Policies and Good Practices».

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001677/12  
to the Commission  
Marc Tarabella (S&D)  
(10 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Commission support for regional consumer education schools

The Commission has just put an end to the Dolceta online consumer education programme due to its inability to meet trainers' needs, its lack of visibility and the lack of visitors to this site. The Commission acknowledges spending more than EUR 9 million on this initiative.

Can the Commission indicate:

- Is it aware of the existence in several regions of the Member States of consumer education schools set up by regional authorities, towns or consumer organisations?
- If so, does it support these initiatives which are very successful, but lack the means to develop?
- If not, why does it not wish to devote part of the budget previously allocated to Dolceta to helping these schools and setting up other schools before the end of 2013?

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

The Commission has no up-to-date information about 'consumer schools' or other consumer education initiatives in the Member States, as Member States do not report such activities to the Commission.

The Commission is aware that national authorities have reduced their funding for some consumer education activities. However, the role of the Commission in consumer education is to complement the activities of national authorities with EU activities having an added value and not to finance national activities.

In the follow-up to the evaluation of Dolceta and other consumer education actions <sup>(1)</sup>, the Commission is redefining its action in this field. Given the diversity of consumer education activities in EU countries, and in line with the policy recommendations by the OECD <sup>(2)</sup>, future action will focus on facilitating the exchange of best practices. Consumer education materials from Dolceta and other sources will be used to build an interactive community site for teachers, where they can exchange views, materials and ideas about integrating consumer education into the school curriculum.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/strategy/docs/evaluation\\_consumer\\_education\\_report\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/strategy/docs/evaluation_consumer_education_report_en.pdf)

<sup>(2)</sup> OECD 2009, Promoting Consumer Education: Trends, Policies and Good Practices.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001678/12  
alla Commissione**

**Andrea Zaroni (ALDE)**

(10 febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: Campionati europei di calcio EURO 2012: intervento dell'UE presso le autorità ucraine

Il Campionato europeo di calcio 2012, organizzato dall'UEFA, si svolgerà nella sua fase finale in Polonia e Ucraina dall'8 giugno al 1° luglio 2012. Da circa un anno le autorità ucraine, per ripulire le proprie città dai cani e gatti randagi in previsione di questo campionato, invece di attrezzare strutture adeguate e effettuare specifiche campagne di sterilizzazione, non si fanno alcuno scrupolo di utilizzare mezzi estremamente cruenti quali l'avvelenamento, l'uccisione con percosse, la fucilazione e i forni crematori ambulanti <sup>(1)</sup>, dove i poveri animali in alcuni casi vengono gettati ancora vivi. Viene stimato un numero di diecimila animali barbaramente ammazzati fino ad ora.

Queste terribili notizie si stanno diffondendo rapidamente in tutto il mondo. La situazione è denunciata e documentata da fotoreporter e associazioni locali per la tutela di animali che inviano continuamente testimonianze su quanto sta accadendo e è stata ripresa da molti canali televisivi europei <sup>(2)</sup>.

Nonostante ripetute denunce, appelli e iniziative, questo massacro di migliaia di animali innocenti non si ferma e sta compromettendo l'immagine di Euro 2012, un grande evento europeo che avrebbe dovuto essere un formidabile vettore per realizzare gli obiettivi strategici fondamentali dell'Unione in tema di integrazione e civiltà.

Può la Commissione riferire se per l'organizzazione dei Campionati europei vi sono stati cofinanziamenti a carico del bilancio dell'Unione europea e, se sì, in quale percentuale?

Considerato che l'accordo di partenariato e cooperazione tra l'Unione europea (UE) e l'Ucraina, entrato in vigore il 1° marzo 1998 è destinato a essere prossimamente sostituito dall'accordo di associazione e alla luce dell'articolo 13 del Trattato di Lisbona che considera gli animali quali esseri senzienti, intende la Commissione intraprendere urgentemente azioni concrete presso le autorità ucraine per fermare questo incivile, barbaro e inutile massacro che sta indignando i cittadini dell'Unione e del mondo intero?

**Risposta data da John Dalli a nome della Commissione**

(16 aprile 2012)

La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole deputato alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-011178/2011 <sup>(3)</sup> sulla questione dei cani randagi in Ucraina. In una lettera del 1° febbraio 2012 inviata alle autorità ucraine il capo della delegazione UE in Ucraina ha espresso sollecitudine per il trattamento dei cani randagi in Ucraina e ha chiesto informazioni sulle misure adottate dal governo per affrontare tale questione.

L'UE non cofinanzia il campionato europeo di calcio 2012 organizzato dall'UEFA. L'UE ha però fornito un limitato sostegno tecnico avente essenzialmente lo scopo di ridurre al minimo i rischi per la salute e la sicurezza legati all'evento.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://rt.com/news/animal-cruelty-ukraine-euro-2012-929/>.

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A\\_MRhC1wE9g](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A_MRhC1wE9g).

<sup>(3)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001678/12  
to the Commission**

**Andrea Zaroni (ALDE)**

(10 February 2012)

*Subject:* European Football Championships EURO 2012: intervention of the EU vis-à-vis the Ukrainian authorities

The final stages of the 2012 European Football Championship, organised by UEFA, will take place in Poland and Ukraine from 8 June to 1 July 2012. For about a year, in order to clear its towns of stray cats and dogs in anticipation of the championship, the Ukrainian authorities, instead of setting up adequate facilities and carrying out specific sterilisation campaigns, have had no scruples about using extremely cruel methods such as poisoning, bludgeoning to death, shooting and mobile incinerators <sup>(1)</sup>, where in some cases the poor animals are thrown in when still alive. It is estimated that ten thousand animals have been barbarically killed up to now.

This terrible news is fast spreading around the world. The situation has been denounced and documented by press photographers and local animal protection associations which continually send proof of what is happening and it has been shown by many European television channels <sup>(2)</sup>.

Notwithstanding repeated complaints, appeals and initiatives, this massacre of thousands of innocent animals has not stopped and is compromising the image of Euro 2012, a great European event that should have been a wonderful means of achieving the fundamental strategic objectives of the Union with regard to integration and civilisation.

Can the Commission state whether there has been co-financing at the expense of the European Union budget for the organising of the European Championships and, if so, what percentage the budget has contributed?

Considering that the partnership and cooperation agreement between the European Union (EU) and Ukraine, which came into effect on 1 March 1998, is shortly due to be replaced by the Association Agreement and in the light of Article 13 of the Treaty of Lisbon, which considers animals to be sentient beings, does the Commission intend to take urgent concrete action vis-à-vis the Ukrainian authorities to stop this uncivilised, barbaric and pointless massacre that is provoking outrage among the citizens of the Union and throughout the entire world?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission**

(16 April 2012)

The Commission would refer to its reply to Written Question E-011178/2011 <sup>(3)</sup> on the issue of stray dogs in Ukraine. In a letter of 1 February 2012 to the Ukrainian authorities, the Head of the EU Delegation to Ukraine raised concerns about the treatment of stray dogs in Ukraine and requested information about measures taken by the government to address these concerns.

The EU does not co-finance the UEFA European Football Championship 2012. However, the EU has provided limited technical support mainly aimed at minimising security and safety risks of the event.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://rt.com/news/animal-cruelty-ukraine-euro-2012-929/>.

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A\\_MRhC1wE9g](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A_MRhC1wE9g).

<sup>(3)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp>



(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001680/12**  
**alla Commissione**  
**Oreste Rossi (EFD)**  
(10 febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: Trapianti in Europa

A seguito della presentazione del rapporto del Centro Nazionale Trapianti sull'attività dell'anno 2011, è apparso che l'Italia, con 21,7 donatori ogni milione di persone, è terza tra i grandi paesi europei.

Il primo posto lo detiene la Spagna con 29,2 donatori ogni milione e il secondo la Francia con 22,8 donatori ogni milione di persone.

Ciò che sorprende è che i dati italiani sono superiori del 35 % alla media europea, la quale risulta essere piuttosto bassa: solo 16,9 donatori ogni milione di persone.

Dalla donazione di organi dipende ogni giorno la vita di molte persone. Purtroppo la lista di attesa per i trapianti è sempre molto lunga e la media europea di donatori di organi è ancora molto bassa se si considerano i dati dei paesi appena elencati.

Considerati gli esempi molto positivi di Spagna, Francia e Italia, può la Commissione far sapere se intende sensibilizzare gli altri paesi europei affinché la popolazione capisca l'importanza della donazione degli organi in maniera tale da aumentare la media europea di donatori e, di conseguenza, abbassare i tempi di attesa per i trapianti?

**Risposta data da John Dalli a nome della Commissione**  
(20 marzo 2012)

La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole deputato alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-010591/2011 <sup>(1)</sup>.

La Commissione sostiene attivamente gli Stati membri dell'UE nelle loro attività volte a migliorare la qualità e la sicurezza degli organi destinati ai trapianti. Una direttiva <sup>(2)</sup> che stabilisce regole in termini di qualità e di sicurezza degli organi destinati ai trapianti è stata adottata nel 2010 al fine di tutelare i donatori e i destinatari. La gestione delle liste d'attesa e l'organizzazione dei sistemi di consenso rimangono tuttavia di responsabilità dei singoli Stati.

La Commissione promuove inoltre lo scambio volontario di pratiche ottimali tra i paesi dell'UE per il tramite del Piano d'azione per la donazione e il trapianto di organi. Le azioni condotte in tale contesto intendono contribuire ad aumentare la disponibilità di organi e a ridurre le liste d'attesa. La Commissione promuove lo scambio di conoscenze e di buone pratiche attraverso gruppi di lavoro e progetti finanziati dal programma Salute dell'UE <sup>(3)</sup>. Alcuni progetti sono direttamente impennati sulle strategie di comunicazione <sup>(4)</sup>.

Inoltre, la Commissione partecipa attivamente alla sensibilizzazione sulla donazione degli organi e sul problema delle liste d'attesa tra i giornalisti europei che possono quindi divulgare le informazioni ai cittadini. Nel 2010 e nel 2011 sono stati organizzati workshop con i giornalisti consacrati alla donazione di organi <sup>(5)</sup>. Diverse altre iniziative della Commissione, come il Premio giornalistico europeo sulla sanità <sup>(6)</sup> o il bollettino informativo Salute-UE <sup>(7)</sup> contribuiscono a sensibilizzare su questa questione cruciale.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB>

<sup>(2)</sup> Direttiva 2010/53/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 7 luglio 2010, relativa alle norme di qualità e di sicurezza degli organi umani destinati ai trapianti, GU L 207 del 6.8.2010.

<sup>(3)</sup> L'elenco dei progetti è disponibile sul sito: [http://ec.europa.eu/health/blood\\_tissues\\_organ/projects/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/health/blood_tissues_organ/projects/index_en.htm)

<sup>(4)</sup> <http://www.europeandonationday.org/>

<sup>(5)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/health/blood\\_tissues\\_organ/events/journalist\\_workshops\\_organ\\_en.htm#fragment0](http://ec.europa.eu/health/blood_tissues_organ/events/journalist_workshops_organ_en.htm#fragment0)

<sup>(6)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/health-eu/europe\\_for\\_patients/organ\\_donation\\_transplantation/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/health-eu/europe_for_patients/organ_donation_transplantation/index_en.htm)

<sup>(7)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/health-eu/newsletter/80/newsletter\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/health-eu/newsletter/80/newsletter_en.htm)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001680/12  
to the Commission  
Oreste Rossi (EFD)  
(10 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Transplants in Europe

In the light of the presentation of the report by the National Transplant Centre on activities in 2011, it appears that Italy, with 21.7 donors per million people, is in third place among the major European countries.

Spain holds first place with 29.2 donors per million and France is second with 22.8 donors per million people.

What is surprising is that the Italian figures are 35 % above the European average, which turns out to be rather low: only 16.9 donors per million people.

Each day, the lives of many people depend on organ donation. Unfortunately, the waiting list for transplants is always very long and the European average for organ donors is still very low considering the data for the countries listed above.

Considering the very positive examples of Spain, France and Italy, can the Commission confirm whether it intends to bring awareness to the other European countries so that their populations understand the importance of organ donation in such a way as to increase the European average for donors and, as a result, lower waiting times for transplants?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission  
(20 March 2012)**

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-010591/2011 <sup>(1)</sup>.

The Commission actively supports EU Member States in their work to improve quality and safety of organs for transplantation. A Directive <sup>(2)</sup> setting quality and safety rules in organs for transplantation was adopted in 2010 to protect donors and recipients. The management of the waiting lists and the shaping of the consent systems, however, remain national responsibility.

The Commission also promotes the voluntary exchange of best practices between EU countries through the action plan on Organ Donation and Transplantation. Action in this context aims to help increase organ availability and to reduce waiting lists. The Commission fosters exchange of knowledge and good practice through working groups and projects funded under the EU Health Programme <sup>(3)</sup>. Some projects directly focus on communication strategies <sup>(4)</sup>.

Moreover, the Commission is actively involved in raising awareness about organ donation and waiting lists among European journalists who can then disseminate information towards citizens. Journalist Workshops <sup>(5)</sup> were organised in 2010 and 2011 on organ donation. Several other Commission initiatives such as the European Prize for Health Journalism <sup>(6)</sup> or the Health-EU Newsletter <sup>(7)</sup> contribute to raising awareness on this crucial issue.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB>.

<sup>(2)</sup> Directive 2010/53/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 7 July 2010 on standards of quality and safety of human organs intended for transplantation, OJ L 207, 6.8.2010.

<sup>(3)</sup> The list of projects is available at [http://ec.europa.eu/health/blood\\_tissues\\_organ/projects/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/health/blood_tissues_organ/projects/index_en.htm)

<sup>(4)</sup> <http://www.europeandonationday.org/>.

<sup>(5)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/health/blood\\_tissues\\_organ/events/journalist\\_workshops\\_organ\\_en.htm#fragment0](http://ec.europa.eu/health/blood_tissues_organ/events/journalist_workshops_organ_en.htm#fragment0).

<sup>(6)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/health-eu/europe\\_for\\_patients/organ\\_donation\\_transplantation/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/health-eu/europe_for_patients/organ_donation_transplantation/index_en.htm)

<sup>(7)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/health-eu/newsletter/80/newsletter\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/health-eu/newsletter/80/newsletter_en.htm)

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001682/12**  
**alla Commissione**  
**Oreste Rossi (EFD)**  
(10 febbraio 2012)

**Oggetto:** Disabilità: la mancata accessibilità ai contenuti web denunciata da un ragazzo non vedente

Il servizio del Censimento online dell'Istat è territorio proibito ai non vedenti. Lo «svela» un ragazzo italiano non vedente di 17 anni, che ha denunciato l'ennesima falla nel mondo della disabilità. L'Istituto di statistica prevede, infatti, l'accessibilità ad altre parti del suo sito, ma proprio in quella che è servita in questi mesi per aggiornare l'identikit della nazione non ha previsto l'utilizzo di un software che permettesse il «dialogo» con un lettore a sintesi vocale, che è appunto uno strumento indispensabile per i non vedenti.

Considerando che la mancanza di accesso ai nuovi mezzi di comunicazione costituisce una delle barriere principali da abolire affinché tutti possano partecipare alla società dell'informazione, le amministrazioni pubbliche nazionali hanno il dovere di ricercare il costante perfezionamento delle proprie pagine web e di esplorare nuovi e migliori metodi per fornire i contenuti e i servizi Internet, laddove vengano sviluppate nuove tecnologie.

L'accessibilità del web per i disabili deve costituire parte integrante della politica d'informazione pubblica all'interno e all'esterno dell'Unione e la legislazione o gli altri strumenti della politica devono rappresentare validi incentivi per integrare tutti, in particolare i disabili e gli anziani, nella società dell'informazione.

Ciò premesso, può la Commissione far sapere se intende promuovere misure di sensibilizzazione sul tema della *eAccessibility* e intensificare le iniziative per accelerare l'accessibilità del web e dei relativi contenuti mediante divulgazione, istruzione e formazione, non solo all'interno delle istituzioni europee ma soprattutto negli Stati membri?

Può essa verificare l'attuazione di misure specifiche da parte degli Stati membri, presentando una relazione sui risultati raggiunti e destinando loro le risorse necessarie per raggiungere l'accessibilità dei siti web?

Intende la Commissione imporre alle amministrazioni pubbliche a tutti i livelli di governo l'attuazione di regole di condotta nei siti web per lo sviluppo dei quali è concesso un finanziamento?

**Risposta data da Neelie Kroes a nome della Commissione**  
(21 marzo 2012)

Dal 2002 la Commissione ha pubblicato diverse comunicazioni sul tema dell'e-accessibilità, compresa l'accessibilità del web, come per esempio nel 2008 «Verso una società dell'informazione accessibile». L'Agenda digitale europea <sup>(1)</sup> è impegnata sul fronte dell'accessibilità del web e, dopo aver esplorato le alternative rivolte ai proprietari di siti web (nello specifico le amministrazioni pubbliche a tutti i livelli), attualmente la Commissione sta elaborando una proposta di eventuale intervento legislativo volto a garantire l'efficienza degli sforzi per evitare la frammentazione. Nell'ambito della Strategia europea sulla disabilità 2010-2020 e della Convenzione delle Nazioni Unite sui diritti delle persone con disabilità, la Commissione sta altresì lavorando a una proposta di «Atto europeo per l'accessibilità».

La Commissione lancia regolarmente campagne di sensibilizzazione e organizza eventi pubblici, come i premi europei 2012 per l'e-inclusione <sup>(2)</sup> o il premio Access city Award, finanzia progetti di ricerca e promozione (per es. 7° PQ TIC WAI-ACT <sup>(3)</sup> per integrare il materiale WCAG2.0 e la rete CIP-ICT PSP eAccess+ <sup>(4)</sup>, destinata ad assistere gli operatori negli Stati membri) nonché di normalizzazione (per es. il mandato 376 <sup>(5)</sup> inteso a sviluppare una norma europea per le prescrizioni in materia di accessibilità nel settore delle TIC, compreso il web, da utilizzare nelle gare d'appalto) e promuove il dialogo fra le parti. Il piano d'azione europeo per l'eGovernment 2011-2015 interessa anche lo sviluppo di servizi elaborati sulle esigenze dell'utente, al fine di garantire l'inclusione e l'accessibilità.

<sup>(1)</sup> C(2010)245 definitivo, [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0245R\(01\):IT:NOT](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0245R(01):IT:NOT).

<sup>(2)</sup> [www.e-inclusionawards.eu](http://www.e-inclusionawards.eu).

<sup>(3)</sup> [www.w3.org/WAI/ACT/](http://www.w3.org/WAI/ACT/).

<sup>(4)</sup> [www.eaccessplus.eu](http://www.eaccessplus.eu).

<sup>(5)</sup> [www.mandate376.eu](http://www.mandate376.eu).

Per quanto riguarda il monitoraggio dei progressi dell'attuazione negli Stati membri, risultati recenti sono stati pubblicati (MeAC-2 <sup>(6)</sup>), mentre è in corso di preparazione una terza campagna di monitoraggio. La Commissione sta inoltre analizzando l'accessibilità dei propri siti web.

Nell'ambito dei fondi erogati per sviluppare siti web, il regolamento sui fondi strutturali dispone che l'accessibilità costituisca uno dei criteri alla base della definizione e dell'attuazione delle operazioni cofinanziate.

---

---

<sup>(6)</sup> [www.eaccessibility-monitoring.eu](http://www.eaccessibility-monitoring.eu).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001682/12  
to the Commission  
Oreste Rossi (EFD)  
(10 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Disability: condemnation by a blind teenager of lack of access to web content

The online census service of the Italian National Institute of Statistics (Istat) is off-limits to the blind. This has been 'revealed' by a blind 17-year-old Italian boy who has condemned yet another failure in the world of disability issues. The Institute of Statistics facilitates access to other parts of its website, but precisely in the section that has served in recent months to update the nation's identikit, it has failed to provide for the use of dialogue-enabling text-to-speech software, which is, of course, an essential tool for the blind.

Considering that the lack of access to new means of communication is one of the main barriers which need to be overcome in order to enable everyone to participate in the information society, national public administrations have a duty to seek constantly to perfect their web pages and explore new and better methods for providing Internet services and content in areas where new technologies are developed.

Web access for the disabled should be an integral part of public information policy both within and outside the Union, and legislation or other policy instruments must provide valid incentives for the inclusive integration, especially of the disabled and the elderly, in the information society.

In the light of this, can the Commission state whether or not it intends to promote awareness-raising measures with regard to *eAccessibility* and to intensify initiatives for speeding up access to the web and web content through information dissemination, education and training, not only within the EU institutions, but also, and above all, in the Member States?

Can the Commission check that Member States have implemented targeted measures and present a report on the results achieved, allocating to the Member States the resources needed to ensure web accessibility?

Does the Commission intend to oblige public administrations at all levels to introduce rules of good conduct on websites for whose development funding is granted?

**Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission  
(21 March 2012)**

Since 2002 the Commission has issued several communications on e-accessibility, including web-accessibility, e.g. in 2008: 'Towards an accessible Information Society'. The Digital Agenda for Europe <sup>(1)</sup> has commitments on web-accessibility, and after investigating options for addressing the owners of websites (specifically public administrations, at all levels), the Commission is currently elaborating a proposal for a possible legislative intervention for ensuring efficiency of efforts by avoiding fragmentation. In the context of the EU Disability Strategy 2010-2020 and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities, the Commission is also working on proposing an 'European Accessibility Act'.

The Commission regularly initiate awareness campaigns, public events, e.g. currently the '2012 e-Inclusion Awards' <sup>(2)</sup> or the Access City Awards. It is funding projects for research and deployment (e.g. FP7 ICT WAI-ACT <sup>(3)</sup> for supplementing WCAG2.0 material, and CIP-ICT PSP eAccess+ <sup>(4)</sup> network for assisting actors in Member States), standardisation (e.g. Mandate 376 <sup>(5)</sup> developing a European standard for accessibility requirements for ICT, including the web, to be used in public procurements) and is encouraging stakeholders' dialogue. The eGovernment Action Plan 2011-2015 also covers the development of services designed around user needs and ensuring inclusiveness and accessibility.

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2010) 245 final, [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0245R\(01\):EN:NOT](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0245R(01):EN:NOT).

<sup>(2)</sup> [www.e-inclusionawards.eu](http://www.e-inclusionawards.eu).

<sup>(3)</sup> [www.w3.org/WAI/ACT/](http://www.w3.org/WAI/ACT/).

<sup>(4)</sup> [www.eaccessplus.eu](http://www.eaccessplus.eu).

<sup>(5)</sup> [www.mandate376.eu](http://www.mandate376.eu).

With regard to monitoring of progress of implementation in Member States, recent results were published (MeAC-2 <sup>(9)</sup>) and a third monitoring campaign is being prepared. The Commission is also evaluating the accessibility of its own websites.

In the context of funds used to develop websites, the Structural Fund Regulation requires that accessibility shall be one of the criteria in defining and implementing operations co-financed.

---

---

<sup>(9)</sup> [www.eaccessibility-monitoring.eu](http://www.eaccessibility-monitoring.eu).

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001683/12  
alla Commissione  
Oreste Rossi (EFD)  
(10 febbraio 2012)**

**Oggetto:** L'OMS intende eliminare morbillo e rosolia entro il 2015

Il PNEMRC, «Piano nazionale di eliminazione del morbillo endemico e della rosolia congenita», sarà attuato sotto la supervisione della Commissione appositamente formata in seno all'Organizzazione mondiale della sanità. Il Piano, cui hanno aderito 53 paesi, sia Stati membri dell'Unione europea che del resto del mondo, mira ad eliminare il morbillo endemico e a ridurre, a valori inferiori a 1/100.000 di nati vivi, l'incidenza della rosolia e della sindrome da rosolia congenita entro l'anno 2015.

Entrambe le malattie possono comportare gravi conseguenze. Il morbillo è altamente contagioso e, se non curato bene, può portare addirittura alla morte.

La rosolia è una patologia pericolosa soprattutto se contratta dalle donne durante il primo trimestre di gestazione. Essa può provocare la sindrome da rosolia congenita che causa gravi danni, oltretutto permanenti, al neonato.

Secondo la commissione dell'OMS, è possibile raggiungere il traguardo prefissato attraverso una copertura vaccinale a livello nazionale del 95 % o superiore. I paesi che hanno aderito al PNEMRC si impegneranno, nei prossimi anni, a migliorare la sorveglianza di queste due malattie, a valutare lo stato immunitario e la vaccinazione delle donne in età fertile, nonché a migliorare le coperture vaccinali contro morbillo e rosolia.

In considerazione di quanto sopra esposto, può dire la Commissione quale sia la sua opinione in merito al traguardo prefissato dall'OMS e se intenda sensibilizzare i paesi che non hanno aderito al PNEMRC sulla gravità delle conseguenze provocate dalle due patologie in oggetto?

**Risposta data da John Dalli a nome della Commissione  
(16 marzo 2012)**

Considerata l'incidenza inusitatamente elevata del morbillo, in particolare nell'ultimo biennio, la Commissione ha concordato con il Centro europeo per la prevenzione e il controllo delle malattie di intensificare gli sforzi a sostegno degli Stati membri per aiutarli a raggiungere l'obiettivo di eradicazione di tale malattia, sviluppando materiali informativi per il pubblico, promuovendo la vaccinazione degli operatori sanitari, sostenendo lo scambio di buone pratiche e migliorando la raccolta di dati in tema di copertura da vaccinazione. Per dar seguito alle conclusioni del Consiglio su «Vaccinazione infantile: successi, sfide e prospettive della vaccinazione infantile in Europa» adottate nel giugno 2011, la Commissione intende organizzare nel 2012 una conferenza sulla vaccinazione infantile, cui sarà invitata un'ampia gamma di interessati, al fine di fare il punto sulle azioni finora intraprese e di identificare gli ambiti prioritari per gli interventi futuri.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001683/12  
to the Commission  
Oreste Rossi (EFD)  
(10 February 2012)**

*Subject:* WHO plan to eliminate measles and German measles by 2015

The 'National Plan for Eliminating Measles and Congenital Rubella' (PNEMRC) will be implemented under the supervision of a Commission specifically set up within the World Health Organisation. That plan, to which 53 countries — including EU Member States and other countries — have adhered, aims to eliminate measles and to reduce, to a level of less than 1 in 100 000 live births, the incidence of rubella and congenital rubella syndrome by 2015.

Both illnesses can have serious consequences. Measles is highly contagious and, if not properly treated, can even result in death.

German measles is a dangerous illness especially if contracted by women during the first trimester of pregnancy. It can lead to congenital rubella syndrome which causes serious, and permanent, damage to the newborn.

According to the WHO Commission, it is possible to reach the target set with a vaccination coverage rate at national level of 95 % or higher. The countries that have signed up to PNEMRC have undertaken, over the coming years, to improve surveillance of these two illnesses and to assess the immunisation status and vaccination of women of child-bearing age, as well as to improve vaccination coverage against measles and German measles.

In view of the above, can the Commission give its opinion on the target set by the WHO and state whether it intends to make the countries that have not signed up to PNEMRC aware of the serious consequences of the two illnesses in question?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission  
(16 March 2012)**

Given the unusually high incidence of measles in particular during the last two years, the Commission agreed with the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control to step up efforts to support Member States in reaching the elimination goal by developing communication material for the public, advocating vaccination to healthcare workers, supporting the exchange of best practices, and improving data collection on vaccination coverage. Further to the Council conclusions on 'Childhood immunisation: successes and challenges of European childhood immunisation and the way forward' adopted in June 2011, the Commission plans to organise in 2012 a conference on childhood immunisation with a wide range of stakeholders, to take stock of the actions taken so far and to identify priority areas for future action.

---



(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001685/12**  
**alla Commissione**  
**Oreste Rossi (EFD)**  
(10 febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: Riforma della PAC: dismissione di terreni agricoli

Uno studio recente sul censimento dell'agricoltura italiana ha rilevato che negli ultimi 10 anni c'è stata una perdita della superficie agricola utilizzata pari a 300 mila ettari, accompagnata da una riduzione del numero di aziende di circa un terzo (-32,2 %) e da un processo di concentrazione dei terreni in un numero minore di aziende, al quale hanno fatto da contraltare la drastica riduzione delle aziende di piccole dimensioni e un vero e proprio abbandono delle zone rurali.

La politica di alienazione massiccia di terreni agricoli demaniali potrebbe rivelarsi la «spada di Damocle» non solo del processo di liberalizzazione del settore avviato dal Governo Italiano, ma anche della prossima riforma della PAC. Ciò darebbe un'ulteriore occasione alle immense disponibilità di liquidità gestite dalla malavita organizzata di appropriarsi, a prezzi di favore, di una parte ingente del patrimonio messo in vendita, facilitando così il riciclaggio dei proventi illeciti.

La politica di riforma dell'agricoltura dovrebbe, in realtà, garantire e promuovere l'accesso alla terra e lo sviluppo di nuove imprese agricole, meglio se condotte da giovani imprenditori rurali singoli o associati, includendo anche attività di rilevanza sociale, per consentire sia l'ingresso di nuovi operatori nel settore primario, sia la sopravvivenza delle piccole realtà già esistenti.

Può la Commissione far sapere come intende definire le linee d'indirizzo in merito alla dismissione di terreni agricoli, al fine di garantire risorse aggiuntive alle casse pubbliche, tenendo conto della messa in valore obbligatoria di tutte le superfici agricole oggi di proprietà pubblica, tramite contratti di affitto a equo canone riservati a imprenditori agricoli e dando priorità a giovani agricoltori singoli o associati e a iniziative di rilevanza sociale?

**Risposta data da Dacian Cioloș a nome della Commissione**  
(28 marzo 2012)

Relativamente ai suoi interventi in tema di politica del territorio, in particolare circa la destinazione dei terreni agricoli demaniali, la Commissione rileva che la questione è interamente di competenza degli Stati membri, così come l'ipotesi ventilata dall'onorevole parlamentare di riservare terreni a giovani agricoltori o imprenditori agricoli. Nell'ambito della riforma della politica agricola comune, il 12 ottobre 2011 la Commissione ha tuttavia proposto di riservare i pagamenti diretti agli agricoltori in attività e di destinare parte della relativa dotazione di ciascuno Stato membro ad un complemento di aiuto per i giovani che avviano un'attività agricola. Questi elementi vengono ad aggiungersi allo strumentario delle misure di sviluppo rurale di cui gli Stati membri dispongono per promuovere l'attività agricola e scongiurare l'abbandono delle terre.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001685/12  
to the Commission  
Oreste Rossi (EFD)  
(10 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Reform of the CAP: disposal of agricultural land

A recent study of a census of Italian agriculture has shown that over the last 10 years, 300 000 hectares of land used for agriculture have been lost, while there has been a reduction in the number of farms by approximately one third (-32.2%) and a concentration of land among a smaller number of farms. The counterpart to this has been the drastic reduction in small farms and a real abandonment of rural areas.

The policy of the massive transfer of state agricultural land could prove to be the 'sword of Damocles' not only of the liberalisation of the sector started by the Italian Government, but also of the coming reform of the CAP. This would provide a further occasion for organised crime with its huge availability of liquid assets to appropriate, at special rates, a large part of the land put up for sale, thereby facilitating the recycling of unlawful earnings.

In fact, the policy to reform agriculture should guarantee and promote access to the land and the development of new farms. Ideally, these would be run by young rural entrepreneurs, individually or in groups, and would also include socially important initiatives to enable both the entry of new operators in the primary sector and the survival of already existing small concerns.

Can the Commission state how it intends to draw up guidelines concerning the disposal of agricultural land to guarantee additional resources for public funds, taking into account compulsorily making all publicly owned agricultural land available for use, using controlled rent contracts reserved for agricultural entrepreneurs and giving priority to young individuals or groups of farmers and to socially important initiatives?

**Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission  
(28 March 2012)**

As regards the question what the Commission does concerning land policy and in particular publicly owned agricultural land, the Commission would point out that this issue comes under the full responsibility of the Member States. The same is true regarding the suggested idea of reserving agricultural land to young farmers or agricultural entrepreneurs. However, in the framework of the reform of the common agricultural policy, the Commission has proposed on 12 October 2011 to target the direct payments to 'active farmers' only and to dedicate a share of the direct payments envelope of each Member States to a top-up for young farmers who start their agricultural activities. Those elements come in addition to what is available for the Member States in the 'tool-kit' of rural development measures to encourage farming activities and avoid land abandonment.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001686/12  
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**

**Oreste Rossi (EFD)**

(10 febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Siria e violazione dei diritti dei fanciulli: violenza inaudita

In Siria, negli ultimi 10 mesi che sono stati contrassegnati dalla rivolta popolare contro il governo di Bashir al-Assad, ben 384 tra bambini e ragazzi hanno perso la vita a seguito delle rappresaglie, delle irruzioni nelle case e dei bombardamenti.

A denunciarlo è Rima Salah, vicedirettore dell'Unicef, nel corso della presentazione del rapporto «Humanitarian Action for Children 2012» dedicato all'intervento del Fondo delle Nazioni Unite per l'infanzia nelle emergenze.

Il portavoce dell'Unicef, Marixie Mercado, aggiunge, inoltre, per voce dell'Osservatorio nazionale per i diritti umani in Siria (Ondus), che gli intensi bombardamenti effettuati dalle forze governative nei quartieri civili di Homs hanno colpito l'ospedale pediatrico al Walid, fattore che potrebbe aggravare il bilancio delle vittime denunciato. Sono confermate le notizie di bambini arrestati arbitrariamente, torturati e abusati sessualmente durante la loro detenzione, richiamando anche l'attenzione sull'uso di munizioni contro i manifestanti.

Le violenze volute dal regime di Bashar al-Assad a danno di Homs e che sono sotto osservazione da parte della scena politica e diplomatica internazionale, hanno richiesto l'intervento delle Nazioni Unite: il 19 dicembre scorso, l'Assemblea Generale dell'ONU ha adottato la risoluzione 133/2011, con la quale si chiede al regime di Damasco di cooperare con la Commissione internazionale indipendente d'inchiesta sulla Siria e di cessare le continue violazioni dei diritti umani nel paese.

Alla luce della situazione di emergenza e di crisi in Siria, chiedo alla Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante di riferire in merito alla politica di cooperazione che l'UE intende intraprendere a difesa e tutela dei diritti dei fanciulli e di definire la posizione di ferma condanna delle violenze in atto in quel Paese da parte della comunità internazionale ed europea, sottolineando che la tutela dell'interesse preminente del bambino rientra fra i valori fondamentali della Convenzione ONU sui diritti dell'infanzia ed è espressamente riconosciuto e protetto dall'articolo 24 della Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'UE.

**Risposta data dall'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione**

(22 maggio 2012)

L'UE ha ripetutamente condannato i brutali attacchi e le diffuse violazioni dei diritti umani commessi dal regime siriano nei confronti della sua popolazione, anche contro minori. L'Unione ha ribadito la necessità di fare pienamente chiarezza sulle conclusioni della commissione internazionale indipendente d'inchiesta, che segnalato crimini contro l'umanità, e ha affermato che i responsabili di tali crimini devono essere assicurati alla giustizia.

L'UE ha espresso a più riprese la sua preoccupazione per il crescente deterioramento della situazione umanitaria in cui versa la popolazione civile siriana e ha esortato il regime a garantire libero accesso alle organizzazioni umanitarie affinché possano fornire assistenza umanitaria e cure mediche a chiunque ne abbia bisogno. L'Unione ha condannato gli attacchi illegali ai danni del personale medico e delle strutture recanti il simbolo della Mezzaluna rossa e ha esortato il regime a proteggere tutte le strutture mediche, il personale e i volontari.

Tanto nella politica interna che nella politica estera, l'UE è impegnata nella tutela e nella promozione dei diritti dei minori, in particolare nell'aiuto ai minori coinvolti nei conflitti armati. Gli Orientamenti sui bambini e i conflitti armati impegnano l'Unione ad affrontare la questione in maniera globale e i capi missione dell'UE controllano e riferiscono al riguardo.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001686/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**Oreste Rossi (EFD)**

(10 February 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Syria and the violation of children's rights: unprecedented violence

In Syria, during the last 10 months, which have been marked by the people's revolt against the government of Bashar al-Assad, a total of 384 children and young people have lost their lives following reprisals, raids on homes and bombardments.

The situation was denounced by Rima Salah, Deputy Executive Director of the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (Unicef) during the presentation of the Fund's 'Humanitarian Action for Children 2012' report.

A Unicef spokesperson, Marixie Mercado, also stated that, according to the National Observatory for Human Rights in Syria (Ondus), the heavy bombardment of residential districts of Homs by government forces has damaged the children's hospital in Walid. This is probably set to further increase the number of victims. News of children being unlawfully arrested, tortured and sexually abused while in detention has been confirmed, and attention has been drawn to the use of live ammunition against the demonstrators.

The violence unleashed by the regime of Bashar al-Assad against Homs, which is being observed by the international political and diplomatic community, has required the intervention of the United Nations. On 19 December last year the General Assembly of the UN adopted Resolution 1333/2011, which calls on the Damascus regime to cooperate with the independent international inquiry commission on Syria and end the continuing violation of human rights throughout the country.

In view of the emergency and crisis situation in Syria, I ask the Vice-President/High Representative to report back on the cooperation policy which the EU intends to adopt so as to defend and protect the rights of children and to express strong condemnation, on behalf of the international community and Europe, of the violence taking place in Syria, while stressing that the paramount need to protect the best interests of children is a fundamental principle of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child and is specifically recognised and upheld by Article 24 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU.

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**

(22 May 2012)

The EU has consistently condemned the brutal attacks and widespread human rights violations inflicted by the Syrian regime on its population, including children. It has reiterated that there must be a full investigation of the findings of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry, which pointed to crimes against humanity, and made clear that there can be no impunity for the perpetrators of such alleged crimes.

The EU has repeatedly expressed its concern at the increasingly worsening humanitarian plight of the Syrian population. It has urged the regime to grant unimpeded access of humanitarian organisations in order to allow them to deliver humanitarian assistance and medical care to all those in need. It condemned the illegal attacks against medical staff and installations carrying the symbols of the Red Crescent and urged the regime to protect all medical facilities, professionals and volunteers.

The EU is committed to the protection and promotion of the rights of the child in its external and internal policies. In particular, the EU accords a high priority to helping children facing armed conflicts. The EU Guidelines on Children Affected by Armed Conflicts commit the EU to addressing this issue in a comprehensive manner. The EU Heads of Missions monitor and report on children affected by armed conflicts.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001687/12**  
**alla Commissione**  
**Oreste Rossi (EFD)**  
(10 febbraio 2012)

**Oggetto:** Traffico illecito e maltrattamenti dei pesci tropicali

Ogni anno, vengono importati in Italia circa 10 milioni di pesci di ogni genere. La maggior parte di essi è destinata a fornire negozi di animali che li rivendono a caro prezzo. Il giro d'affari è difficile da calcolare, in quanto una percentuale molto alta, tra il 70 e l'80 per cento, è illegale.

Esemplari come squali, coralli, meduse, piranha, pesci pagliaccio e tanti altri vengono pescati in mari tropicali, sistemati in sacchetti di plastica con pochissima acqua e posti all'interno di grandi cartoni. Gli animali sono costretti a viaggiare in queste condizioni anche per più di 48 ore.

Una volta arrivati in aeroporto, la procedura richiede che essi siano trasportati in acquari specifici dove i biologi possano accertarsi della loro salute e curarli. Vi è anche l'obbligo della stabulazione, una quarantena necessaria per legge.

La procedura legale avviene raramente. La maggior parte dei cartoni contenenti le specie tropicali viene smistata direttamente ai negozianti, abbattendo costi e tempi.

L'inchiesta pubblicata da un noto quotidiano italiano rivela che ci sono molti vuoti normativi in relazione a quanto appena detto. Si pensa che anche le organizzazioni mafiose siano coinvolte in questo tipo di traffici e approfittino dell'anello debole della catena per ampliare il loro giro d'affari con il commercio illegale di pesci tropicali.

Poiché l'Europa è attenta al benessere e alla protezione degli animali, ma il commercio illegale di pesci tropicali a tutt'oggi è all'origine di un enorme giro d'affari, può la Commissione fornire maggiori informazioni quanto alla sua politica rispetto al trasporto e alla vendita di specie animali tropicali e alle misure che intende adottare per frenare il traffico illecito dei suddetti animali?

**Risposta data da John Dalli a nome della Commissione**  
(26 aprile 2012)

Il regolamento (CE) n. 1/2005<sup>(1)</sup> sulla protezione degli animali durante il trasporto si applica, conformemente a quanto esso stabilisce all'articolo 1, paragrafo 1, al trasporto di animali vertebrati vivi, e quindi anche dei pesci, all'interno dell'Unione<sup>(2)</sup>. Pertanto, la parte del viaggio che si svolge sul territorio dell'UE in relazione ad un'attività economica deve avvenire nel rispetto delle disposizioni UE. All'ingresso nell'Unione l'acqua di trasporto nei sacchetti di plastica non è di norma cambiata e il pesce continua il viaggio verso la propria destinazione finale. Il metodo di trasporto, la densità dei pesci, la qualità dell'acqua, ecc. dovrebbero essere tali da corrispondere alle disposizioni generali della legislazione dell'Unione. Non tutte le disposizioni contenute nel regolamento sul trasporto di animali sono altrettanto adatte a trattare le problematiche del benessere dei pesci. Per tale motivo, la Commissione prevede di avviare uno studio sul benessere dei pesci d'allevamento durante il trasporto.

Inoltre, il regolamento (CE) n. 1251/2008 della Commissione, del 12 dicembre 2008, recante modalità di esecuzione della direttiva 2006/88/CE del Consiglio per quanto riguarda le condizioni e le certificazioni necessarie per l'immissione sul mercato e l'importazione nella Comunità di animali d'acquacoltura e relativi prodotti e che stabilisce un elenco di specie vettrici<sup>(3)</sup> contiene disposizioni in tema di polizia sanitaria per l'importazione di pesci ornamentali al fine di prevenire la diffusione di malattie dei pesci nell'Unione. Detto regolamento non prevede una quarantena all'arrivo degli animali nell'Unione. Tuttavia, tutte le partite di pesci vivi originari di paesi terzi devono essere presentate ai posti di ispezione frontalieri per essere sottoposte a controlli veterinari onde verificare il rispetto delle condizioni di importazione di cui alla legislazione summenzionata.

Il controllo e l'attuazione della legislazione rientrano principalmente nelle competenze degli Stati membri.

<sup>(1)</sup> Regolamento (CE) n. 1/2005 del Consiglio, del 22 dicembre 2004, sulla protezione degli animali durante il trasporto e le operazioni correlate, GU L 3 del 5.1.2005.

<sup>(2)</sup> Articolo 1, paragrafo 5, del regolamento (CE) n. 1/2005.

<sup>(3)</sup> GU L 337 del 16.12.2008.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001687/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Oreste Rossi (EFD)**  
(10 February 2012)

*Subject:* Illegal trafficking and ill-treatment of tropical fish

Every year, approximately 10 million fish of all types are imported into Italy. Most of these are destined to supply pet shops, which retail them at high prices. The turnover is difficult to calculate since a very high percentage, between 70 and 80 %, is illegal.

Specimens such as sharks, coral, jellyfish, piranhas, clownfish and many more are caught in tropical waters, put in plastic bags with very little water and placed in large boxes. The fish have to travel in these conditions sometimes for more than 48 hours.

Once they have arrived at the airport, the rules require that the fish are transported in specific aquariums where biologists can check their health and treat them. It is also compulsory to keep them housed, a quarantine required by law.

The legal procedures are rarely adhered to. Most of the boxes containing tropical species are sent directly to the retailers, reducing costs and the time taken.

A public inquiry by a well-known Italian daily newspaper revealed that there are many legislative gaps in relation to the above. It is also thought that the mafia is involved in this type of trafficking and takes advantage of the weak link in the chain to increase its turnover with the illegal trade in tropical fish.

Since the EU is attentive to the wellbeing and protection of animals, but the illegal trade in tropical fish is still the source of an enormous turnover, can the Commission provide further information on its policy with respect to the transportation and sale of tropical fish and the measures it intends to adopt in order to halt illegal trafficking in these species?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission**  
(26 April 2012)

According to Article 1(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 <sup>(1)</sup> on the protection of animals during transport, the regulation applies to the transport of live vertebrate animals, which include fish, carried out within the Union <sup>(2)</sup>. Thus that part of the journey which takes place within the EU in connection with an economic activity has to comply with EU requirements. When entering the Union, the transport water in the plastic bags is normally not changed and the fish continue their journey to their final destination. The transport method, fish density, water quality, etc. should be such that they are in line with the general requirements in Union legislation. Not all the provisions in the transport regulation are equally well suited to addressing fish welfare issues. For this reason, the Commission is planning to launch a study on the welfare of farmed fish during transport.

Furthermore, Commission Regulation (EC) No 1251/2008 of 12 December 2008 implementing Council Directive 2006/88/EC as regards conditions and certification requirements for the placing on the market and the import into the Community of aquaculture animals and products thereof and laying down a list of vector species <sup>(3)</sup> contains animal health requirements for the import of ornamental fish, to prevent the spread of fish diseases to the Union. This regulation does not foresee quarantine of animals upon arrival in the Union as a general principle. However, all consignments of live fish originating from third countries have to be presented to Union approved border inspection posts for veterinary checks to verify that they comply with the import conditions required by the above legislation.

The control and enforcement of legislation is primarily under the competence of the Member States.

<sup>(1)</sup> Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 of 22 December 2004 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations, OJ L 3, 5.1.2005.

<sup>(2)</sup> Article 1(5) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.

<sup>(3)</sup> OJ L 337, 16.12.2008.

(Dansk udgave)

**Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse P-001688/12**  
**til Kommissionen**  
**Morten Løkkegaard (ALDE)**  
(16. februar 2012)

Om: Tvangstilslutning til antenneforeninger

Kommissionen har tidligere behandlet spørgsmålet om, at der i Danmark eksisterer tvunget medlemskab af og betaling til lokale antenneforeninger, i henhold til direktiv 2002/77/EF.

Kommissionen har i et svar af 30. januar 2011 (E-010292/2010) opfordret til, at Danmark hurtigt vedtager den nødvendige lovgivning med henblik på at fjerne obligatorisk medlemskab af lokale antenneforeninger, så adgangen til markedet eller indførelsen af bredbåndsnet (fiberbredbånd eller anden teknologi) ikke hindres. Senest har Kommissionen i et svar af 10. januar 2012 (E-011157/2011) tilkendegivet, at Kommissionen kan indlede en formel overtrædelsesprocedure, såfremt Danmark ikke gør fremskridt, eller hvis ændringerne viser sig at være utilstrækkelige.

Den danske miljøminister har den 16. januar 2012 godkendt et forslag fra en tværministeriel arbejdsgruppe om ændring af planloven i oktober 2012, med mulig ikrafttrædelse af ændret lov omkring årsskiftet 2012-2013.

Forslaget lægger op til, at tvangstilslutning i lokalplaner mv. til antenneforeninger ikke har virkning tre år efter lovændringens ikrafttrædelse. Forslaget giver ikke mulighed for førtidig udtrædelse, uagtet at restgælden for de antenneforeninger, som opretholder tvangstilslutningen — i de fleste tilfælde — er beskeden eller ikke eksisterende. Hermed er der lagt op til, at tvangstilslutning til antenneforeninger tidligst ophæves den 1. januar 2016, dvs. om knap fire år.

1. Mener Kommissionen, hvis lovgivningen ændres i overensstemmelse med det foreliggende forslag, at Danmark hermed lever op til Kommissionens opfordring om, at »Danmark hurtigt vedtager den nødvendige lovgivning med henblik på at fjerne obligatorisk medlemskab af lokale antenneforeninger, så adgangen til markedet eller indførelsen af bredbåndsnet (fiberbredbånd eller anden teknologi) ikke hindres«?
2. Hvis Kommissionen anser det foreliggende forslag som utilstrækkeligt, agter Kommissionen så at indlede en formel overtrædelsesprocedure mod Danmark?

**Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Joaquín Almunia**  
(9. marts 2012)

Det ærede parlamentsmedlem har ved to tidligere lejligheder rejst spørgsmålet om, hvorvidt planlovens bestemmelser om obligatorisk medlemskab af lokale antenneforeninger er i overensstemmelse med EU-lovgivningen. Kommissionen har i den forbindelse åbnet en sag i EU-Pilot-systemet for at indhente den relevante information og har fremsendt flere anmodninger om oplysninger til Danmark.

Danmark ændrede loven den 14. april og den 14. juli 2011 og ophævede forpligtelsen til at være medlem af en lokal antenneforening i nyt boligbyggeri. Ændringen trådte i kraft den 1. september 2011.

Kommissionen har spurgt Danmark, hvordan man vil behandle boligbyggeri fra før 1. september 2011. Danmark informerede den 27. januar 2012 Kommissionen om et forslag om at ændre de relevante bestemmelser i planloven i oktober 2012 med henblik på at adressere dette spørgsmål.

I dette seneste spørgsmål ønsker det ærede parlamentsmedlem at få oplyst, om Kommissionen finder, at det danske forslag er tilstrækkeligt, eller om den påtænker at indlede overtrædelsesprocedurer over for Danmark.

Kommissionen er ved at analysere den seneste udvikling, herunder timingen af lovgivningsprocessen og den overgangsperiode, som den vil indebære. Som allerede nævnt i tidligere svar, vil Kommissionen træffe yderligere foranstaltninger, hvis det er nødvendigt for at sikre overensstemmelse med EU-lovgivningen.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-001688/12  
to the Commission**

**Morten Løkkegaard (ALDE)**

(16 February 2012)

*Subject:* Compulsory affiliation to cable distribution networks

The Commission has previously dealt with the issue of the existence of mandatory membership of and payment to local cable distribution networks in Denmark, with reference to Directive 2002/77/EC.

In its reply of 31 January 2011 (E-010292/2010), the Commission encouraged speedy adoption of the necessary legislation in Denmark to remove compulsory membership of local cable TV associations in Denmark so that market entry or the deployment of broadband networks (fibre and other new technologies) would not be hindered. Recently, in a reply of 10 January 2012 (E-011157/2011), the Commission indicated that it may initiate a formal infringement procedure, should Denmark fail to make progress or the amendments prove insufficient.

Denmark's Environment Minister approved a proposal on 16 January 2012 from a cross-ministry working group on amending the planning law in October 2012, with the possible entry into force of the amended law at the end of 2012/beginning of 2013.

The proposal envisages that compulsory affiliation to cable distribution networks in local planning guidelines will cease three years after the amendment comes into force. The proposal does not offer the opportunity for earlier withdrawal, even though the capital outstanding for cable distribution networks that retain compulsory affiliation, in the majority of cases, is modest or non-existent. It is therefore envisaged that compulsory affiliation to cable distribution networks will be lifted by 1 January 2016 at the earliest, i.e. in just under four years.

1. Does the Commission think, if the legislation is amended in line with the present proposal, that Denmark will comply with the Commission's request for the 'speedy adoption of the necessary legislation in Denmark to remove compulsory membership of local cable TV associations in Denmark so that market entry or the deployment of broadband networks (fibre and other new technologies) would not be hindered'?
2. If the Commission regards the present proposal as inadequate, does it intend to initiate a formal infringement procedure against Denmark?

**Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission**

(9 March 2012)

In two previous questions, the Honourable Member has addressed the issue of compliance with EC law of the provisions of the Danish Planning Act on mandatory membership of local cable TV associations. Regarding this matter, the Commission has opened a file in the EU Pilot system in order to gather the relevant facts and has sent several requests for information to Denmark.

On 14 April and 14 July 2011 Denmark amended the law and removed the obligation of membership of local cable TV associations in new housing developments. The amendment came into force on 1 September 2011.

The Commission has asked Denmark how it plans to deal with housing developments built before 1 September 2011. On 27 January 2012, Denmark informed the Commission of a proposal to amend the relevant provisions of the Planning Act in October 2012 in order to address this issue.

In this latest question, the Honourable Member asks the Commission whether it considers the Danish proposal sufficient or if it intends to initiate infringement proceedings against Denmark.

The Commission is in the process of analysing the most recent developments, including the timing of the legislative process and the transition period that it would involve. As already mentioned in previous replies, the Commission will take further action if it is necessary to ensure compliance with EC law.



(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-001689/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Niki Tzavela (EFD)**  
(10 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Ειδικός λογαριασμός για την Ελλάδα

Πρόταση κατέθεσαν η Γερμανίδα Καγκελάρια Άγκελα Μέρκελ και ο Γάλλος Προέδρος Νικολά Σαρκοζί, για τη δημιουργία ενός ειδικού, δεσμευμένου λογαριασμού, όπου θα κατατίθενται οι τόκοι για την αποπληρωμή του ελληνικού χρέους, ώστε τα χρήματα να είναι μονίμως διαθέσιμα.

Παράλληλα, όπως αναφέρουν οι βρετανικοί Financial Times, η πρόταση, που σύμφωνα με ευρωπαϊό αξιωματούχο είναι πολύ πιθανό να περιλαμβάνεται ως όρος στο νέο ελληνικό δημοσιονομικό πρόγραμμα, προβλέπει ότι οι πιστωτές θα αποπληρώνονται απευθείας από το λογαριασμό αυτό, αποτρέποντας έτσι την απειλή πτώχευσης.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή ποια είναι η επίσημη θέση της για το συγκεκριμένο γαλλογερμανικό σχέδιο.

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

Στη συνεδρίαση της 20ής Φεβρουαρίου 2012, η Ευρωομάδα εξέφρασε την ικανοποίησή της για την πρόθεση της Ελλάδας να δημιουργήσει μηχανισμό που θα επιτρέπει τον καλύτερο εντοπισμό και παρακολούθηση του επίσημου δανεισμού και των ενδογενών πόρων που προορίζονται για την εξυπηρέτηση του χρέους της Ελλάδας, καταβάλλοντας, υπό την επιτήρηση της τρόικας, ποσό που αντιστοιχεί στην εξυπηρέτηση χρέους κατά το προσεχές τρίμηνο απευθείας σε χωριστό λογαριασμό του οργανισμού πληρωμής της Ελλάδας. Η Ευρωομάδα χαιρέτισε επίσης την πρόθεση των ελληνικών αρχών να εισαγάγουν στο ελληνικό νομικό πλαίσιο μέσα στο επόμενο δίμηνο διάταξη με την οποία θα εγγυάται ότι θα δίνεται προτεραιότητα στις πληρωμές εξυπηρέτησης του χρέους. Η εν λόγω διάταξη θα καθιερωθεί στο ελληνικό Σύνταγμα το ταχύτερο δυνατόν.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-001689/12  
to the Commission  
Niki Tzavela (EFD)  
(10 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Special account for Greece

The German Chancellor Angela Merkel and the French President Nicolas Sarkozy have put forward a proposal for creating a special blocked account where the interest for paying off the Greek debt will be deposited so that the money will be permanently available.

At the same time, as reported by the UK *Financial Times*, the proposal, which according to a European official is very likely to be included as a condition under the new Greek financial programme, provides for creditors to be paid directly from this account, thus averting the threat of bankruptcy.

What is the Commission's official position on the French-German plan?

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

The Eurogroup of 20 February 2012 has welcomed Greece's intention to put in place a mechanism that allows better tracing and monitoring of the official borrowing and internally-generated funds destined to service Greece's debt by, under monitoring of the Troika, paying an amount corresponding to the coming quarter's debt service directly to a segregated account of Greece's paying agent. The Eurogroup has also welcomed the intention of the Greek authorities to introduce over the next two months in the Greek legal framework a provision ensuring that priority is granted to debt servicing payments. This provision will be introduced in the Greek constitution as soon as possible.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001690/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(10 febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: Adesione della Croazia

Nel 2013 la Croazia diventerà il 28° membro dell'Unione europea, il secondo Stato sorto dalla dissoluzione della Jugoslavia ad essere accolto nella famiglia europea.

Con il 66 % di «sì» contro il 33 % di «no», il referendum del 22 gennaio chiude un iter negoziale durato sette anni, sul quale hanno pesato le resistenze di una giovane democrazia diffidente rispetto a una sovranità conquistata appena nel 1991, gli spettri del conflitto terminato nel 1995 con 20 000 morti, le inquietudini per la crisi e la voglia di lasciarsi alle spalle i traumi del passato balcanico per le incognite del futuro europeo.

A favore dell'adesione si dichiarano tutti i maggiori partiti, dai socialdemocratici del premier croato e del presidente all'opposizione di centrodestra.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione dire:

1. A seguito del referendum croato, quali sono ora i futuri processi per la completa adesione del 28° Stato membro?
2. Esistono ancora, per quanto risulta alla Commissione, dispute territoriali che potrebbero minare i futuri rapporti diplomatici con altri Stati membri dell'UE?

**Risposta data da Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione**

(16 aprile 2012)

In seguito all'esito positivo del referendum tenutosi in Croazia il 22 gennaio 2012, il parlamento nazionale croato e tutti gli Stati membri sono tenuti a ratificare il trattato d'adesione e a depositare gli strumenti di ratifica entro il 30 giugno 2013 per permettere alla Croazia di entrare a far parte dell'UE dal 1° luglio 2013 (art. 3 dell'atto di adesione).

Il parlamento croato ha ratificato il trattato di adesione il 9 marzo 2012. Il processo di ratifica da parte dei parlamenti nazionali degli Stati membri è stato avviato e al 2 aprile 2012 i parlamenti di sei Stati membri avevano già ratificato il trattato di adesione.

Il trattato prevede specifiche misure di monitoraggio (art. 36 dell'atto di adesione), che verrà condotto dalla Commissione in base a tabelle di controllo regolarmente aggiornate e tramite il dialogo nell'ambito dell'accordo di stabilizzazione e associazione tra UE e Croazia e missioni di verifica *inter pares*. Il monitoraggio riguarderà in particolare gli impegni assunti dalla Croazia in materia di sistema giudiziario e diritti fondamentali, libertà, sicurezza e giustizia, e politica di concorrenza. La Commissione pubblicherà valutazioni semestrali relative agli impegni assunti dalla Croazia fino al momento della sua adesione. Le prossime valutazioni sono previste per la primavera e l'autunno del 2012 e la Commissione pubblicherà una relazione globale di controllo. La Commissione mantiene un dialogo serrato con la Croazia al fine di aiutare e guidare il paese nel resto della fase preparatoria all'adesione.

In merito alle dispute territoriali con altri Stati membri, la Croazia ha siglato con la Slovenia un accordo per un arbitrato internazionale sui confini e il processo di arbitrato è stato lanciato con successo nel gennaio 2012 con la creazione di un collegio arbitrale.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001690/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(10 February 2012)

*Subject:* Accession of Croatia

In 2013, Croatia will become the 28th member of the European Union, as the second state born out of the break-up of Yugoslavia to be welcomed into the European family.

With 66 % 'yes' votes against 33 % 'no' votes, the referendum held on 22 January marks the end of negotiations, which lasted seven years and which were influenced by the resistance of a young democracy mistrustful over a sovereignty which had only been gained in 1991, by the ghosts of the conflict which ended in 1995 leaving 20 000 dead, by concerns over the crisis and by the wish to leave behind the traumas of the past for the unknown quantity of a European future.

All the major parties have declared themselves in favour of accession, from the social democrats of the Croatian Prime Minister and the President to the centre-right opposition.

Given the above, can the Commission state:

1. What the next steps now are, following the referendum in Croatia, towards the full accession of the 28th Member State?
2. Whether she is aware of any continuing territorial disputes which could undermine future diplomatic relations with other Member States of the EU?

**Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission**

(16 April 2012)

Following the positive outcome of the referendum that took place in Croatia on 22 January 2012, the national parliaments of Croatia and of all Member States must ratify the Accession Treaty and deposit their instruments of ratification by 30 June 2013 in order for Croatia to join the EU on 1 July 2013 (Article 3 of the Act of Accession).

The Croatian Parliament has ratified the Accession Treaty on 9 March 2012. The ratification process by the national parliaments of the Member States has started. As of 2 April 2012, parliaments in six Member States have ratified the Accession Treaty.

Specific provisions on monitoring are inserted in the Accession Treaty (Article 36 of the Act of Accession). The Commission's monitoring will consist of regularly updated monitoring tables, dialogue under the Stabilisation and Association Agreement between the EU and Croatia and peer assessment missions. The monitoring will focus in particular on commitments undertaken by Croatia in the area of judiciary and fundamental rights, freedom, security and justice, and competition policy. The Commission will issue six-monthly assessments on the commitments undertaken by Croatia in these areas up to Croatia's accession. The next assessment is foreseen for spring 2012, and in autumn 2012, the Commission will publish a Comprehensive Monitoring Report on Croatia. The Commission maintains a close dialogue with Croatia in order to help and guide it during the remaining part of the accession preparations.

With regard to territorial disputes with Member States, Croatia and Slovenia have signed a Border Arbitration Agreement and the arbitration process was successfully launched with the establishment of an arbitration tribunal in January 2012.

---

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001691/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**  
(13 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Αιτίες καθυστέρησης στην έγκριση της χρηματοδότησης για το 2011 του συνολικού προγράμματος διαχείρισης των ελληνικών συνόρων

Την Δευτέρα 6.2.2012 εγκαινιάστηκε από τον Έλληνα Υπουργό Προστασίας του Πολίτη το έργο κατασκευής φράχτη στον Έβρο για την αντιμετώπιση των παράνομων μεταναστευτικών ροών. Την επόμενη ημέρα ο εκπρόσωπος της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής, κ. Μ. Τσερκόνε, απάντησε έπειτα από σχετικό ερώτημα ότι ο φράχτης που ξεκίνησε να κατασκευάζεται στον Έβρο δεν καταπολεμά τη λαθρομετανάστευση, αποτελεί βραχυπρόθεσμο μέτρο και επομένως δεν συγχρηματοδοτείται από τα σχετικά ευρωπαϊκά ταμεία, όπως, άλλωστε, με προηγούμενες παρεμβάσεις της και σε σχετικές ερωτήσεις μου έχει καταστήσει σαφές η επιτροπος κ. Μάλστρομ.

Κατόπιν αυτού, ο Έλληνας Υπουργός Προστασίας του Πολίτη ανέφερε πως ο κανονισμός του Ταμείου Εξωτερικών Συνόρων επιτρέπει, χωρίς αμφιβολία, τη χρηματοδότηση της κατασκευής του φράχτη στα χερσαία ελληνοτουρκικά σύνορα στον Έβρο, για την ανακοπή των μεταναστευτικών ροών προς την Ελλάδα και την Ευρώπη. Σημειώνει μάλιστα ο Έλληνας υπουργός πως η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή ποτέ δεν αρνήθηκε αυτή τη νομική βάση του ελληνικού αιτήματος. Και συνεχίζει: «Προέβαλλε, όμως, διαρκώς, επιφυλάξεις και, στην πράξη, καθυστέρησε την έγκριση της χρηματοδότησης για το 2011 του συνολικού προγράμματος διαχείρισης των ελληνικών συνόρων. Το αποτέλεσμα ήταν να εγκριθεί μόλις στις 25 Νοεμβρίου 2011 το ελληνικό πρόγραμμα, στο οποίο συμπεριλαμβάνονταν η χρηματοδότηση για τις νέες υπηρεσίες ασύλου και τα κέντρα πρώτης υποδοχής και κράτησης των παράνομων μεταναστών».

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Επιβεβαιώνει τις δηλώσεις του Έλληνα υπουργού ότι η καθυστέρηση της έγκρισης της χρηματοδότησης για το 2011 του συνολικού προγράμματος διαχείρισης των ελληνικών συνόρων στην Ελλάδα οφείλεται στην εμπλοκή που δημιουργήθηκε με το θέμα της κατασκευής του φράχτη στον Έβρο;

**Απάντηση της κας Malmström εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(2 Απριλίου 2012)

Η Ελλάδα υπέβαλε το πρώτο σχέδιο του ετήσιου προγράμματος για το 2011 στις 30 Ιανουαρίου 2011, με 3 μήνες καθυστέρηση. Δεδομένης της στρατηγικής σημασίας και του μεγέθους της συνδρομής της ΕΕ (40,9 εκατομμύρια ευρώ), η Επιτροπή συζήτησε διεξοδικά το περιεχόμενο του προγράμματος με τις αρμόδιες ελληνικές αρχές. Μετά την υποβολή της τελικής εκδοχής του ετήσιου προγράμματος για το 2011 στις 19 Οκτωβρίου 2011, η Επιτροπή κίνησε τη διαδικασία έγκρισης και το πρόγραμμα εγκρίθηκε επίσημα στις 25 Νοεμβρίου 2011.

Όπως αναφέρεται στην απάντηση της Επιτροπής στην κοινοβουλευτική ερώτηση E-009183/2011<sup>(1)</sup>, η Ελλάδα όντως πρότεινε τη χρηματοδότηση του φράχτη. Ωστόσο, οι συζητήσεις σχετικά με το σχέδιο ετήσιου προγράμματος εστιάστηκαν κυρίως στη γενική συμμόρφωση του προτεινόμενου προγράμματος με τις πιο επείγουσες προτεραιότητες για την Ελλάδα, συγκεκριμένα την ανάγκη να εξεταστούν οι συστάσεις της διαδικασίας αξιολόγησης του Σένγκεν, η έγκαιρη ανάπτυξη των εθνικών στοιχείων του SIS II και του VIS, καθώς και η αποτελεσματική εφαρμογή του ελληνικού προγράμματος δράσης για το άσυλο και τη μετανάστευση.

Από την έναρξη των συζητήσεων αυτών, η Επιτροπή δήλωσε ότι είναι έτοιμη να υποστηρίξει τις ενέργειες που έχουν ως στόχο την εφαρμογή των μέτρων που καθορίζονται στο πρόγραμμα δράσης, όπως για παράδειγμα η δημιουργία κέντρων ελέγχου στον Έβρο. Η Επιτροπή ενθάρρυνε επίσης τις ελληνικές αρχές να διαθέσουν περισσότερους πόρους για αυτό το σκοπό και να αρχίσουν να προετοιμάζονται κατάλληλα ώστε να εξασφαλιστεί η ορθή εφαρμογή τους.

Κατά συνέπεια, η συγχρηματοδότηση της ΕΕ για τη δημιουργία κέντρων ελέγχου και κράτησης αυξήθηκε από 2,25 εκατομμύρια ευρώ στο αρχικό σχέδιο σε 7,5 εκατομμύρια ευρώ στην τελική εκδοχή του ετήσιου προγράμματος του 2011, όπως αναφέρθηκε στην απάντηση της Επιτροπής στην κοινοβουλευτική ερώτηση E-008720/2011<sup>(2)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB>

<sup>(2)</sup> Ομοίως.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001691/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**  
(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* Causes of delay in the approval of funding for 2011 for the comprehensive programme for the management of the Greek borders

On Monday 6 February 2012, the Greek Minister for Citizen Protection inaugurated the construction of a barrier along the Evros river to combat illegal migration. The next day, in reply to a question, the European Commission representative Mr M. Cercone stated that the barrier was a short-term measure not intended to combat illegal migration and was therefore not co-funded by the EU, as Commissioner Malmström had indeed made clear during previous statements and replies to questions.

Subsequently, the Greek Minister for Citizen Protection stated that the rules governing the External Borders Fund would, without doubt, permit the financing of construction of the barrier along the Evros at the border between Greece and Turkey, so as to stem migration flows to Greece and the rest of Europe. The Greek Minister observed in fact that the European Commission had never denied the legal justification of the application by Greece. He continued: 'It did, however, constantly voice reservations and in fact delayed the approval of funding for 2011 for the comprehensive programme for management of the Greek borders. Consequently, the Greek programme, which included funding for new asylum services and centres for the reception and detention of illegal immigrants, was only approved on 25 November 2011.'

In view of this:

Can the Commission confirm the statements of the Greek Minister that the delay in approval of funding for 2011, for the comprehensive programme for management of the Greek borders in Greece, is due to the complications arising in connection with the construction of the Evros barrier?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission**  
(2 April 2012)

Greece submitted the first draft of the 2011 annual programme (AP) on 30 January 2011 with a three-month delay. Given its strategic importance and the size of the EU contribution (EUR 40.9 million), the Commission thoroughly discussed the programme content with the relevant Greek authorities. Following the submission of the final version of the 2011 AP on 19 October 2011, the Commission has launched the adoption procedure and the programme was formally approved on 25 November 2011.

As indicated in the Commission reply to parliamentary Question E-009183/2011 <sup>(1)</sup>, Greece indeed proposed the funding of the fence. However, discussions on the draft annual programme largely focused on the general compliance of the proposed programme with the most pressing priorities for Greece, namely the needs to address recommendations of the Schengen Evaluation process, the timely development of the national components of SIS II and VIS and the effective implementation of the Greek Action Plan on Asylum and Migration.

From the outset of these discussions, the Commission expressed its readiness to support the actions aiming at the implementation of measures identified in the action plan, such as screening centres in Evros. The Commission also encouraged the Greek authorities to allocate more resources for this purpose and to start making the appropriate preparations to ensure proper implementation. Accordingly, EU co-financing for the establishment of screening and detention centres was raised from EUR 2.25 million in the initial draft to EUR 7.5 million in the final version of the 2011 AP as indicated in Commission reply to parliamentary Question E-008720/2011 <sup>(2)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB>

<sup>(2)</sup> *Idem.*

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001692/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**  
(13 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Ανακοίνωση της Unicef για το θάνατο 400 παιδιών στη Συρία

Την Τρίτη 7 Φεβρουαρίου 2012, η Unicef ανακοίνωσε πως τουλάχιστον 400 παιδιά έχουν σκοτωθεί στη Συρία από την έναρξη της εξέγερσης κατά του καθεστώτος, το Μάρτιο του 2011. Μάλιστα, ανέφερε πως υπάρχουν πληροφορίες σύμφωνα με τις οποίες παιδιά έχουν συλληφθεί αυθαίρετα, έχουν βασανιστεί και υποστεί σεξουαλική κακοποίηση στη διάρκεια της κράτησής τους.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Ποια είναι τα μέτρα που σκοπεύει να λάβει προκειμένου να αποτραπούν νέοι θάνατοι παιδιών εξαιτίας της σύρραξης; Διαθέτει εργαλεία πίεσης προς τη συριακή πλευρά προκειμένου να απελευθερωθούν άμεσα παιδιά που βασανίζονται και υφίστανται σεξουαλική κακοποίηση;
2. Έχει επιχειρήσει η Επιτροπή να συνδράμει με αποστολή ανθρωπιστικού χαρακτήρα στη Συρία η οποία θα αντιμετωπίσει το συγκεκριμένο φαινόμενο;

**Απάντηση της Υπατης Εκπροσώπου/Αντιπροέδρου Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(21 Μαΐου 2012)

Η ΕΕ ανέκαθεν καταδίκασε τις βίαιες επιθέσεις και τις εκτεταμένες παραβιάσεις των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων που έχει προκαλέσει το συριακό καθεστώς στον πληθυσμό του, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των παιδιών. Έχει ζητήσει από τις συριακές αρχές να ελευθερώσουν άμεσα όλους όσους έχουν συλληφθεί ή κρατούνται παράνομα, και να απέχουν από κάθε βάρβαρη πράξη συμπεριλαμβανομένων του βασανισμού και της σεξουαλικής κακοποίησης. Δήλωσε ότι πρέπει να ερευνηθούν πλήρως τα πορίσματα της Επιτροπής Ερευνών που επισημαίνουν εγκλήματα κατά της ανθρωπότητας.

Η ΕΕ επανειλημμένως εξέφρασε την ανησυχία της σχετικά με την επιδείνωση των συνθηκών διαβίωσης του άμαχου πληθυσμού της Συρίας. Ζήτησε από το καθεστώς να διασφαλίσει την απρόσκοπτη πρόσβαση των ανθρωπιστικών οργανώσεων προκειμένου να διευκολυνθεί η παροχή βοήθειας σε όσους την έχουν ανάγκη και καταδίκασε τις παράνομες επιθέσεις εναντίον ιατρικού προσωπικού και εγκαταστάσεων. Η ΕΕ υποστήριξε πλήρως διεθνείς προσπάθειες για τη διασφάλιση μιας οργανωμένης, γρήγορης και αποτελεσματικής ανθρωπιστικής αντίδρασης στην κρίση. Εξέφρασε ικανοποίηση για το αποτέλεσμα του δεύτερου ανθρωπιστικού φόρουμ για τη Συρία που διεξήχθη στις 20 Απριλίου 2012 στη Γενεύη, ζητώντας αυξημένη πρόσβαση και κλιμάκωση των ανθρωπιστικών δυνατοτήτων για την κάλυψη των ανθρωπιστικών αναγκών που έχουν αναγνωριστεί. Επειδή οι ανάγκες μεγαλώνουν, η ΕΕ και τα κράτη μέλη της αύξησαν την οικονομική υποστήριξη στις ανθρωπιστικές οργανώσεις στο συνολικό ποσό των 32 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ, εκ των οποίων 1 εκατομμύριο ευρώ κινητοποιήθηκε για έκτακτες ανθρωπιστικές ανάγκες, ιατρική φροντίδα και στήριξη των κρατουμένων μέσω της Διεθνούς Επιτροπής του Ερυθρού Σταυρού.

Η ΕΕ δεσμεύτηκε σχετικά με την προστασία και την προώθηση των δικαιωμάτων του παιδιού στην εξωτερική και εσωτερική της πολιτική. Συγκεκριμένα, η ΕΕ προσδίδει υψηλή προτεραιότητα στη βοήθεια των παιδιών που αντιμετωπίζουν ένοπλες συγκρούσεις. Οι κατευθυντήριες γραμμές της ΕΕ σχετικά με τα παιδιά που πλήττονται από τις ένοπλες συγκρούσεις δεσμεύουν την ΕΕ να εξετάσει διεξοδικά το ζήτημα. Οι αρχηγοί αποστολών της ΕΕ παρακολουθούν και υποβάλλουν εκθέσεις σχετικά με τα παιδιά που πλήττονται από τις ένοπλες συγκρούσεις.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001692/12  
to the Commission  
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)  
(13 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Announcement by Unicef on the death of 400 children in Syria

On Tuesday, 7 February 2012, Unicef announced that at least 400 children had been killed in Syria since the start of the uprising against the regime in March 2011. It went on to quote reports of children having been arbitrarily arrested, tortured, and sexually abused during their detention.

In view of this:

1. What measures does the Commission intend to take to prevent further deaths of children due to the conflict? Does it have any means of exerting pressure on the Syrian side to immediately release children being tortured and sexually abused?
2. Has it attempted to give assistance by sending a humanitarian mission to Syria to address this problem?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission  
(21 May 2012)**

The EU has consistently condemned the brutal attacks and widespread human rights violations inflicted by the Syrian regime on its population, including children. It has called on the Syrian authorities to immediately release all those illegally arrested or detained and to refrain from all acts of barbarism including torture and sexual abuse. It affirmed that there must be a full investigation of the findings of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry, which pointed to crimes against humanity.

The EU has reiterated its concern at the worsening humanitarian plight of the Syrian population. It urged the regime to grant unimpeded access of humanitarian organisations to enable them to assist those in need and condemned the illegal attacks against medical staff and installations. The EU has fully supported international efforts to ensure a coordinated, rapid and effective humanitarian response to the crisis. It welcomed the outcome of the second Syria Humanitarian Forum held on 20 April 2012 in Geneva, calling for increased access and scaling up of humanitarian capacities to meet the identified humanitarian needs. In the light of growing needs, the EU and Member States have increased their financial support to humanitarian organisations, now amounting to EUR 32 million, out of which EUR 1 million has been mobilised for humanitarian emergency medical care and assistance to detainees through the International Committee of the Red Cross.

The EU is committed to the protection and promotion of the rights of the child in its external and internal policies. In particular, the EU accords a high priority to helping children facing armed conflicts. The EU Guidelines on Children Affected by Armed Conflicts commit the EU to addressing this issue in a comprehensive manner. The EU Heads of Missions monitor and report on children affected by armed conflict.

---



(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001693/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**  
(13 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Δημόσια έσοδα από την αδειοδότηση τυχερών παιγνίων στην Ελλάδα

Σύμφωνα με το σημείο 5 του αναθεωρημένου μνημονίου συνεργασίας (Αύγουστος 2010) μεταξύ Ελλάδας και τρόικας, προβλεπόταν εξασφάλιση επιπρόσθετων εσόδων για το ελληνικό δημόσιο από την αδειοδότηση τυχερών παιγνίων και συγκεκριμένα τουλάχιστον 225 εκ. ευρώ από την πώληση αδειών και 400 εκ. ευρώ από ετήσια δικαιώματα.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Διαπιστώνει ότι επετεύχθησαν οι παραπάνω στόχοι; Αν όχι, ποιοι είναι οι κύριοι λόγοι που διαπιστώνει η Επιτροπή ως υπαίτιους για τις καθυστερήσεις αυτές; Η μη επίτευξη των προβλεπόμενων στόχων και το εισπρακτικό κενό που δημιουργήθηκε με ποιον τρόπο καλύφθηκε από την Ελλάδα;

**Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(28 Μαρτίου 2012)

Όπως το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου πιθανόν να γνωρίζει, δύο είναι οι συναλλαγές που σχετίζονται με τυχερά παίγνια και οι οποίες έχουν ολοκληρωθεί μέχρι στιγμής.

Και οι δυο συμφωνίες υπεγράφησαν τον Οκτώβριο του 2011, όπου η άδεια του ΟΠΑΠ του 2020 παρατάθηκε μέχρι το 2030, με τίμημα 375 εκατ. ευρώ και νέα άδεια του ΟΠΑΠ για VLT, η οποία πωλήθηκε έναντι 475 εκατομμυρίων. Το επιπλέον ποσοστό 5 % για ετήσια δικαιώματα και για τις δύο συναλλαγές προβλέπεται μέχρι τα τέλη του 2013.

Υπάρχουν και άλλες συναλλαγές σχετικές με τα παίγνια στο σχέδιο ιδιωτικοποιήσεων που αναμένεται να αποφέρουν πρόσθετα έσοδα καθ' όλη τη διάρκεια του 2012.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001693/12  
to the Commission  
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)  
(13 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Public revenue from the licensing of gaming in Greece

Section 5 of the revised Memorandum of Understanding (August 2010) between Greece and the Troika provided for additional revenue for the Greek Government from the licensing of gaming — in particular, at least EUR 225 million from the sale of licences and EUR 400 million from annual rights fees.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

Does it believe that these objectives have been achieved? If not, what are, in its opinion, the main reasons for these delays? How have the failure to achieve these objectives and the resulting shortfall in revenue been remedied by Greece?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission  
(28 March 2012)**

As the Honourable Member is probably aware, two transactions related to gaming have taken place so far.

Both deals were signed last October 2011, whereby OPAP's 2020 license was extended until 2030, for a value of EUR 375 million; and OPAP's new license for VLTs was sold for a value of EUR 475 million. The additional 5 % on annual royalties in both transactions should be generated by end-2013.

There are other gaming-related transactions in the Privatisation Plan which are expected to generate additional receipts throughout 2012.

---

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001694/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Georgios Paranikolaou (PPE)**  
 (13 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Πορεία αξιοποίησης πόρων των διαρθρωτικών ταμείων για την Ελλάδα σύμφωνα με τις προβλέψεις του μηνιολογίου συνεργασίας

Στην αναθεώρηση του μηνιολογίου συνεργασίας τον Αύγουστο του 2010 προβλεπόταν επακριβώς η ακόλουθη εξέλιξη όσον αφορά την απορρόφηση πόρων από την Ελλάδα:

Προγραμματική περίοδος: 2007-2013 — Αιτήσεις πληρωμών που θα υποβληθούν μεταξύ 2010 και 2013 (σε εκ. ευρώ)				
	2010	2011	2012	2013
Ευρωπαϊκό Περιφερειακό Ταμείο και Ταμείο Συνοχής	2 330	2 600	2 850	3 000
Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο	420	75	880	890
Στόχος πρώτου εξαμήνου του έτους		1 105	1 231	1 284
Στόχος δεύτερου εξαμήνου του έτους		2 245	2 499	2 606
Συνολικός ετήσιος στόχος	2 750	3 350	3 730	3 890

Παράλληλα, η κυβέρνηση ανέφερε πως θα παρουσιάσει μια έκθεση πάνω στις δραστηριότητες της ομάδας δράσης που αξιολογεί την πρόοδο στη διασφάλιση της γρήγορης υλοποίησης και απορρόφησης των διαρθρωτικών κονδυλίων και θα προτείνει βελτιώσεις, όπου είναι αναγκαίο.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Διαπιστώνει σύμπτωση στους στόχους που τέθηκαν το 2010 όσον αφορά τους στόχους για την απορρόφηση και την μέχρι σήμερα πορεία; Πού αποδίδει η Επιτροπή τις καθυστερήσεις;
2. Η έκθεση την οποία παρουσίασε η κυβέρνηση σχετικά με την πρόοδο στη διασφάλιση της γρήγορης υλοποίησης και απορρόφησης των διαρθρωτικών κονδυλίων κρίνεται ικανοποιητική;

**Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
 (13 Απριλίου 2012)

1. Το 2011 υποβλήθηκαν στην Επιτροπή αιτήσεις πληρωμών ύψους 3,3 δισ. ευρώ, ενώ ο ετήσιος στόχος του μηνιολογίου συνεργασίας ανέρχεται σε 3,35 δισ. ευρώ (επίτευξη κατά 99 %). Ο στόχος του ΕΤΠΑ και του Ταμείου Συνοχής, ο οποίος είναι 2,6 δισ. ευρώ, ξεπεράστηκε κατά 4,5 % (αιτήσεις πληρωμών άνω των 2,7 δισ. ευρώ). Ωστόσο, οι αιτήσεις πληρωμών για το ΕΚΤ (584 εκατ. ευρώ) υπολείπονται του ετήσιου στόχου κατά 750 εκατ. ευρώ (επίτευξη κατά 78 %).

2. Η Ελλάδα έχει υποβάλει έκθεση για την πρόοδο που συντελέστηκε όσον αφορά την ταχεία υλοποίηση και απορρόφηση των διαρθρωτικών ταμείων και η Επιτροπή κρίνει την πρόοδο αυτή ικανοποιητική. Έχουν ληφθεί μέτρα για την επιτάχυνση της επιλογής και της υλοποίησης των σχεδίων (τροποποίηση της νομοθεσίας που διέπει την εφαρμογή του εθνικού στρατηγικού πλαισίου αναφοράς, αφαίρεση από τα προγράμματα των αδρανών δράσεων, ενεργοποίηση των θεματικών προτεραιοτήτων κ.τ.λ.) καθώς και για την έκδοση αρχαιολογικών και περιβαλλοντικών αδειών. Επιπλέον, παροτρύνθηκαν οι εθνικές αρχές να θεσπίσουν τάχιστα τη νομοθεσία που είναι αναγκαία για τον συντόμευση και την απλούστευση των διαδικασιών που αφορούν τις αναθέσεις συμβάσεων και τις απαλλοτριώσεις γης. Τέλος, με τη συνεργασία των υπηρεσιών της Επιτροπής, σχεδιάζεται η λήψη συμπληρωματικών μέτρων για την περαιτέρω απλούστευση και επιτάχυνση των παρεμβάσεων των διαρθρωτικών ταμείων. Επί του παρόντος, το ποσοστό απορρόφησης της Ελλάδας (για το σύνολο των Ταμείων) είναι 40 %, ποσοστό που υπερβαίνει τον μέσο όρο της ΕΕ που είναι 35 %.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001694/12  
to the Commission  
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)  
(13 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Utilisation of Structural Fund resources for Greece, as envisaged in the memorandum of understanding

The August 2010 revision of the memorandum of understanding specifically provided for the following targets as regards the take-up of funds by Greece:

Programming period: 2007-13 — Payment applications to be submitted between 2010 and 2013 (In million euro)				
	2010	2011	2012	2013
European Regional Fund and Cohesion Fund	2 330	2 600	2 850	3 000
European Social Fund	420	75	880	890
Target for first half of year		1 105	1 231	1 284
Target for second half of year		2 245	2 499	2 606
Total annual target	2 750	3 350	3 730	3 890

Furthermore, the government stated that it would present a report on the activities of the Task Force assessing progress in ensuring the rapid implementation and take-up of Structural Fund resources, and that it would suggest improvements where necessary.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Does it consider that the take-up rates so far are consistent with the objectives set in 2010? What, in the Commission's view, are the reasons for the delays?
2. Is the report presented by the government regarding progress in ensuring rapid implementation and take-up of Structural Funds considered to be satisfactory?

**Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission  
(13 April 2012)**

1. Payment claims of EUR 3.3 billion were declared to the Commission in 2011 against the memorandum of understanding annual target of EUR 3.35 billion (achievement of 99 %). The ERDF/Cohesion Fund target of EUR 2.6 billion has been exceeded by 4.5 % (payment claims of over EUR 2.7 billion). However, the payment claims for ESF (EUR 584 million) missed the annual target of EUR 750 million (achievement of 78 %).

2. Greece has reported on progress in ensuring rapid implementation and take-up of Structural Funds and the Commission considers this progress to be satisfactory. Steps have been taken to accelerate project selection and implementation (modification of the legislation governing the implementation of the National Strategic Reference Framework, removing inactive actions from programmes, activation of thematic priorities etc) as well as for the issuance of archaeological permits and environmental licensing. In addition, national authorities have been urged to rapidly adopt the necessary legislation to shorten and simplify procedures on contract awards and land expropriation. Finally, with the cooperation of the Commission services, additional measures for further simplification and acceleration of Structural Fund interventions are under consideration. Currently the rate of absorption of Greece (all Funds) is 40 %, which is above the EU average of 35 %.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001695/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)**  
(13 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Δημόσια ιδρύματα παιδικής προστασίας στην Ελλάδα

Σύμφωνα με εκτιμήσεις του Συνηγόρου του Πολίτη στην Ελλάδα, στα 2 500 ανέρχονται σήμερα τα παιδιά, εν μέσω της οικονομικής κρίσης, που βρίσκουν καταφύγιο σε δημόσια ιδρύματα παιδικής προστασίας ή σε ιδιωτικές δομές φροντίδας, όπως αυτές των Μη Κυβερνητικών Οργανώσεων και της Εκκλησίας. Το φαινόμενο της πλημμελούς παιδικής φροντίδας στην Ελλάδα έχει λάβει πρωτοφανείς διαστάσεις, υποβοηθούμενο από τις περικοπές πόρων που απειλούν τη συνέχιση της λειτουργίας αυτών των δομών.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Διαθέτει εργαλεία προς αξιοποίηση από τα κράτη μέλη, ιδίως από εκείνα που βρίσκονται στην πιο δυσχερή οικονομική θέση, προκειμένου να ενισχυθούν οι παιδικές ομάδες που είναι ιδιαίτερα εκτεθειμένες στην οικονομική κρίση (π.χ. παιδιά από πολύ αδύναμες οικονομικά οικογένειες, παιδιά με ειδικές ανάγκες);
2. Είναι επιλέξιμα προς χρηματοδότηση από τα ευρωπαϊκά διαρθρωτικά ταμεία δημόσια ιδρύματα παιδικής προστασίας στην Ελλάδα; Αξιοποιεί η χώρα επαρκώς πόρους για αυτόν τον σκοπό;

**Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(12 Απριλίου 2012)

1. Το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο παρέχει υποστήριξη σε παιδιά από ευάλωτες ομάδες είτε απευθείας με τη λήψη μέτρων ειδικής εκπαίδευσης προσαρμοσμένων σε αυτά ή έμμεσα με τη λήψη μέτρων υποστήριξης της φροντίδας των παιδιών ώστε να προωθηθεί η απασχόληση των γονιών τους. Όσον αφορά τις δράσεις της ΕΕ για την καταπολέμηση της παιδικής φτώχειας και, γενικά, άλλα διαθέσιμα χρηματοπιστωτικά μέσα, η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή παραπέμπει τον κύριο βουλευτή στην απάντησή της στην ερώτηση E-001262/2012<sup>(1)</sup>.
2. Οι δημόσιες εγκαταστάσεις παιδικής μέριμνας και παιδικής προστασίας ως τέτοιες δεν είναι επιλέξιμες για συγχρηματοδότηση από το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο.

Η κατασκευή υποδομών παιδικής φροντίδας καθώς και η απόκτηση εξοπλισμού μπορούν να είναι επιλέξιμες στο πλαίσιο του Ευρωπαϊκού Ταμείου Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης (ΕΤΠΑ). Ωστόσο, επειδή η επιλογή ειδικών παρεμβάσεων πραγματοποιείται υπό την αιγίδα των εθνικών αρχών και οι πληροφορίες που είναι διαθέσιμες στην Επιτροπή για την απορρόφηση της βοήθειας του ΕΤΠΑ δεν είναι αρκετά λεπτομερείς για να προσδιοριστούν τα ακριβή ποσά που διατίθενται και χρησιμοποιούνται για τα ιδρύματα παιδικής μέριμνας που υποστηρίζουν τα παιδιά που πλήττονται από την κρίση, η Επιτροπή προτείνει στον κύριο βουλευτή να επικοινωνήσει απευθείας με τις αρμόδιες εθνικές αρχές για τα ιδρύματα παιδικής μέριμνας για περισσότερες πληροφορίες.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001695/12  
to the Commission  
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)  
(13 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Public child protection institutions in Greece

The Greek Ombudsman estimates that, today, in the midst of the economic crisis, there are as many as 2 500 children are being cared for by public child protection institutions or private care facilities, such as those of NGOs and the Church. The phenomenon of inadequate childcare in Greece has assumed unprecedented proportions, aggravated by cuts in resources that threaten the continued operation of these facilities.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Does it have at its disposal any instruments for use by Member States, especially those in the most difficult economic circumstances, in order to support those groups of children which are particularly vulnerable to the economic crisis (e.g. children from poor families, children with special needs)?
2. Are public child protection institutions in Greece eligible for funding from the European Structural Funds? Is the country adequately utilising resources for this purpose?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission  
(12 April 2012)**

1. The European Social Fund offers support to children from vulnerable groups either directly through specific education measures tailored for them or indirectly through measures supporting childcare in order to promote the employment of their parents. With regard to the EU's actions against child poverty and to other financial instruments available in general, the European Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its response to parliamentary Question E-001262/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.

2. Public childcare and child protection facilities as such are not eligible for co-financing from the European Social Fund.

The construction of childcare infrastructures as well as the acquisition of equipment can be eligible under the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF). However, as the selection of specific interventions lies under the auspices of the national authorities and information available to the Commission on the absorption of ERDF assistance is not sufficiently detailed to establish the precise amounts allocated and used for childcare institutions supporting children affected by the crisis, the Commission would suggest to the Honourable Member to contact directly the national authorities in charge of childcare institutions for more detailed information.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp>.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001696/12  
alla Commissione  
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)  
(13 febbraio 2012)**

**Oggetto:** Sviluppo produttivo e armonizzazione degli oneri burocratici

I trattati affidano all'Unione europea la funzione di coordinare le politiche economiche. La crisi ha costretto gli Stati membri al coordinamento stretto delle politiche di bilancio con il «Fiscal compact». Il meccanismo europeo di stabilità assicurerà assistenza finanziaria ai paesi in difficoltà a condizioni molto severe. Ma forse le nuove regole non tengono conto delle situazioni di partenza diverse da paese a paese, diversità che incidono sui risultati degli sforzi d'austerità che i governi devono compiere per adeguarsi ai nuovi obiettivi e sulla strategia delle imprese per rimanere sul mercato. Per quanto riguarda queste ultime, ad esempio, competere nel mercato unico con oneri pesanti sull'attività produttiva diventa molto problematico ed in ogni caso penalizzante rispetto ai concorrenti che beneficiano di oneri molto inferiori. È il caso dei costi della burocrazia italiana che, secondo una ricerca dell'ufficio studi della Confartigianato, ammontano complessivamente, per tutte le pratiche necessarie a fare impresa, a 23 miliardi di euro solo per le imprese artigiane. Il 26 marzo, sempre secondo questa ricerca, è il giorno della «liberazione dalla burocrazia», perché fino a quella data molto è il tempo impiegato durante l'anno per certificati, autorizzazioni, file agli sportelli postali, incontri con i commercialisti, ecc.. Per quanto riguarda, per esempio, le procedure ed i tempi per il pagamento delle tasse nei paesi dell'OCSE, in Italia si registrano 15 procedure e tempi pari a 235 ore, rispetto alla media OCSE che è di 2 procedure con 99 ore impiegate.

Di fronte a queste enormi differenze, comprese quelle della libertà economica, degli oneri amministrativi annui e del costo del lavoro pubblico, si chiede alla Commissione quanto segue:

1. Non ritiene opportuno consigliare agli Stati membri un'armonizzazione degli oneri, al fine di rendere più equa la competizione e garantire alle economie nazionali ed ai loro settori produttivi un'identica base di partenza?
2. Non crede che lavorare per il fisco fino al 20 giugno (è il caso italiano) sia eccessivamente oneroso e renda estremamente difficoltosa la riduzione del debito, così come è stata programmata dal «Fiscal compact»?
3. Non pensa che la coordinazione economica e fiscale debba andare di pari passo con quella degli oneri burocratici?
4. Intende esaminare a fondo le conseguenze di questa disparità e proporre misure adeguate?

**Risposta data da José Manuel Barroso a nome della Commissione  
(2 aprile 2012)**

Nella misura in cui la questione non è soggetta alle regole di armonizzazione dell'Unione, gli Stati membri sono liberi di imporre le norme nazionali che ritengono opportune — purché conformi alle regole generali del diritto dell'Unione — e di definire gli oneri amministrativi che ne derivano. Lo stesso vale per la materia tributaria, esazione fiscale compresa.

Dal canto proprio la Commissione sta riducendo gli oneri derivanti dalla normativa UE — oneri amministrativi compresi — nell'ambito delle iniziative a favore della regolamentazione intelligente. La riduzione degli oneri regolamentari è oramai parte integrante delle valutazioni d'impatto cui le iniziative legislative della Commissione sono soggette prima di essere presentate al Consiglio e al Parlamento.

In linea con l'analisi annuale della crescita del 2012, sono in corso a livello nazionale e dell'Unione interventi intesi a modernizzare la pubblica amministrazione. Su richiesta della Commissione, il gruppo ad alto livello di parti interessate indipendenti sugli oneri amministrativi (GAL) ha elaborato di recente una relazione sulle buone pratiche degli Stati membri per l'attuazione della normativa UE con il minor onere amministrativo <sup>(1)</sup>. Uno scambio di buone pratiche potrebbe favorire la riduzione degli oneri regolamentari a carico delle imprese in alcuni Stati membri e nell'Unione europea nel suo complesso. Al presidente del GAL, Edmund Stoiber, è stato chiesto di proseguire i lavori concentrandosi ulteriormente sulla riduzione degli oneri gravanti in particolare sulle piccole imprese e sull'efficienza della pubblica amministrazione. Tutte queste iniziative mirano a definire una linea comune incisiva, tanto a livello nazionale che dell'Unione, per coordinare la politica economica e creare condizioni più favorevoli alla crescita e all'occupazione.

---

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat\\_general/admin\\_burden/best\\_practice\\_report/best\\_practice\\_report\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat_general/admin_burden/best_practice_report/best_practice_report_en.htm)



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001696/12  
to the Commission**

**Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* Development of production and harmonisation of red tape

The Treaties entrust the European Union with the task of coordinating economic policy. The crisis has forced Member States to strictly coordinate their budgetary policies by means of the 'Fiscal compact'. The European stability mechanism will provide financial assistance for countries in difficulty, under very strict conditions. However, the new rules may not take into account the different starting points in each country. This is having an impact on the outcome of the austerity measures governments are having to implement to comply with the new objectives, but also on the strategies that businesses are having to employ to remain in the market.

Competing in the single market when subject to a large amount of red tape is becoming a major problem and, in any case, is putting companies at a disadvantage compared to their competitors who benefit from a much lighter touch. For instance, in Italy, according to a study by the Confartigianato (General Italian Confederation of Artisans) research department, red tape is costing small businesses a total of EUR 23 billion simply to comply with all the required procedures in order to do business. According to this research, 26 March is 'Freedom from Red Tape' day, because up to then a huge amount of time is spent on obtaining certificates, authorisations, queuing at post-office counters, meeting accountants, etc. As regards, for example, the procedures and time frame necessary for the payment of taxes in OECD countries, Italy has 15 procedures to follow, which take around 235 hours, while the OECD average is 2 procedures which take 99 hours.

Given these enormous differences, including varying levels of economic freedom, annual administrative burdens and the cost of work in the state sector, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Does it not think it should advise Member States to harmonise their red tape in order to make competition fairer and create a level playing field for national economies and their productive sectors?
2. Does it not agree that working simply to pay taxes until 20 June (as is the case in Italy) is unduly burdensome and will make it extremely difficult to reduce debt, as agreed in the 'Fiscal compact'?
3. Does it not believe that economic and fiscal coordination should go hand in hand with the coordination of red tape?
4. Will it examine in depth the consequences of this disparity and propose appropriate measures?

**Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission**

(2 April 2012)

To the extent no EU harmonising rules apply to the issue concerned, and provided they comply with the general rules of EC law, Member States remain free to establish the national rules they see fit and, by the same token, the regulatory burden associated with the choices made. This also applies to the area of taxation, including tax collection arrangements.

The Commission is reducing regulatory burden of EU legislation, including administrative burden, as part of its Smart Regulation agenda. The reduction of regulatory burden has become an integral part of the impact assessments that Commission initiatives undergo before being proposed to Council and Parliament.

In line with the Annual Growth Survey 2012, further actions are being pursued at EU and national level to modernise public administrations. On the request of the Commission, the High Level Group of Independent Stakeholders on Administrative Burdens (HLG-AB) has recently prepared a report on best practice in Member States implementing EU legislation in the least burdensome way<sup>(1)</sup>. An exchange of good practice could boost the reduction of regulatory burden for businesses in some Member States and in the EU as a whole. The chair of the HLG-AB, Dr Edmund Stoiber, has been asked to continue his work focusing more on reducing regulatory burden particularly for small businesses and on the efficiency of public administrations. All of these initiatives are designed to produce a strong common agenda at EU and national level to coordinate economic policy and improve conditions for growth and employment.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat\\_general/admin\\_burden/best\\_practice\\_report/best\\_practice\\_report\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat_general/admin_burden/best_practice_report/best_practice_report_en.htm)

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001698/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

*(13 febbraio 2012)*

Oggetto: Uova cinesi di gomma

Un'agenzia di stampa cinese ha riportato casi di «uova alimentari di gomma», capaci anche di rimbalzare 20 centimetri da terra, che si sono verificati in tutto il paese e in particolare a Shanghai.

Le autorità sanitarie cinesi hanno lanciato un'inchiesta per verificare la natura di queste uova. Il sospetto è che siano state prodotte artificialmente per lucrare sul prezzo delle uova, ma la scarsa quantità con cui sono comparse sul mercato depone contro questa tesi.

Alla luce dei fatti sopraesposti, s'interroga dunque la Commissione per sapere:

1. se è informata sul caso delle uova di gomma cinesi,
2. se intende effettuare un apposito studio scientifico per comprendere l'origine e la pericolosità dei prodotti in questione,
3. se e come intende verificare che le uova in questione non entrino nei mercati europei.

**Risposta data da John Dalli a nome della Commissione**

*(20 marzo 2012)*

La Commissione non è stata informata ufficialmente ma è a conoscenza del caso delle uova elastiche cinesi.

La Commissione non intende condurre uno studio scientifico per stabilire l'origine e i rischi potenziali di tali prodotti in considerazione del fatto che la questione si limita a casi segnalati in Cina. Tuttavia, la Commissione segue da vicino le indagini intraprese dalle autorità cinesi.

La Commissione si basa su sistemi articolati ed efficaci di controllo della sicurezza alimentare nell'UE al fine di individuare gli eventuali problemi legati a prodotti alimentari importati da paesi terzi.

La Commissione è fiduciosa che i controlli obbligatori effettuati dalle autorità competenti degli Stati membri prima dell'importazione, controlli basati sulla pertinente legislazione dell'UE, saranno sufficienti a prevenire l'introduzione di questi prodotti sul mercato dell'UE.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001698/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* Chinese rubber eggs

A Chinese news agency has reported cases of 'rubber eggs', capable of bouncing 20 centimetres from the ground, which have appeared throughout the country and in Shanghai in particular.

The Chinese health authorities have launched an investigation to ascertain the nature of these eggs. It is suspected that they have been produced artificially in order to make a profit, but the small numbers that have appeared on the market tend to discount this theory.

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

1. whether it has been informed of this case of the Chinese rubber eggs,
2. whether it intends to conduct an appropriate scientific study in order to establish the origin and potential risks of the products in question;
3. whether it intends to check whether these eggs are entering the European markets, and if so, how?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission**

(20 March 2012)

The Commission was not officially informed but was aware of this case concerning Chinese elastic eggs.

The Commission does not intend to conduct a scientific study in order to establish the origin and potential risks of the products in question given that this matter is restricted to reported cases in China. However, the Commission is following closely the investigation undertaken by the Chinese authorities.

The Commission relies on exhaustive and effective EU food safety control systems to detect problems in food imported from third countries.

The Commission is confident that the thorough compulsory controls carried out by the Member States' competent authorities prior to import, based on the relevant EU legislation, will be sufficient to prevent the introduction of these items into the EU market.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001700/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(13 febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: Sperimentazione per il controllo della qualità dell'aria

Per monitorare la qualità dell'aria arriva un'arma in più: sessanta «nasi elettronici» e sofisticatissimi. A Bergamo giungono dopo un'estrazione a sorte del Forum delle polizie locali. Grazie alla collaborazione fra il Comune e l'università dell'Aquila, gli agenti della polizia locale di Bergamo, muniti di sensori portatili (leggi «nasi elettronici») potranno monitorare le condizioni dell'aria e trasmettere direttamente i dati agli studiosi.

La sperimentazione di un anno verrà affiancata dall'attivazione di un nucleo di polizia ambientale e dal potenziamento del sistema di centraline.

Tutto ciò premesso, si chiede alla Commissione se:

1. è a conoscenza della sperimentazione del comune di Bergamo sul controllo di qualità dell'aria;
2. pensa che l'iniziativa del corpo di polizia municipale di Bergamo possa essere replicata in altri paesi europei nell'ambito di futuri progetti pilota.

**Risposta data da Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione**

(30 marzo 2012)

1. La Commissione non è a conoscenza dell'iniziativa sul monitoraggio della qualità dell'aria condotta a Bergamo cui l'onorevole parlamentare fa riferimento.
2. Nella revisione del regolamento LIFE+, la Commissione ha proposto di finanziare una serie di progetti integrati al fine di migliorare l'attuazione della normativa sulla qualità dell'aria nelle zone urbane. Tali progetti potrebbero contemplare la sperimentazione di tecniche di monitoraggio innovative. La Commissione sarebbe lieta di ricevere dalle autorità di Bergamo la relazione finale dell'iniziativa in questione alla casella di posta elettronica funzionale ENV-AIR@ec.europa.eu.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001700/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* Experiment in monitoring air quality

Another weapon has been added to the armoury for monitoring air quality: sixty extremely sophisticated 'electronic noses', which were sent to Bergamo after lots were drawn by the local police forum. Thanks to cooperation between the municipal authorities and the University of Aquila, the Bergamo local police, armed with the portable sensors ('electronic noses'), will be able to monitor air conditions and transmit data to researchers directly.

The one-year experiment will involve the formation of a central environmental police unit, together with a number of satellite units.

In view of this:

1. Is the Commission aware of the experiment in monitoring air quality being conducted by the municipality of Bergamo?
2. Does it believe that the initiative involving the Bergamo local police can be replicated in other European countries as part of future pilot projects?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission**

(30 March 2012)

1. The Commission is not aware of the experiment in monitoring air quality in Bergamo to which the Honourable Member refers.
2. The Commission has proposed in the revision of the LIFE+ Regulation that a series of integrated projects be funded with a view to improving implementation of air quality legislation in urban areas. Such projects could include the trial of innovative monitoring techniques. The Commission would be grateful if the Bergamo authorities would forward the final report of the initiative to the functional mailbox ENV-AIR@ec.europa.eu

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001701/12  
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(13 febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Attentato ad Aleppo

Il 10 febbraio ad Aleppo, in Siria, tre esplosioni hanno provocato 25 morti e 175 feriti, di cui molti bambini. A rivendicare l'attentato è stato il Libero esercito siriano (Les), formato da militari disertori delle truppe di Bashar el Assad.

Mentre ad Aleppo ci sono state esplosioni, decine di migliaia di soldati hanno attaccato un quartiere nella periferia di Homs. La città ribelle è sotto attacco da quasi una settimana. Gli attivisti spiegano che sono in corso rastrellamenti casa per casa. Solo nella giornata di venerdì ci sarebbero state almeno 39 vittime, che salgono a 65 contando anche quelle di Aleppo. In sei giorni le persone decedute sono invece state oltre 400.

Alla luce dei fatti sopraesposti, si chiede dunque al Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante:

1. È a conoscenza dell'attentato di Aleppo e degli scontri di Homs tra i ribelli e l'esercito siriano?
2. Intende adottare provvedimenti e azioni, e in caso affermativo quali, per garantire che in Siria la situazione torni al più presto alla normalità?

**Risposta data dall'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione**

(24 maggio 2012)

L'AR/VP ha sottolineato a più riprese, e ultimamente il 19 marzo 2012 attraverso il suo portavoce, l'urgenza di porre fine alla spirale di violenza in Siria e di proteggere la vita dei cittadini siriani. Catherine Ashton ha condannato la brutale repressione messa in opera ad Homs dall'esercito siriano e ha esortato il regime a ritirare le truppe dalle città e dai villaggi assediati.

Al fine di aumentare la pressione sul regime affinché cessi la violenta repressione della popolazione siriana, l'UE ha adottato, a partire dal maggio 2011, 14 serie di misure restrittive. L'Unione proseguirà su questa strada fino a che non cesseranno le violenze ed esorta inoltre la comunità internazionale ad unirsi ai suoi sforzi per adottare e mettere in atto sanzioni nei confronti dei responsabili della repressione in Siria.

Con l'obiettivo di una soluzione politica della crisi, l'Ue sostiene a pieno l'inviato speciale dell'ONU e della Lega araba e il suo piano in sei punti per una soluzione inclusiva e pacifica sotto la guida della Siria. L'Unione accoglie favorevolmente la dichiarazione del presidente del Consiglio di sicurezza delle Nazioni Unite a sostegno del piano di Kofi Annan ed esorta tutti i membri del Consiglio di sicurezza a continuare a lavorare in questa direzione.

Nel frattempo l'UE partecipa attivamente al gruppo «Amici del popolo siriano» al fine di promuovere un consenso internazionale che conduca a una soluzione politica della crisi siriana.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001701/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)  
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Attack in Aleppo

On 10 February in Aleppo, Syria, three explosions left 25 dead and 175 injured, many of whom were children. The Free Syrian Army, made up of soldiers who have defected from Bashar al-Assad's forces, claimed responsibility for the attack.

While explosions were occurring in Aleppo, tens of thousands of soldiers attacked a neighbourhood on the outskirts of Homs. The rebel-held city has been under attack for almost a week. Activists say that house-to-house raids have been taking place. On Friday alone, there were at least 39 victims, but the figure rises to 65 when we count those killed in Aleppo. In six days the number of dead has exceeded 400.

In light of these facts, can the Vice-President/High Representative say:

1. Whether she is aware of the attack in Aleppo and the clashes in Homs between rebels and the Syrian troops?
2. Whether she intends to implement measures to ensure the situation in Syria returns to normal as quickly as possible. If so, what does she propose?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**

(24 May 2012)

The HR/VP has repeatedly — and most recently on 19 March via her spokesperson — underlined the urgent need to stop the spiral of violence in Syria and protect the lives of Syrian citizens. She has condemned the Syrian army's brutal crackdown on Homs and urged the regime to withdraw its troops from besieged cities and towns.

To increase the pressure on the Syrian regime to cease the brutal crackdown on its population, the EU adopted 14 rounds of restrictive measures since May 2011. It will continue to do so until there is an end to the violence and also urges the international community to join its efforts in adopting and enforcing sanctions against those responsible for the repression in Syria.

In view of a political solution to the crisis, the EU fully supports the Joint UN-LAS Envoy to Syria and his six point plan, providing for a peaceful Syrian-led and inclusive settlement. It welcomes the Security Council's Presidential Statement backing Mr Kofi Annan's plan and urges all members of the UNSC to continue working in this direction.

Meanwhile, the EU actively partakes in the Friends of the Syrian People Group to foster international consensus on the way towards a political settlement to the crisis in Syria.

---

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-001703/12**

**aan de Commissie**

**Marianne Thyssen (PPE)**

(13 februari 2012)

*Betref:* Verplicht gebruik van winterbanden voor personenvoertuigen

Veel verkeersongevallen en verkeersoponhoud ten gevolge van sneeuwval of ander winterweer kunnen voorkomen worden indien elk personenvoertuig uitgerust zou zijn met winterbanden. De Europese wetgeving bevat reeds heel wat veiligheidsvoorschriften voor personenvoertuigen.

Acht de Commissie het niet aangewezen om het verplichte seizoensgebruik van winterbanden toe te voegen aan de bestaande lijst veiligheidsvoorschriften?

**Antwoord van de heer Kallas namens de Commissie**

(16 maart 2012)

De Commissie deelt het geachte Parlementslid mee dat de enige aanvullende eis die momenteel voor winterbanden geldt — vergeleken met gewone banden — is dat winterbanden moeten zijn voorzien van het opschrift „M+S” zoals vastgesteld in Richtlijn 92/23/EEG van de Raad betreffende banden voor motorvoertuigen en aanhangwagens daarvan alsmede betreffende de montage ervan <sup>(1)</sup>. In het kader van de Economische Commissie voor Europa van de Verenigde Naties (VN-ECE) zijn reeds voorbereidingen aan de gang om functionele eisen, zoals de grip op sneeuw, op te nemen in de regelgeving inzake typegoedkeuringen.

De Commissie is van oordeel dat eerst functionele eisen moeten zijn vastgesteld alvorens een eventueel verplicht seizoensgebruik van winterbanden kan worden overwogen.

---

(<sup>1</sup>) PBL 129 van 14.5.1992, blz. 95.



(English version)

**Question for written answer P-001703/12  
to the Commission**

**Marianne Thyssen (PPE)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* Compulsory use of winter tyres for passenger vehicles

Many traffic accidents and delays caused by snow or other winter conditions could be prevented if all passenger vehicles were equipped with winter tyres. The European legislation already contains a lot of safety requirements for passenger vehicles.

Does the Commission deem it inappropriate to add the compulsory seasonal use of winter tyres to the existing list of safety requirements?

**Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission**

(16 March 2012)

The Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that currently the only additional requirement — compared to a normal tyre — a winter tyre has to meet is bearing the sign 'M+S' as laid down in Council Directive 92/23/EEC on tyres relating to tyres for motor vehicles and their trailers and to their fitting <sup>(1)</sup>. Preparatory work has already been done at UN-ECE to include functional requirements — such as snow-gripp — into type-approval legislation.

The Commission considers that the establishment of functional requirements should be concluded before reflecting on a possible compulsory seasonal use of winter tyres.

\_\_\_\_\_

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 129, 14.5.1992, p. 95.

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001704/12  
aan de Commissie  
Marianne Thyssen (PPE)  
(13 februari 2012)**

*Betref:* Verplichte uitrusting van personenwagens met een volwaardig reservewiel

Europese personenwagens zijn verplicht uitgerust met een reservewiel. Nergens in de wetgeving wordt echter bepaald dat dit reservewiel een volwaardig wiel dient te zijn. Bijgevolg zijn vele personenvoertuigen enkel voorzien van een klein wiel waar men niet mee kan blijven rijden en dat niet hetzelfde veiligheidsniveau haalt als een gewoon wiel (zogenaamde „thuiskomer“).

Acht de Commissie het niet aangewezen de verplichting om personenwagens uit te rusten met een reservewiel verder te specificeren als doelende op een volwaardig reservewiel?

**Antwoord van de heer Tajani namens de Commissie  
(13 maart 2012)**

Verordening (EU) nr. 458/2011 van de Commissie <sup>(1)</sup> bepaalt dat wanneer een voertuig met een reservewiel en -band wordt uitgerust, dit ofwel een standaardreserve-eenheid moet zijn in dezelfde maat als de banden die op het voertuig gemonteerd zijn, ofwel een reserve-eenheid voor tijdelijk gebruik van een voor gebruik op het voertuig geschikt type overeenkomstig de internationale geharmoniseerde voorschriften van VN/ECE-Reglement nr. 64. Het is bovendien ook aanvaardbaar om auto's krachtens de eerder genoemde wetgeving met runflatbanden uit te rusten.

Voertuigfabrikanten kunnen op dit ogenblik vrij beslissen om voertuigen al dan niet met reserve-eenheden, runflatbanden of andere oplossingen zoals reparatiesets uit te rusten. Zo kunnen de fabrikanten gewicht besparen om het brandstofverbruik en de CO<sub>2</sub>-emissie te verbeteren, ruimte besparen of gewoon de kosten verlagen.

Bijgevolg kunnen de consumenten in de EU zelf kiezen of zij voertuigen kopen die standaard of optioneel van dergelijke uitrusting zijn voorzien.

Het is dan ook niet aangewezen de installatie van volwaardige reserve-eenheden verplicht te stellen.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Verordening (EU) nr. 458/2011 van de Commissie van 12 mei 2011 betreffende typegoedkeuringsvoorschriften voor motorvoertuigen en aanhangwagens daarvan wat de montage van de banden betreft en tot uitvoering van Verordening (EG) nr. 661/2009 van het Europees Parlement en de Raad betreffende typegoedkeuringsvoorschriften voor de algemene veiligheid van motorvoertuigen, aanhangwagens daarvan en daarvoor bestemde systemen, onderdelen en technische eenheden. PB L 124 van 13.5.2011, blz. 11.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001704/12  
to the Commission  
Marianne Thyssen (PPE)  
(13 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Mandatory requirement for passenger vehicles to be equipped with a full size spare wheel

It is mandatory for European passenger vehicles to be equipped with a spare wheel. It is not stipulated anywhere in the legislation however, that this spare wheel should be a full size one. As a result, many passenger vehicles only carry a small wheel (the so-called space saver), which cannot be used for driving over long distances and does not offer the same safety level as a normal wheel.

Would it not be appropriate, in the Commission's view, to narrow the definition of the mandatory requirement for passenger vehicles to be equipped with a spare wheel to the mandatory requirement to be equipped with a full size spare wheel?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission  
(13 March 2012)**

Commission Regulation (EU) 458/2011 <sup>(1)</sup> provides that in cases where a vehicle is equipped with a spare wheel and tyre, it shall be either a standard spare unit in the same size as the tyres actually fitted to the vehicle or a temporary-use spare unit of a type suitable for use on the vehicle in compliance with the international harmonised rules of UNECE Regulation No 64. In addition, it is also acceptable for cars to be fitted with run-flat tyres in compliance with the aforementioned Regulations.

Vehicle manufacturers are currently free to decide whether or not vehicles are fitted with spare units, run-flat tyres or other solutions such as repair kits. This enables manufacturers to address issues linked to weight saving efforts to improve fuel consumption and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, to address available space restrictions or to simply achieve cost reduction.

Subsequently, consumers in the EU can choose whether or not they purchase vehicles fitted with such equipment, either provided as standard or not, depending on their personal preference.

In light of the above, it is not appropriate to define mandatory fitment of full-size spare units.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Commission Regulation (EU) No 458/2011 of 12 May 2011 concerning type-approval requirements for motor vehicles and their trailers with regard to the installation of their tyres and implementing Regulation (EC) No 661/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning type-approval requirements for the general safety of motor vehicles, their trailers and systems, components and separate technical units intended therefore; OJ L 124, 13.5.2011, p. 11.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001705/12  
an die Kommission**

**Karl-Heinz Florenz (PPE)**

(13. Februar 2012)

*Betrifft:* Überarbeitung der Richtlinie über Tabakerzeugnisse (2001/37/EG)

Immer mehr Raucher in Deutschland und Europa steigen auf die elektronische Zigarette um, die von Herstellern als „zeitgemäße Form des Rauchens“, „schadstoffärmere Alternative“ und „sozialverträglicher“ beworben wird. Laut Wissenschaftlern und Gesundheitsexperten sind jedoch die Risiken von E-Zigaretten noch nicht abschätzbar und die gesundheitlichen Auswirkungen unbekannt, da aussagekräftige Studien bisher fehlen. Einige Bundesländer in Deutschland haben den Handel mit E-Zigaretten bereits verboten, weitere EU-Mitgliedstaaten, wie Österreich und Dänemark, haben diesbezüglich sehr strikte Regelungen, da in vielen Fällen die arzneimittel- und medizinproduktrechtlichen Vorschriften nicht eingehalten werden. Die Gesetzeslage in Deutschland und in Europa ist uneinheitlich, und es ist noch nicht geklärt, ob die E-Zigarette als Genussmittel, Tabakprodukt oder Medizinprodukt betrachtet wird.

In diesem Zusammenhang ergeben sich folgende Fragen:

1. Inwiefern werden die E-Zigarette und die Inhaltsstoffe in dem Vorschlag der Kommission zur Überarbeitung der Tabakproduktrichtlinie berücksichtigt werden?
2. Liegen der Kommission Studien über Wirkungen und Nebenwirkungen von E-Zigaretten vor? Und wenn ja, welche? Wenn nein, sind beispielsweise im Rahmen der Gemeinsamen Forschungsstelle Studien geplant?
3. Strebt die Kommission eine EU-weit einheitliche Gesetzeslage im Hinblick auf den Handel mit E-Zigaretten und im Hinblick auf die erlaubten Inhaltsstoffe in E-Zigaretten an?
4. Wie ist die Meinung der Kommission zur Einstufung von E-Zigaretten als Genussmittel, Tabakprodukt oder Medizinprodukt? Wird sie bei der Überarbeitung der Tabakproduktrichtlinie eine Einstufung vornehmen?

**Antwort von Herrn Dalli im Namen der Kommission**

(22. März 2012)

Im Zusammenhang mit der anstehenden Überprüfung der Richtlinie 2001/37/EG<sup>(1)</sup> über Tabakerzeugnisse werden derzeit im Zuge der Folgenabschätzung elektronische Zigaretten untersucht, die als Verbrauchsgüter vermarktet werden. Eine der zu prüfenden Optionen ist die mögliche Ausweitung des Geltungsbereichs der Richtlinie auf diese Produkte und die Regelung der entsprechenden Inhaltsstoffe. Die Kommission hat sich bisher noch nicht endgültig für eine Regelungsoption entschieden.

Falls E-Zigaretten von den Mitgliedstaaten als Medizinprodukte eingestuft werden, müssen Wirkung und mögliche negative Auswirkungen vor Erteilung einer Marktzulassung eingehend bewertet werden.

Derzeit liegen nur begrenzte Informationen über die Wirkung und die Nebenwirkungen von E-Zigaretten vor. Untersuchungen der US-Arzneimittelbehörde (Food and Drug Administration (FDA)) über elektronische Zigaretten haben ergeben, dass der Rauch Karzinogene (wie Nitrosamine), giftige Chemikalien (wie Diethylenglykol) und andere tabakspezifische Bestandteile enthalten kann, die im Verdacht stehen, schädlich für den Menschen zu sein<sup>(2)</sup>. Die Studiengruppe der Weltgesundheitsorganisation (WHO) zur Regelung von Tabakprodukten kam zu dem Ergebnis, dass zu befürchten ist, dass die Nikotinabgabe an die Lungen schwere toxikologische, physiologische und süchtig machende Wirkungen haben könnte<sup>(3)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> Richtlinie 2001/37/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 5. Juni 2001 zur Angleichung der Rechts- und Verwaltungsvorschriften der Mitgliedstaaten über die Herstellung, die Aufmachung und den Verkauf von Tabakerzeugnissen — Erklärung der Kommission, ABl. L 194 vom 18.7.2001.

<sup>(2)</sup> FDA: Summary of Results: Laboratory Analysis of Electronic Cigarettes Conducted By FDA. US: Food and Drug Administration (FDA), Juli 2009, <http://www.fda.gov/NewsEvents/PublicHealthFocus/ucm173146.htm>

<sup>(3)</sup> WHO Study Group on Tobacco Product Regulation, Report on the Scientific Basis of Tobacco Product Regulation: Third Report of a WHO Study Group, 2009.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001705/12  
to the Commission**

**Karl-Heinz Florenz (PPE)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* Revision of the Tobacco Products Directive (2001/37/EC).

An increasing number of smokers in Germany and Europe are switching to electronic cigarettes, which, according to the manufacturers are the 'modern way to smoke', a 'less harmful alternative' and a 'more socially acceptable' form of smoking. However, according to scientists and health experts, the e-cigarette risks are still difficult to assess and their health effects are still unknown since conclusive studies do not yet exist. A few German *Länder* have already banned the sale of e-cigarettes, while other EU Member States, such as Austria and Denmark, have very strict regulations in this regard because, in many cases, the regulations concerning pharmaceutical products and medical devices are not observed. The legal situation in Germany and Europe is non-uniform, and it is still unclear whether e-cigarettes are considered stimulants, tobacco products or pharmaceuticals.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. To what extent will e-cigarettes and their ingredients be considered in the Commission's proposal for a revision of the Tobacco Products Directive?
2. Does it have any studies available on the effects and side-effects of e-cigarettes? If so, what are they? If not, are studies planned, for example, within the scope of the Joint Research Centre?
3. Is it working towards a uniform EU-wide legal position regarding the e-cigarette trade and the ingredients permitted in e-cigarettes?
4. What is its opinion regarding the classification of e-cigarettes as stimulants, tobacco products or pharmaceuticals? Does it intend to include a classification in the revision of the Tobacco Products Directive?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission**

(22 March 2012)

In the context of the forthcoming review of the Tobacco Products Directive 2001/37/EC <sup>(1)</sup>, the question of electronic cigarettes marketed as consumer products is currently being analysed in the ongoing impact assessment. A possible extension of the scope of the directive to include these products and regulate their ingredients is among the various options being analysed. The Commission has not, at this stage, taken a final position on the preferred policy option.

When e-cigarettes are classified as medicinal products by Member States, such products are subject to an in-depth assessment of the effect and possible adverse reactions before the marketing authorisation is granted.

Currently, there is limited data available on the effects and side-effects of e-cigarettes. Analyses of electronic cigarettes conducted by the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) have shown that the vapour produced can contain carcinogens, including nitrosamines, toxic chemicals such as diethylene glycol and other tobacco specific components suspected of being harmful to humans <sup>(2)</sup>. The World Health Organisation (WHO) Study Group on Tobacco Product Regulation has concluded that there is concern that nicotine delivery to the lung might result in strong toxicological, physiological and addictive effects <sup>(3)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Directive 2001/37/EC of Parliament and of the Council of 5 June 2001 on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States concerning the manufacture, presentation and sale of tobacco products — Commission statement, OJ L 194, 18.7.2001.

<sup>(2)</sup> FDA: Summary of Results: Laboratory Analysis of Electronic Cigarettes Conducted By FDA. US: Food and Drug Administration (FDA), July 2009, <http://www.fda.gov/NewsEvents/PublicHealthFocus/ucm173146.htm>

<sup>(3)</sup> WHO Study Group on Tobacco Product Regulation, Report on the Scientific Basis of Tobacco Product Regulation: Third Report of a WHO Study Group, 2009.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001707/12**

**an die Kommission**

**Andreas Mölzer (NI)**

(13. Februar 2012)

*Betrifft:* Förderung von Schiefergasvorkommen

Schiefergas gilt als unkonventionelle Energiequelle, da die im Gestein gespeicherte und förderbare Gasmenge geringer ist als bei konventionellen Lagerstätten. Seit längerer Zeit wird bereits Schiefergas abgebaut. Dabei wird eine Vielzahl von (teilweise krebserregenden) Chemikalien eingesetzt, weshalb massive Umweltbedenken bestehen. Auch kann die Abdichtung des Bohrlochs gegenüber den grundwasserführenden Schichten nicht gewährleistet werden, wodurch salzhaltiges Wasser oder gesundheitsschädliche Hilfsstoffe beim Fracken in das Grundwasser gelangen können.

Die technologisch aufwendige Förderung von Schiefergasvorkommen wird erst durch steigende Erdgaspreise und dem Streben nach Energieunabhängigkeit als rentable Alternative angesehen. In einigen Teilen Europas (z. B. Österreich und Polen) soll nun die Schiefergasförderung vorangetrieben werden.

1. Wie ist die Haltung der Kommission zur Schiefergasförderung?
2. Gibt es auf EU-Ebene Forschungen hinsichtlich Umweltbedenken bei der Schiefergasförderung?
3. Falls ja, was sind die Ergebnisse?
4. Falls nein, sind solche Untersuchungen geplant?

**Antwort von Herrn Potočnik im Namen der Kommission**

(30. März 2012)

Die Kommission nimmt zur Exploration und Förderung von nichtkonventionellem Gas eine neutrale Haltung ein. Die Mitgliedstaaten selbst sind für die Entscheidungen über die Nutzung ihrer Energiequellen verantwortlich, vorausgesetzt, die EU-Rechtsvorschriften — einschließlich derer zum Schutz der Umwelt und der menschlichen Gesundheit — finden gebührende Berücksichtigung.

Die Kommission hat vor kurzem ihre rechtliche Beurteilung auf Grundlage der vorliegenden technischen Informationen abgeschlossen und kam zu dem Schluss, dass die bestehenden EU-Umweltvorschriften für die Exploration und Förderung von Schiefergas von der Planungsphase bis zur Einstellung der Förderung gelten. Zu diesem Zeitpunkt kann jedoch nicht endgültig entschieden werden, dass die bestehenden Vorschriften einen ausreichenden Schutz der Umwelt und der menschlichen Gesundheit sicherstellen, da die Erfahrung mit und das Wissen über solche Praktiken in den EU beschränkt sind.

Die Kommission hat eine Studie begonnen, die mögliche Umweltauswirkungen und -risiken der integrierten Nutzung von Hydrofracking und Richtbohrungen in großem Maßstab wie bei der Schiefergasgewinnung untersucht. Sie hat eine Arbeitsgruppe der Mitgliedstaaten eingerichtet, die als EU-weite Plattform für den Informationsaustausch über entscheidende Umweltaspekte von mit Schiefergas in Verbindung stehenden Praktiken und über die laufende Forschung auf nationaler Ebene zum Thema dient. Des Weiteren untersucht die Kommission die Auswirkungen solcher Praktiken auf Wasser- und Bodennutzung. Außerdem prüft sie die Stoffsicherheitsberichte in den Registrierungsdossiers einer Reihe von chemischen Stoffen, die allgemein beim Hydrofracking eingesetzt werden, um festzustellen, ob die Expositionsszenarien in solchen Berichten für Schiefergas-Operationen als angemessen angesehen werden können.

Alle diese Maßnahmen sind noch nicht abgeschlossen. Es liegen noch keine Ergebnisse vor. Die Kommission wird weitere Studien einleiten, sollte dies als notwendig erachtet werden.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001707/12  
to the Commission  
Andreas Mölzer (NI)  
(13 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Extraction of shale gas deposits

Shale gas is regarded as an unconventional energy source because the extractable volume of gas stored in rock is lower than in conventional deposits. The practice of shale gas extraction has long been in decline. Numerous chemicals are used in the process, some of them carcinogenic, and there are serious environmental concerns. Furthermore, it is not possible to guarantee that the well can be effectively sealed off from the strata carrying groundwater, so that saline solution or harmful auxiliary substances might enter the groundwater during extraction.

The technologically-complex extraction of shale gas is only seen as a profitable alternative in the context of rising natural gas prices and the quest for independent energy sources. There are reports of shale gas extraction now being promoted in some parts of Europe (e.g. Austria and Poland).

1. What is the position of the Commission on shale gas extraction?
2. Has there been any research at EU level in relation to environmental concerns regarding shale gas extraction?
3. If so, what are the results?
4. If not, are any such studies planned?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission  
(30 March 2012)**

The Commission is neutral regarding the exploration and production of unconventional gas. Member States are responsible for the decisions on the use of their energy resources, with due regard to the need to comply with EU legal requirements, including with regard to the environment and human health.

The Commission's legal assessment, based on the available technical information, has recently concluded that existing EU environmental legislation apply to shale gas exploration and production practices from the planning until cessation stage. It can however not conclude definitely at this stage that the existing legislation ensures a sufficient level of protection to the environment and human health, given limitations in experience and knowledge with such practices in the EU.

The Commission launched a study looking at potential environmental impacts and risks of the integrated use of high-volume hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling such as in shale gas extraction. It has set up a working group of Member States which serves as an EU-wide platform for information exchange on key environmental aspects and ongoing research at national level on shale gas related practices. The Commission is also examining the impacts on water and land use of such practices. It is also examining the Chemical Safety Reports of the registration files for a number of chemical substances generally used in hydraulic fracturing, in order to determine if the exposure scenarios included in such reports could be considered adequate for shale gas operations.

All of these activities are currently ongoing. Results are not yet available. The Commission will launch further studies, should this be deemed necessary.

---

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001708/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Andreas Mölzer (NI)**  
(13. Februar 2012)

*Betrifft:* Waffenlieferungen an die syrischen Rebellen

Beim UN-Sicherheitsrat in New York legten Russland und China ein Veto gegen eine Syrien-Resolution ein. Im Rahmen der Münchner Sicherheitskonferenz brachte US-Senator Joseph Lieberman den Vorschlag ein, der Westen solle Waffen an die Freie Syrische Armee, also an die Rebellen, liefern.

Wie steht die Kommission zu diesem Vorschlag, mit dem unter Umständen das Blutvergießen zunehmen und die Zahl der Flüchtlinge ansteigen würde?

**Antwort von Frau Catherine Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission**  
(21. Mai 2012)

Die EU wird sich auch weiterhin nachdrücklich für entschlossene Maßnahmen der Vereinten Nationen zur Erhöhung des internationalen Drucks auf das syrische Regime einsetzen. Sie fordert alle Mitglieder des Sicherheitsrates auf, ihrer Verantwortung nachzukommen und sich für ein Ende des Blutvergießens und für eine demokratische Zukunft in Syrien auszusprechen. In diesem Zusammenhang begrüßt die EU die Erklärung des Präsidenten des UN-Sicherheitsrates vom 20. März 2012, in der er dem gemeinsamen Sondergesandten der UN und der Liga der Arabischen Staaten, Kofi Annan, und seinem Sechs-Punkte-Plan für eine friedliche von Syrien selbst geleitete und umfassende Beilegung der Krise seine uneingeschränkte Unterstützung bekundet. Die EU bestärkt den Sicherheitsrat der Vereinten Nationen, in dieser Richtung weiterzuarbeiten.

Die EU hat gegenüber der Opposition mehrfach deutlich gemacht, dass sich die verschiedenen Gruppen klar zum Grundsatz der Gewaltlosigkeit bekennen müssen, angesichts der Tatsache, dass die Verbreitung von Waffen den Weg des künftigen syrischen Staates zu einer friedlichen Demokratie erschweren wird. Die EU appelliert an die Opposition, ihre Ziele auf politischer Ebene zu verfolgen.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001708/12  
to the Commission  
Andreas Mölzer (NI)  
(13 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Weapon shipments to the Syrian rebels

In the UN Security Council in New York, Russia and China vetoed a resolution on Syria. During the Munich Security Conference, US Senator Joseph Lieberman proposed that the West should supply weapons to the Free Syrian Army, in other words, to the rebels.

What is the Commission's position on this proposal, which could lead to further bloodshed and an increase in refugees?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission  
(21 May 2012)**

The EU will continue to press for strong UN action to increase international pressure on the Syrian regime. It urges all members of the Security Council to assume their responsibilities and speak out for an end to the bloodshed and a democratic future for Syria. In this respect, it welcomes the UN Security Council's Presidential Statement of 20 March 2012 pledging full support to the Joint UN-Arab League Special Envoy, Mr Kofi Annan, and his six point plan for a peaceful Syrian-led and inclusive settlement to the crisis. The EU encourages the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) to continue working in this direction.

In its messages to the opposition the EU has repeatedly made clear that the different groups must show a clear commitment to the principle of non-violence in the awareness that the proliferation of weapons will complicate the path of the future Syrian state towards a peaceful democracy. The EU encourages the opposition to pursue the political track for achieving its objectives.

---

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001709/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Andreas Mölzer (NI)**  
(13. Februar 2012)

*Betrifft:* Wirtschaftlicher Nutzen von Einwanderern

Seit Langem wird argumentiert, dass Einwanderer einen großen wirtschaftlichen Nutzen bringen würden, weil sie als Arbeitskräfte gebraucht würden und Jobs übernehmen, die die Einheimischen nicht machen wollten. Die Erfahrungen zeigen indessen, dass dies nur kurzfristig, nämlich nur so lange der Fall ist, bis aus Niedriglohnländern stammende Einwanderer innerhalb des Sozialstaates entsprechende Ansprüche erwerben, so dass Lohnersatzleistungen zur „lohnenden“ Alternative avancieren.

Die deutsche Bundesausländerbeauftragte veröffentlichte unlängst folgende Zahlen: Die Zahl der Ausländer ist in Deutschland von 1971 bis 2000 auf etwa 7,5 Millionen gestiegen. Hingegen hielt sich die Zahl der erwerbstätigen Ausländer bei rund zwei Millionen. Hier wurden also keine entsprechenden Zuwächse verzeichnet. Im Jahr 1973, als der Anwerbestopp erfolgte, lag die Beschäftigung von Einwanderern auf dem Arbeitsmarkt bei 65 %. Ein Jahrzehnt später betrug die Einwanderer-Beschäftigung nur noch 38 %. Da das Gros der Zuwanderung in die Bundesrepublik Deutschland seit dem Anwerbestopp über Familienzusammenführung erfolgte, resultierte somit keine Zuwanderung in den Arbeitsmarkt, sondern in die Sozialsysteme. Verdeutlicht wird dies auch durch die Arbeitslosenquote unter Ausländern (lt. Integrationsbeauftragte Maria Böhmer), die in Deutschland mit über 20 % doppelt so hoch ist wie jene der Einheimischen. In den Niederlanden leben zudem 40 % der Einwanderer überwiegend von Sozialleistungen.

1. Damit die Einwanderer für den Wohlfahrtsstaat tatsächlich von Nutzen sind — dies wird ja als ein Hauptargument dafür verwendet, dass Europa Zuwanderung brauche — müssten sie (und ihre Nachkommen) in die Sozialsysteme mehr einzahlen, als sie daraus erhalten. Wie steht die Kommission dazu, dass die Zahl der Ausländer in Deutschland von 1971 bis 2000 auf etwa 7,5 Millionen gestiegen ist, sich hingegen die Zahl der erwerbstätigen Ausländer bei rund zwei Millionen hielt?
2. Sieht die Kommission dieses Argument der für den Wohlfahrtsstaat (Finanzierung der Pensionen etc.) notwendigen Einwanderung angesichts der im Vergleich zur einheimischen Bevölkerung höheren Arbeitslosenzahlen und Abhängigkeit von Sozialleistungen nicht als widerlegt?

**Antwort von Herrn Andor im Namen der Kommission**  
(29. März 2012)

Nach Ansicht der Kommission beziehen sich die vom Herrn Abgeordneten beschriebenen Auswirkungen auf Arbeitsmarkt und Wohlfahrtsstaat auf spezielle Merkmale früherer Migrationstrends und -strategien in Deutschland. In den 1950er und 1960er Jahren nahm Deutschland viele gering qualifizierte Einwanderer auf, die damals für den Wiederaufbau und in der Industrie gebraucht wurden. Da die meisten dieser Einwanderer bei ihrer Ankunft jung waren, gründeten sie Familien und bekamen Kinder. Im Jahr 1973 entschied sich Deutschland für eine sehr restriktive Arbeitsmigrationspolitik. Der Großteil der damaligen Immigrantenströme bestand aus Personen, die von ihrem Recht auf Familiennachzug oder Asyl Gebrauch machten. Diese Entwicklungen erklären weitgehend die relativ geringen Auswirkungen dieser Immigranten auf den Arbeitsmarkt.

Laut den neuesten Eurostat-Daten für Deutschland beläuft sich die Zahl der erwerbstätigen Nicht-EU-Ausländer in der Altersgruppe der 15-64-Jährigen auf 2,1 Millionen, die Zahl der nicht erwerbstätigen Nicht-EU-Ausländer auf 315 000. Zwischen 2005 und 2010 ist die Beschäftigungsquote von Nicht-EU-Ausländern um fast 6 Prozentpunkte gestiegen. Außerdem sind die Beschäftigungsquoten von Migranten, die sich bereits seit längerer Zeit in einem Land aufhalten, deutlich höher als die von erst vor kurzem zugezogenen Migranten. Dies gilt für alle aufnehmenden EU-Länder einschließlich Deutschland (Beschäftigungsquoten von 69 bis 82 % nach einer Aufenthaltsdauer von acht Jahren). Integrationsmaßnahmen zeigen erhebliche Wirkung.

Allerdings sei daran erinnert, dass Deutschland erst im Jahr 2005 seine Migrationsvorschriften überarbeitet und Beschäftigungsmöglichkeiten für qualifizierte Migranten eröffnet hat. Die Erfahrung zeigt, dass sich die Migration in Ländern mit einer weniger restriktiven Arbeitsmigrationspolitik wie Kanada und Australien insgesamt positiv auf Gesellschaft und Arbeitsmarkt auswirkt.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001709/12  
to the Commission  
Andreas Mölzer (NI)  
(13 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Economic benefits of immigrants

It has long been argued that immigrants bring significant economic benefits because they are needed as labour and perform jobs that the native population is unwilling to perform. Experience shows, however, that this is only true in the short term, in other words, only until immigrants from low-wage countries acquire appropriate entitlements within the welfare state to make unemployment benefits a 'profitable' alternative.

The Federal Government Commissioner for Foreign Nationals recently published the following figures: the number of foreigners in Germany increased to approximately 7.5 million between 1971 and 2000. In contrast, the number of foreigners in employment remained at around two million. In other words, no corresponding increases were recorded. In 1973, when the halt in recruitment went into effect, the employment rate among immigrants in the labour market was 65 %. A decade later, employment among immigrants was only 38 %. Because most immigration to Germany since the halt in recruitment took place under the auspices of family reunification, the resulting increase in numbers affected the social security systems and not the labour market. This is also illustrated by the unemployment rate among foreigners in Germany (according to Commissioner for Foreign Nationals Maria Böhmer), which, at 20 %, is twice as high as the unemployment rate among German nationals. Furthermore, 40 % of immigrants in the Netherlands predominantly live on social welfare payments.

1. In order for immigrants to be a real benefit to the welfare state — used as a principal argument for Europe needing immigration — they (and their offspring) would have to pay more into the social security systems than they receive from them. How does the Commission view the fact that the number of foreigners in Germany increased to approximately 7.5 million between 1971 and 2000, while the number of foreigners in employment remained at around two million?
2. Does the Commission not think that the argument that immigration is needed for the good of the welfare state (to fund pensions, etc.) is refuted in view of the higher unemployment rates among immigrants and their greater dependence on welfare benefits compared to the native population?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission  
(29 March 2012)**

The Commission believes that the labour market and welfare outcomes presented by the Honourable Member relate to specific characteristics of past migration trends and policies in Germany. More specifically, during the 1950s and 1960s Germany has welcomed many low skilled immigrants needed at that time for its reconstruction and its industrial production. As most of those immigrants were young at the time of their arrival, they soon formed families and started raising children. In 1973, Germany opted towards a very restrictive labour migration policy. In turn, the bulk of immigrant flows arriving at that time were those making use of their family reunion and asylum rights. These developments explain to a large extent the relatively poor labour market outcomes of immigrants observed.

According to the latest Eurostat data for Germany, the number of non-EU foreigners in the age group 15-64 currently in employment is 2.1 million, while the number of the non-EU foreigners unemployed is 315 000. Between 2005 and 2010, the employment rate of the non-EU foreigners increased by almost 6 percentage points. Also, employment rates among settled migrants are substantially higher than those of recent migrants; this applies to all EU host countries, including Germany (participation rates going from 69 to 82 % after eight years of residence); integration policies have a marked impact.

However, it is worth remembering that it is only since 2005 that Germany has reviewed its migration legislation, opening some labour market pathways to skilled migrant workers. Evidence shows that in countries implementing more open labour migration policies, such as Canada and Australia, the social and labour market outcomes of the migrant population point to an overall positive experience.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001711/12**  
**alla Commissione**  
**Fiorello Provera (EFD)**  
(13 febbraio 2012)

**Oggetto:** Crisi da avvelenamento da piombo in Nigeria

Il 7 febbraio diversi mezzi di comunicazione hanno riferito di un'epidemia di avvelenamento da piombo verificatasi nello Stato di Zamfara, nell'area nord-occidentale della Nigeria. Alcuni la ritengono la peggiore epidemia di avvelenamento da piombo della storia moderna. Migliaia di bambini necessitano di cure mediche e, in base alle stime ufficiali, quattrocento bambini sono già morti.

Il problema è riconducibile alle modalità artigianali di estrazione dell'oro, che richiedono l'utilizzo di piombo. I bambini sono esposti alla polvere di piombo durante la fase di lavorazione del minerale; ciò ha causato la contaminazione dell'acqua e del cibo. Molte donne hanno subito aborti spontanei e sono sorti problemi di infertilità.

Il governo dello Stato di Zamfara, in collaborazione con organizzazioni quali Medici senza frontiere e i Centri statunitensi per il controllo delle malattie, ha preso in cura più di 1 500 bambini colpiti da avvelenamento acuto da piombo. Il piombo può causare danni a cervello, fegato, reni, nervi e stomaco. Può inoltre causare disabilità intellettive e dello sviluppo permanenti. In molti villaggi ubicati nello Stato di Zamfara, il tasso di mortalità dei bambini colpiti dall'avvelenamento si avvicina al 40 %. A Barega, uno di questi villaggi, almeno 2 000 bambini necessitano di cure. È stato segnalato che nelle miniere lavorano anche bambini di soli otto anni che vengono condotti nelle miniere per lavorare i minerali e utilizzano il mercurio per estrarre l'oro.

La convenzione n. 182 dell'Organizzazione internazionale del lavoro è finalizzata a proteggere i bambini che lavorano in condizioni pericolose, come, ad esempio, quelli esposti ad agenti e processi pericolosi. Il governo statale sta tentando di decontaminare con grandi sforzi le aree colpite; tuttavia, è difficile gestire la situazione senza finanziamenti, personale e competenze adeguati.

1. È la Commissione a conoscenza dei casi di avvelenamento da piombo nello Stato nigeriano di Zamfara?
2. È la Commissione pronta a unirsi alle iniziative di Medici senza frontiere e dei Centri statunitensi per il controllo delle malattie intese a curare i bambini esposti al piombo?
3. Sta la Commissione già adottando misure e, in caso affermativo, può fornire maggiori informazioni circa l'entità del problema nello Stato di Zamfara?
4. Quali misure può la Commissione adottare per contribuire all'attuazione di programmi volti a istruire le persone circa i rischi dell'avvelenamento da piombo, ma anche per fornire assistenza nell'elaborazione di piani per una gestione maggiormente sicura delle miniere?

**Risposta di Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione**  
(27 aprile 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza dell'epidemia di saturnismo che ha colpito lo Stato di Zamfara. Il dottor Henry Akpan, epidemiologo capo del ministero della Sanità nigeriano, ha annunciato la scoperta dell'epidemia il 4 giugno 2010. Un programma di immunizzazione annuale nella Nigeria settentrionale ha permesso di constatare l'elevato numero di bambini morti in seguito ad avvelenamento da piombo.

Il problema può avere conseguenze su tutti i familiari, soprattutto in tenera età, esposti alla polvere di piombo<sup>(1)</sup>. Médecins sans Frontières (MSF) sta cercando di trattare tutti i 3 000 bambini di età inferiore ai cinque anni in sette villaggi colpiti. L'altro problema fondamentale è la complessa questione della bonifica delle zone contaminate dal piombo: i bambini che tornano a casa dopo le cure vengono presto nuovamente contaminati se l'ambiente circostante non è stato ripulito dalle polveri di piombo.

<sup>(1)</sup> Incidenza del 95 % tra tutti i bambini sotto i cinque anni nei villaggi esaminati.

La Commissione ha appreso che sono state avviate iniziative volte a controllare l'attività mineraria e a renderla sicura. L'Organizzazione mondiale della sanità e MSF contribuiscono alle attività del ministero della Sanità nigeriano tese ad attenuare il fenomeno. Questa situazione cronica di avvelenamento da piombo provocato da pratiche pericolose di estrazione e trasformazione dei minerali è aggravata dall'estrema povertà locale e dalla mancanza di mezzi di sussistenza alternativi. È chiaro che gli aiuti umanitari a breve termine non rappresentano uno strumento di aiuto adeguato, ma l'attuale strategia nazionale con la Nigeria non lascia alcun margine per un'azione specifica nel settore minerario. Il 14 marzo 2012 <sup>(2)</sup> il commissario responsabile per lo sviluppo ha chiaramente indicato al Parlamento europeo che il sostegno alla Nigeria settentrionale per fronteggiare le attuali difficoltà avrebbe costituito una priorità della prossima strategia nazionale. Gli Stati membri hanno elaborato manuali e stanno fornendo formazione ai minatori che operano su scala ridotta o che utilizzano metodi di estrazione artigianali nella Nigeria settentrionale <sup>(3)</sup>.

È chiaro tuttavia che per risolvere il problema occorrerà prima migliorare le condizioni di vita della popolazione e ridurre la povertà nella parte settentrionale del paese — priorità fondamentale della collaborazione tra UE e Nigeria.

---

<sup>(2)</sup> Osservazioni conclusive in merito alla discussione in sessione plenaria sulla situazione in Nigeria.

<sup>(3)</sup> Ad esempio, il manuale per la Nigeria (ASM Handbook) pubblicato dal Geological Survey of Denmark and Greenland:  
<http://web.worldbank.org/external/projects/main?menuPK=64529586&pagePK=233757&piPK=233763&theSitePK=40941&Supplierid=188740>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001711/12  
to the Commission  
Fiorello Provera (EFD)  
(13 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Lead poisoning crisis in Nigeria

On 7 February a number of media sources reported on the lead poisoning epidemic in Nigeria's north western Zamfara State. Some are calling this the worst lead poisoning epidemic in modern history. Thousands of children require medical treatment and, according to official estimates, four hundred have already died.

The problem is due to artisanal gold mining, which requires the use of lead. Children are exposed to lead dust when ore is processed, which has led to the contamination of water and food. Many women suffer miscarriages and there is also a problem of infertility.

Zamfara's State government, in partnership with organisations such as Médecins sans frontières and the United States Centers for Disease Control, have treated more than 1 500 children with acute lead poisoning. Lead can cause damage to the brain, liver, kidney, nerves and stomach. It can also lead to permanent intellectual and development disabilities. The mortality rate is close to 40 % among children who suffer from lead poisoning in many villages across Zamfara State. In one village, Bagega, at least 2 000 children are in need of treatment. The children working in the mines have been recorded as young as eight. They are placed in mines, processing the ore, using mercury to extract the gold.

International Labour Organisation Convention No 182 aims to protect children from hazardous labour, such as exposure to hazardous, agents and processes. The state government is in the midst of trying to clean up the contaminated areas, but it is difficult to cope without adequate funds, personnel and expertise.

1. Is the Commission aware of cases of lead poisoning in Nigeria's Zamfara State?
2. Is the Commission prepared to join in the effort along with Médecins sans frontières and United States Centers for Disease Control in treating children affected by exposure to lead?
3. Is it already taking measures, and if so, can it offer some insight into the extent of the problem in Zamfara?
4. What steps is the Commission able to take in helping to implement programmes to educate people about the risks of lead poisoning, but also working to assist in creating safer mining schemes?

**Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission  
(27 April 2012)**

The Commission is fully aware of the lead poisoning in Zamfara State. Nigeria's chief epidemiologist Dr Henry Akpan announced the discovery of the epidemic on 4 June 2010. An annual immunization programme in Northern Nigeria led to the discovery of the high number of child deaths from lead poisoning.

This problem can affect all family members, especially young children, exposed to the lead-dust <sup>(1)</sup>. Médecins sans frontières (MSF) is trying to target all of the 3 000 children less than five years of age in seven affected villages. The other main problem is the complex issue of the cleaning-up of lead contamination. Children returning home after treatment are quickly re-contaminated if the local environment has not been cleaned of lead dust.

<sup>(1)</sup> 95 % incidence amongst all less than five years in the affected villages screened.

The Commission understands that efforts to control the mining activity and to make it safe have started. The World Health Organisation and MSF are helping the Nigerian Ministry of Health to mitigate this. This chronic situation of lead poisoning from hazardous mining and ore-processing practices is aggravated by deep local poverty and lack of alternative livelihoods. It is clear that short-term humanitarian aid is not the appropriate aid instrument. However, the current Country Strategy with Nigeria does not leave any room for a specific action on mining. The Commissioner responsible for Development clearly indicated in Parliament on 14 March 2012 <sup>(1)</sup> that support to Northern Nigeria as a response to the ongoing trouble would be a priority in the next Country Strategy. Member States have produced handbooks and are providing training for small and artisanal miners in Northern Nigeria <sup>(2)</sup>.

However, it is clear that this problem will not be solved without improved livelihoods and reduced poverty in Northern Nigeria — key priority for the EU's collaboration with Nigeria.

---

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Closing remarks on the Nigeria debate in the plenary session.

<sup>(2)</sup> Ex. The ASM Handbook for Nigeria issued by the Geographical survey of Denmark and Greenland:  
<http://web.worldbank.org/external/projects/main?menuPK=64529586&pagePK=233757&piPK=233763&theSitePK=40941&Supplierid=188740>

*(Versione italiana)*

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001713/12  
alla Commissione  
Elisabetta Gardini (PPE)  
(13 febbraio 2012)**

**Oggetto:** Conseguenze del freddo sull'efficacia dei farmaci

In riferimento all'ondata di gelo che ha colpito l'Europa nelle ultime settimane, la stampa italiana riporta come la naturale vasocostrizione stimolata dal freddo abbia l'effetto di ridurre gli effetti dei medicinali assunti: con le basse temperature, infatti, l'efficacia di alcune terapie può venire compromessa.

Alla luce di quanto sopra esposto, intende la Commissione confermare l'effetto provocato dal freddo sull'efficacia dei medicinali? In caso affermativo, intende la Commissione adoperarsi affinché venga lanciata una campagna divulgativa sul tema?

**Risposta data da John Dalli a nome della Commissione  
(16 marzo 2012)**

Un prodotto medicinale può essere immesso sul mercato dell'Unione europea soltanto dopo che gli sia stata concessa un'autorizzazione alla commercializzazione conformemente alla legislazione farmaceutica <sup>(1)</sup>, dopo che se ne siano valutate la qualità, la sicurezza e l'efficacia e che si è giunti alla conclusione che esso presenta un equilibrio positivo tra rischi e benefici. L'autorizzazione alla commercializzazione contiene anche le informazioni sul prodotto ammesse, tra cui le indicazioni, la posologia, le controindicazioni, le precauzioni particolari e gli avvertimenti legati all'uso.

La Commissione concede l'autorizzazione alla commercializzazione per il tramite di una procedura centralizzata in cui rientrano in particolare le nuove sostanze attive. Le competenze degli Stati membri comprendono l'autorizzazione alla commercializzazione dei medicinali attraverso altre procedure (riconoscimento reciproco, procedura decentralizzata, nazionale), la regolamentazione della pubblicità e le decisioni in tema di prezzi/rimborsi. L'autorizzazione alla commercializzazione di medicinali usati in condizioni di freddo e aventi un effetto vaso-costrittore quale principale meccanismo d'azione è stata concessa dagli Stati membri.

Alla Commissione non è stata segnalata nessuna sollecitudine specifica quanto all'efficacia dei medicinali usati in condizioni di freddo affinché essa proceda al riesame a livello di UE. Per tale motivo la Commissione non prevede di condurre un riesame o una campagna legati all'efficacia di questi medicinali nella stagione fredda.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Regolamento (CE) n. 726/2004 che istituisce procedure comunitarie per l'autorizzazione e la sorveglianza dei medicinali per uso umano e veterinario e che istituisce l'Agenzia europea per i medicinali, GU L 136 del 30.4.2004, e successive modifiche, direttiva 2001/83/CE recante un codice comunitario relativo ai medicinali per uso umano, GU L 311 del 28.11.2001, e successive modifiche.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001713/12  
to the Commission**

**Elisabetta Gardini (PPE)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* Impact of the cold on the effectiveness of medicines

In the context of the cold snap that has struck Europe in recent weeks, the Italian press has reported that natural vasoconstriction caused by the cold weather may reduce the effect of medicines taken and that low temperatures may undermine the effectiveness of certain forms of treatment..

In the light of this, does the Commission intend to take steps to confirm that the cold does have an impact on the effectiveness of medicines? If so, will the Commission launch an awareness-raising campaign on the matter?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission**

(16 March 2012)

A medicinal product can be placed on the European Union market only after a marketing authorisation has been granted in accordance with the pharmaceutical legislation <sup>(1)</sup>, after its quality, safety and efficacy have been evaluated and a positive benefit-risk balance related to its use has been concluded. Product information which includes approved indications, posology, contraindications, special precautions and warnings related to its use, is annexed to a marketing authorisation.

The Commission grants marketing authorisations via a centralised procedure, under the scope of which fall particularly new active substances. Member States competencies include marketing authorisation of medicinal products via other procedures (mutual recognition, decentralised, national), regulation of advertisement and pricing/reimbursement decisions. Marketing authorisation of medicinal products used in common cold, with a vasoconstrictive effect as their main mechanism of action, have been granted by Member States.

No specific concern related to the efficacy of medicinal products used in common cold has been referred to the Commission for an EU level review. Therefore the Commission does not plan any review or campaign related to efficacy of these medicinal products in relation to the cold season.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 laying down Community procedures for the authorisation and supervision of medicinal products for human and veterinary use and establishing a European Medicines Agency, OJ L 136, 30.4.2004, as amended, Directive 2001/83/EC on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use, OJ L 311, 28.11.2001, as amended.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001714/12  
alla Commissione  
Elisabetta Gardini (PPE)  
(13 febbraio 2012)**

Oggetto: Fondi della DG Salute

In tempi di crisi economica e di ricorrenti tagli ai bilanci, i fondi provenienti dall'Unione europea rappresentano spesso una vera e propria boccata d'ossigeno. Oltre a questo, i fondi a disposizione della DG Salute e Politica dei Consumatori hanno un'intrinseca importanza per la delicatezza delle tematiche toccate.

In riferimento a quanto precede, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. a quali progetti sono già stati assegnati i fondi;
2. che parte spetta all'Italia;
3. a che livello di saturazione è il budget della DG Salute e Politica dei Consumatori?

**Risposta data da John Dalli a nome della Commissione  
(16 aprile 2012)**

I programmi di lavoro Consumatori e Salute nonché i programmi di eradicazione e sorveglianza per l'anno 2012 sono stati adottati dalla Commissione alla fine del 2011 e sono attualmente in corso di realizzazione. Non è pertanto possibile in questa fase precoce fornire dati relativi al 2012. Si riportano più oltre i dati richiesti relativi al 2011.

Per quanto concerne i finanziamenti di progetti nell'ambito dei vari programmi, il programma Salute ha consacrato 29,8 milioni di euro al cofinanziamento di progetti mediante sovvenzioni. I particolari sono disponibili sul sito <http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html>. Il programma Consumatori ha destinato a sua volta 11 milioni di euro a progetti. Per quanto concerne il bilancio relativo alla sicurezza alimentare, alla salute degli animali e alla salute delle piante, esso ha stanziato 312 milioni di euro, ripartiti come segue, attraverso sistemi di rimborso dei costi sostenuti dagli Stati membri:

- 236 milioni di euro per programmi di eradicazione e sorveglianza,
- 13 milioni di euro per misure veterinarie,
- 10 milioni di euro per interventi di emergenza,
- 21 milioni di euro per misure fitosanitarie,
- e quasi 30 milioni di euro per i controlli degli alimenti e dei mangimi.

Per quanto concerne le quote fornite ai beneficiari in Italia, il programma Salute ha concesso una sovvenzione per un importo di 273 415 milioni di euro a un'organizzazione italiana. I beneficiari italiani hanno ricevuto inoltre crediti per contratti pari a 509 170 euro. Inoltre, per il tramite del programma Consumatori, le autorità italiane hanno ricevuto 16 800 nel contesto delle azioni congiunte degli Stati membri nel campo della cooperazione per la tutela dei consumatori, e il Centro europeo consumatori italiano ha ricevuto una sovvenzione di 260 200 euro. Il bilancio per la sicurezza alimentare, la salute degli animali e la salute delle piante è stato assegnato all'Italia in base alle seguenti ripartizioni:

- 24 milioni di euro per programmi di eradicazione e sorveglianza,
- 0,5 milioni di euro per interventi d'emergenza,
- 0,5 milioni di euro per misure fitosanitarie,
- e quasi 1 milione di euro per i controlli dei mangimi e degli alimenti.

Per quanto concerne il grado di impegno del bilancio della Direzione generale Salute e consumatori, la situazione è illustrata nella seguente tabella:

	Disponibile nel 2011	Impegnato nel 2011
Salute	EUR 50,7 milioni	EUR 50,3 milioni
Consumatori	EUR 21,8 milioni	EUR 21,8 milioni
Mangimi e alimenti	EUR 330,1 milioni	EUR 313,4 milioni

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001714/12  
to the Commission**

**Elisabetta Gardini (PPE)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* Directorate-General for Health funds

In times of economic crisis and frequent budget cuts, EU funds are often a real boost. In addition, the funds at the disposal of the Directorate-General for Health and Consumers are vitally important due to the sensitivity of the issues involved.

With reference to the above, can the Commission state:

1. Which projects have been allocated funds?
2. What portion is due to Italy?
3. How much of the budget of the Directorate-General for Health and Consumers is already committed?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission**

(16 April 2012)

The Consumers and Health Work Programmes as well as the Eradication and Surveillance Programmes for the year 2012 were adopted by the Commission at the end of 2011 and are currently being implemented. It is therefore not possible at this early stage to provide data for 2012. Below is the requested data for the year 2011.

As regards funds allocated to projects per programme, the Health Programme dedicated EUR 29.8 million to co-financing projects through grants. Details are available at <http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html>. The Consumers Programme further dedicated EUR 11 million to projects. As for the budget for food safety, animal health and plant health, it allocated EUR 312 million as follows mainly through systems of reimbursement of costs incurred by the Member States:

- EUR 236 million for eradication and surveillance programmes,
- EUR 13 million for veterinary measures,
- EUR 10 million for emergency actions,
- EUR 21 million for plant health measures,
- and almost EUR 30 million for food and feed control.

As regards the share provided to beneficiaries in Italy, the Health Programme provided a grant worth EUR 27 341 5 million to an Italian organisation. Italian beneficiaries have further received credits for contracts for an amount of EUR 509 170. In addition, through the Consumers Programme, Italian authorities received EUR 16 800 in the context of joint Member States' actions in the field of consumer protection cooperation, and the Italian European Consumer Centre received a grant of EUR 260 200. The budget for food safety, Animal health and plant health was allocated to Italy as follows:

- EUR 24 million for eradication and surveillance programmes,
- EUR 0.5 million for emergency actions,
- EUR 0.5 million for plant health measures,
- and almost EUR 1 million for food and feed control.

As regards how much of the budget of the Directorate-General for Health and Consumers is already committed, the situation is detailed in the table below.

	Available in 2011	Committed in 2011
Health	EUR 50.7 million	EUR 50.3 million
Consumers	EUR 21.8 million	EUR 21.8 million
Feed and food	EUR 330.1 million	EUR 313.4 million

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001715/12  
alla Commissione  
Elisabetta Gardini (PPE)  
(13 febbraio 2012)**

Oggetto: Fondo di Solidarietà e maltempo

I contributi provenienti dal Fondo di Solidarietà hanno l'obiettivo di aiutare gli Stati membri a riprendersi dai danni provocati da calamità naturali. Risulterebbero quindi di particolare aiuto in una situazione come quella attuale, in cui gli Stati membri sono colpiti violentemente dall'ondata di neve e gelo.

In riferimento a quanto precede, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se la dotazione del Fondo può essere utilizzata anche per aiutare gli Stati colpiti dalla recente ondata di maltempo;
2. quale eventuale quota del Fondo di Solidarietà spetta all'Italia, Stato membro in cui le nevicate hanno provocato, oltre a un elevato numero di decessi, innumerevoli disagi?

**Risposta data da Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione  
(12 marzo 2012)**

I disastri causati da condizioni meteorologiche avverse come, ad esempio, inverni eccezionalmente rigorosi, sono, in linea di principio, ammissibili per un'assistenza del Fondo di solidarietà se sono rispettate le condizioni stabilite nel regolamento 2012/2002 del Consiglio che istituisce il Fondo di solidarietà dell'Unione europea. Per mobilitare il Fondo di solidarietà le autorità nazionali dello Stato colpito devono presentare domanda alla Commissione entro 10 settimane dal primo danno causato dalla catastrofe. Il Fondo può essere mobilitato se il danno diretto totale provocato dalla catastrofe supera una soglia che, per l'Italia, è fissata a 3 miliardi di euro a prezzi del 2002, vale a dire a 3,607 miliardi di euro a prezzi correnti. Se il danno è più contenuto il Fondo può essere mobilitato soltanto in via eccezionale e qualora sia dimostrato nella domanda che la catastrofe ha colpito la maggior parte della popolazione della regione interessata e ha comportato profonde e durevoli ripercussioni sulle condizioni di vita dei cittadini e sulla stabilità economica della regione stessa. La Commissione ha già incontrato le autorità italiane per discutere le condizioni e le procedure in merito a un'eventuale domanda legata al recente disastro causato dalle nevicate e dal freddo intenso.

Se la Commissione accerta che una domanda soddisfa i criteri per mobilitare il Fondo di solidarietà, essa propone un aiuto per un importo calcolato sulla base dei danni riscontrati in relazione alla soglia del danno. A seconda dei casi, l'aiuto ammonta di norma al 2,5 %-3,5 % del danno diretto totale. L'importo dell'aiuto proposto deve essere approvato dal Parlamento europeo e dal Consiglio prima di poter essere versato.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001715/12  
to the Commission**

**Elisabetta Gardini (PPE)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* Solidarity Fund and bad weather

The purpose of Solidarity Fund aid is to help Member States recover from the damage caused by natural disasters. It would therefore be of particular help in situations such as those currently faced by Member States which have been severely affected by a wave of snow and cold weather.

With reference to the above, can the Commission state:

1. whether the Fund's resources could also be used to help Member States affected by the recent wave of bad weather;
2. what portion of the Solidarity Fund could potentially be allocated to Italy, a Member State in which the snow has caused countless difficulties in addition to a high number of deaths?

**Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission**

(12 March 2012)

Disasters caused by adverse weather conditions such as exceptionally hard winters are, in principle, eligible for Solidarity Fund assistance, if the conditions laid down in Council Regulation 2012/2002 establishing the European Union Solidarity Fund are met. In order to mobilise the Solidarity Fund, the national authorities of the affected State have to submit an application to the Commission within 10 weeks of the first damage caused by the disaster. The Fund can be mobilised if total direct damage caused by the disaster exceeds a threshold which for Italy is defined as EUR 3 billion in 2002 prices, i.e. EUR 3.607 billion in current prices. If the damage is lower, the Fund could only be mobilised very exceptionally and if it is demonstrated in the application that the disaster affects the majority of the population in the region concerned and has serious and lasting repercussions on living conditions and the economic stability of the affected region. The Commission has already met with the Italian authorities to discuss the conditions and procedures for a possible application regarding the recent disaster from snow and cold weather.

If the Commission assesses that an application meets the criteria for mobilising the Solidarity Fund, it proposes an amount of aid calculated on the basis of damage caused in relation to the damage threshold. Depending on the case, aid normally represents between 2.5 % and 3.5 % of total direct damage. The amount of aid proposed has to be approved by the European Parliament and the Council before it can be paid out.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001716/12  
alla Commissione  
Elisabetta Gardini (PPE)  
(13 febbraio 2012)**

Oggetto: Fondi per il ripristino di opere d'arte

La parte dei fondi destinata al ripristino d'opere d'arte rappresenta probabilmente la fetta più importante di tutti i fondi riservati alla DG Istruzione, Cultura, Multilinguismo e Gioventù. L'Italia, nota in tutto il mondo per il suo patrimonio culturale, è particolarmente interessata alle modalità di assegnazione di questi fondi.

In riferimento a quanto precede, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. a quali progetti sono già stati assegnati i fondi;
2. che parte spetta all'Italia;
3. a che livello di saturazione è il budget della DG Istruzione, Cultura, Multilinguismo e Gioventù?

**Risposta data da Androulla Vassiliou a nome della Commissione  
(16 aprile 2012)**

1. La Commissione attribuisce la massima importanza alla salvaguardia del patrimonio culturale europeo. Tuttavia, la manutenzione, la tutela, la conservazione e il restauro del retaggio culturale rientrano essenzialmente nelle responsabilità nazionali.

La Commissione sostiene tuttavia attività di cooperazione culturale per il tramite del programma Cultura. Nel 2011 il programma Cultura ha recato sostegno a 68 progetti nel campo del patrimonio culturale. L'elenco dei progetti sovvenzionati è disponibile all'indirizzo: [http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/projects-and-actions-supported\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/projects-and-actions-supported_en.htm)

Nell'ambito di questo programma la Commissione reca inoltre un sostegno ai Premi UE del patrimonio culturale, che interessano anche il restauro di opere d'arte e intendono essere il riconoscimento di grandi risultati raggiunti nel campo della conservazione, della ricerca, dei servizi resi da singoli e gruppi, dell'istruzione, della formazione e della sensibilizzazione. Dal 2003 sono stati 18 i progetti italiani a vincere questo premio.

2. I finanziamenti nell'ambito del programma Cultura non seguono una ripartizione per paese poiché i progetti sono selezionati esclusivamente sulla base della loro qualità in seguito a inviti a presentare proposte e a concorsi di selezione.

3. Sul bilancio stanziato per progetti dal programma Cultura nel 2011 (53 milioni di euro), circa 3 milioni di euro sono stati assegnati a progetti la cui tematica principale è il patrimonio culturale. Si noti tuttavia che nell'ambito di questo programma i progetti sono valutati esclusivamente sulla base della loro qualità e il bilancio non è ripartito in base a tematiche specifiche.

---



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001716/12  
to the Commission**

**Elisabetta Gardini (PPE)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* Funds for the restoration of works of art

Funding for the restoration of works of art probably accounts for the largest share of the funds available to the Directorate-General for Education, Culture, Multilingualism and Youth. Italy, which is known throughout the world for its cultural heritage, is particularly interested in how these funds are allocated.

With reference to the above, can the Commission state:

1. to which projects funds have already been allocated;
2. what portion of the funding is earmarked for Italy;
3. how much of the budget of the Directorate-General for Education, Culture, Multilingualism and Youth has already been committed?

**Answer given by Mrs Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission**

(16 April 2012)

1. The Commission holds the safeguarding of European cultural heritage to be of the utmost importance. However, the upkeep, protection, conservation and renovation of cultural heritage are primarily a national responsibility.

Nevertheless, the Commission supports cultural cooperation activities through the Culture Programme. In 2011, the Culture Programme supported 68 projects in the field of cultural heritage. The list of supported projects is available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/projects-and-actions-supported\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/projects-and-actions-supported_en.htm)

Within the framework of this programme, the Commission also supports the EU Prizes for cultural heritage, including restoration of works of art, which highlight extraordinary achievement in the field of conservation, research, dedicated service and education, training and awareness raising. Since 2003, 18 Italian projects have won this Prize.

2. Funds under the Culture Programme are not earmarked for any particular country as projects are only selected on the basis of their quality, further to calls for proposals and a competitive selection process.

3. Of the budget allocated to projects from the Culture Programme in 2011 (EUR 53 million), around EUR 3 million were assigned to projects having cultural heritage as their main theme. It should be noted, however, that within this programme projects are only assessed on the basis of their quality and the budget is not earmarked according to specific themes.

---

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001717/12  
do Komisji**

**Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR)**

(13 lutego 2012 r.)

*Przedmiot:* Działania rządu RP w zakresie ustawodawstwa dotyczącego GMO

Czy w czasie polskiej prezydencji Rząd Polski zwracał się do Komisji z inicjatywami zmian w zakresie ustawodawstwa dotyczącego genetycznie modyfikowanych organizmów (GMO)?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Johna Dallego w imieniu Komisji**

(22 marca 2012 r.)

Polska nie przedłożyła Komisji żadnych wniosków w sprawie zmiany prawodawstwa UE dotyczącego organizmów zmodyfikowanych genetycznie (GMO). Sprawując prezydencję UE Polska przewodniczyła kilku posiedzeniom grupy roboczej ad-hoc do spraw GMO w ramach Rady zorganizowanym w celu omówienia wniosku dotyczącego rozporządzenia Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady zmieniającego dyrektywę 2001/18/WE<sup>(1)</sup> w zakresie umożliwienia państwom członkowskim ograniczenia lub zakazania uprawy organizmów zmodyfikowanych genetycznie na swoim terytorium. Komisja proponuje Szanownemu Panu Posłowi zwrócić się bezpośrednio do Sekretariatu Rady w celu uzyskania bardziej szczegółowych informacji w tej kwestii.

---

(<sup>1</sup>) Dz.U. L 106 z 17.4.2001.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001717/12  
to the Commission**

**Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* Measures taken by the Polish Government with regard to legislation on GMOs

Were any initiatives submitted to the Commission by the Polish Government during the Polish Presidency with a view to amending legislation on genetically modified organisms (GMOs)?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission**

(22 March 2012)

Poland did not submit to the Commission any initiatives with a view to amending the EU legislation on Genetically Modified Organisms (GMO). In its role of Presidency, Poland chaired several meetings of the Council ad-hoc Working Party on GMOs to discuss the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Directive 2001/18/EC<sup>(1)</sup> as regards the possibility for the Member States to restrict or prohibit the cultivation of GMOs in their territory. The Commission invites the Honourable Member to contact directly the General Secretariat of the Council to get more details in this respect.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 106, 17.4.2001.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001718/12  
do Rady**

**Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR)**

(13 lutego 2012 r.)

*Przedmiot:* Działania polskiej prezydencji w zakresie ustawodawstwa dotyczącego GMO

Czy polska prezydencja podejmowała jakieś inicjatywy w zakresie zmiany ustawodawstwa dotyczącego genetycznie modyfikowanych organizmów (GMO)?

**Odpowiedź**

(12 kwietnia 2012 r.)

Rada chciałaby poinformować Pana Posła, że istnieje tylko jeden wniosek ustawodawczy (Rada nie przeprowadziła jeszcze analizy tego wniosku w pierwszym czytaniu) mianowicie: wniosek w sprawie rozporządzenia Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady zmieniającego dyrektywę 2001/18/WE w zakresie umożliwienia państwom członkowskim ograniczenia lub zakazania uprawy organizmów zmodyfikowanych genetycznie na swoim terytorium <sup>(1)</sup>.

Podczas polskiej prezydencji Rada prowadziła kompleksowe dyskusje w tej sprawie. W świetle tych dyskusji polska prezydencja przygotowała teksty kompromisowe, po to by uwzględnić kilka ważnych poprawek, które zostały przyjęte przez Parlament Europejski w lipcu 2011 r.

W grudniu 2011 r. Rada doceniła dokonane postępy i uznała kompromisowy wniosek polskiej prezydencji za dający techniczną podstawę do kontynuowania tej pracy przez nadchodzącą prezydencję duńską <sup>(2)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Dok. 12371/10 ADD 1.

<sup>(2)</sup> Dok. 18786/11.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001718/12  
to the Council**

**Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* Measures taken by the Polish Presidency with regard to legislation on GMOs

Has the Polish Presidency taken any initiatives with a view to amending legislation on genetically modified organisms (GMOs)?

**Reply**

(12 April 2012)

The Council would like to inform the Honourable Member that there is only one legislative proposal whose examination at first reading is pending in the Council: the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Directive 2001/18/EC as regards the possibility for the Member States to restrict or prohibit the cultivation of GMOs in their territory <sup>(1)</sup>.

During the Polish Presidency, the Council held comprehensive discussions on this matter. In the light of these discussions, the Polish Presidency prepared compromise texts, with a view to taking into account the set of amendments which had been adopted by the European Parliament in July 2011.

In December 2011, the Council acknowledged the progress made and considered that the Polish Presidency's compromise proposal provided the incoming Danish Presidency with the technical basis to pursue this work <sup>(2)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> 12371/10 ADD 1.

<sup>(2)</sup> 18786/11.

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer P-001719/12  
to the Commission**

**William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)**

*(16 February 2012)*

*Subject:* Financial transaction tax

According to the 'Pacte Colonial' with France, the CFA/CAF countries in Africa have to deposit some 80 % of their foreign currency reserves with the French Treasury, which then invests these reserves on the Paris Bourse.

Are these transactions by the French Treasury subject to the proposed financial transaction tax?

**Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission**

*(8 March 2012)*

Under the Commission Proposal on Financial Transaction Tax (COM(2011)594), essentially the purchase and sale of financial instruments and the conclusion or modification of derivatives agreements are subject to Financial Transaction Tax (FTT). This is on the condition that at least one party to the transaction is established in a Member State and that a financial institution established in the territory of a Member State is party to the transaction, acting either on its own account or for the account of another person, or is acting in the name of a party to the transaction. The underlying concepts, which are critical for the application of the proposed tax, are defined in the proposal, notably the concepts of 'financial transaction' and 'financial institution'.

The information at the Commission's disposal in regard to the operations referred to by the Honourable Member does not allow it to judge whether, in view of all the requirements set out in the draft Directive, the transactions carried out by the French Treasury referred to by the Honourable Member would be subject to the proposed FTT.

---

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001720/12  
al Consejo**

**Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)**

(13 de febrero de 2012)

*Asunto:* Instrumentos de riesgo compartido

La propuesta de reforma del Reglamento del Consejo n° 1083/2006, según la cual se modifican ciertas disposiciones sobre los instrumentos de distribución de riesgo que pueden usar aquellos Estados miembros que padecen graves dificultades de estabilidad financiera, dice en su página 2 de la explicación de la reforma que: «Por otra parte, los proyectos de infraestructuras necesarios para la recuperación económica de los Estados miembros en cuestión también pueden recibir ayudas si se considera oportuno.»

Por otra parte, el pasado 19 de Octubre la Comisión Europea presentó el mapa de *Trans-European Transport Network* (TEN-T) para el sector ferroviario. Como afirma la Comisión en su página web: «El establecimiento de una eficiente red transeuropea de transporte (RTE-T) ha constituido un elemento clave en la estrategia renovada de Lisboa para la competitividad y el empleo en Europa y jugará un papel igualmente fundamental en la consecución de los objetivos de la Estrategia Europa 2020.

Si Europa quiere cumplir con su potencial económico y social, es esencial para construir los enlaces que faltan y eliminar los cuellos de botella en nuestra infraestructura de transporte, así como para garantizar la sostenibilidad futura de nuestras redes de transporte, teniendo en cuenta las necesidades de eficiencia energética y la desafíos del cambio climático.»

Así pues, la rápida construcción del TEN-T es fundamental para la consecución de un crecimiento sostenible en Europa.

A la luz de todo lo anterior,

¿Qué opina el Consejo de la posibilidad de utilizar estos mecanismos de riesgo compartido para financiar infraestructuras del TEN-T en los Estados miembros con graves dificultades de estabilidad financiera?

**Respuesta**

(12 de abril de 2012)

El 14 de octubre de 2011, la Comisión presentó una propuesta de Reglamento del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo por el que se modifica el Reglamento (CE) n° 1083/2006 en lo que se refiere a determinadas disposiciones relativas a los instrumentos de riesgo compartido para los Estados miembros que sufren, o corren el riesgo de sufrir, graves dificultades en relación con su estabilidad financiera <sup>(1)</sup>.

Esta propuesta prevé que las operaciones subvencionables en virtud de un instrumento de riesgo compartido deben ser los grandes proyectos que ya hayan sido objeto de una decisión de la Comisión en virtud del artículo 41 del Reglamento (CE) n° 1083/2006, u otros proyectos cofinanciados por el Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Regional o el Fondo de Cohesión y cubiertos por un programa operativo, en los casos en que dichos proyectos no reciban la financiación adecuada por parte de inversores privados. Además, las operaciones también pueden ser subvencionables cuando contribuyan a los objetivos del marco estratégico nacional de referencia y a las directrices estratégicas comunitarias para la cohesión, reforzando el crecimiento y la recuperación económica del Estado miembro que haya solicitado hacer uso del instrumento de riesgo compartido para los proyectos seleccionados.

El Consejo está estudiando la propuesta y por lo tanto aún no ha adoptado su posición.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> 15527/11.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001720/12  
to the Council**

**Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* Risk-sharing instruments

The proposal to amend Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006, which modifies certain provisions on risk-sharing instruments that may be used by Member States experiencing serious difficulties with respect to their financial stability, states on page 2 of the introduction that: 'In addition, infrastructure projects relevant in the context of the economic recovery of the Member States concerned can also be supported if considered appropriate'.

In addition, on 19 October 2011 the Commission presented the map of the Trans-European Transport Network (TEN-T) for the railway sector. As the Commission states on its website: 'Establishing an efficient trans-European transport network (TEN-T) has constituted a key element in the relaunched Lisbon strategy for competitiveness and employment in Europe and will play an equally central role in the attainment of the objectives of the Europe 2020 strategy. If Europe is to fulfil its economic and social potential, it is essential to build the missing links and remove the bottlenecks in our transport infrastructure, as well as to ensure the future sustainability of our transport networks by taking into account energy efficiency needs and climate change challenges'.

The rapid construction of TEN-T is therefore crucial in order to achieve sustainable growth in Europe.

In light of the above:

What does the Council think of the possibility of using these risk-sharing instruments to finance TEN-T infrastructures in Member States facing grave difficulties with respect to their financial stability?

**Reply**

(12 April 2012)

On 14 October 2011, the Commission forwarded a proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 as regards certain provisions relating to risk-sharing instruments for Member States experiencing or threatened with serious difficulties with respect to their financial stability<sup>(1)</sup>.

This proposal envisages that the operations eligible under a risk-sharing instrument should be major projects that have already been subject to a Commission decision under Article 41 of Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006, or other projects co-financed by the European Regional Development Fund or the Cohesion Fund and covered by an operational programme, in cases where these projects do not receive adequate financing from private investors. In addition, operations could also be eligible where they contribute to the objectives of the National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF) and the Community Strategic Guidelines (CSG) on cohesion by supporting the growth and economic recovery of the Member State that has requested to make use of the risk-sharing instrument for selected projects.

The Council is currently examining the proposal and so has not yet adopted its position.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> 15527/11.



(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001722/12  
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta / Alta Representante)  
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)  
(13 de febrero de 2012)**

*Asunto:* VP/HR — Conflicto de las Malvinas e incidencia en las relaciones bilaterales Unión Europea-Mercosur

El Reino Unido, con su falta de voluntad para dialogar sobre la instalación y mantenimiento de una base militar en las Islas Malvinas, bajo su jurisdicción, en un conflicto no resuelto entre el Reino Unido y la República Argentina, incumple las Resoluciones de las Naciones Unidas, y la reanudación de maniobras militares y aéreas pone en peligro la paz de la zona.

— ¿Cuáles son las medidas preventivas ya tomadas por el Servicio de Acción Exterior Europeo?

— ¿Cuáles serán las medidas adicionales concretamente, en caso de que el Reino Unido persista en su posición?

— ¿Cuáles son los mecanismos de los que la Alta Representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad dispone, en caso de que un Estado miembro, sin consulta de los demás Estados miembros, realice iniciativas de tipo bélico que cuestionen las relaciones bilaterales regionales?

— ¿Cuáles son los mecanismos previstos en la Decisión 90/530/CEE del Consejo, de 8 de octubre de 1990, relativa a la celebración del Acuerdo marco de cooperación comercial y económica entre la Comunidad Económica Europea y la República Argentina, para solucionar conflictos como el presente?

— ¿Cuáles son los mecanismos que la Unión Europea y la República Argentina proponen para la posible conclusión de un Acuerdo de Asociación con el Mercosur?

— ¿De qué manera y en qué aspectos influye el conflicto en las negociaciones de un Acuerdo de Asociación con el Mercosur, teniendo en cuenta que la República Argentina ejerce la presidencia de turno del Mercosur hasta el primero de julio de 2012?

**Respuesta de la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión  
(10 de mayo de 2012)**

Las Islas Malvinas constituyen uno de los 25 países y territorios de ultramar (PTU) fuera de Europa continental. Estos PTU tienen vínculos constitucionales con uno de los siguientes Estados miembros: Dinamarca, Francia, los Países Bajos y el Reino Unido.

El artículo 198 del Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión Europea establece que los Estados miembros convienen en asociar a la Unión las Islas Malvinas (entre otros países y territorios de ultramar que mantienen relaciones especiales con Dinamarca, Francia, Países Bajos y Reino Unido), con el fin de promover su desarrollo económico y social y de establecer unas estrechas relaciones económicas entre éstos y la Unión en su conjunto.

La disputa territorial sobre las Islas Malvinas es por tanto principalmente un problema bilateral entre el Reino Unido y Argentina.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001722/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — The Falkland Islands conflict and its impact on bilateral European Union-Mercosur relations

The United Kingdom, with its lack of willingness to hold talks on the installation and maintenance of a military base in the Falkland Islands, under its jurisdiction, in an unresolved conflict between the United Kingdom and the Argentine Republic, fails to comply with the United Nations Resolutions, and the resumption of air and military manoeuvres put the peace of the area in danger.

— Which preventive measures have been taken by the European External Action Service?

— Specifically, which additional measures will be taken in the event that the United Kingdom maintains its position?

— Which mechanisms are available to the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, in the event that one Member State, without consulting the other Member States, executes war-type initiatives that question regional bilateral relations?

— Which mechanisms are provided in Decision 90/530/EEC of the Council, of 8 October 1990, concerning the entering into of the framework Agreement for commercial and economic cooperation between the European Economic Community and the Argentine Republic, to solve conflicts such as the current one?

— Which mechanisms does the European Union and the Argentine Republic propose for the possible conclusion of an Association Agreement with Mercosur?

— How, and in what respect, does the conflict affect the negotiations of an Association Agreement with Mercosur, given that Mercosur's rotating presidency is held by the Argentine Republic until 1 July 2012?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**

(10 May 2012)

The Falkland Islands are one of 25 Overseas Countries and Territories (OCTs) outside mainland Europe. These OCTs have constitutional ties with one of the following Member States: Denmark, France, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom.

Article 198 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU states that Member States agree to associate the Falklands Islands (among other overseas countries and territories that have special relations with Denmark, France, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom) with the Union, with the purpose of promoting their economic and social development and to establish close economic relations between them and the Union as a whole.

The territorial dispute about the Falklands Islands is thus primarily a bilateral issue between the UK and Argentina.

---

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001723/12  
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta / Alta Representante)**

**Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)**

(13 de febrero de 2012)

*Asunto:* VP/HR — Mediación de la Unión Europea en el conflicto de soberanía de las Malvinas entre el Reino Unido y la República Argentina

Como Miembro de la Delegación en la Asamblea Parlamentaria Euro-Latinoamericana, le traslado la preocupación en relación a la disputa territorial que mantiene el Reino Unido con la República Argentina sobre la soberanía de las islas Malvinas, Georgias del Sur y Sandwich del Sur. El Gobierno argentino solicita que el Reino Unido cumpla con la Resolución 2065 de Naciones Unidas de 16 de diciembre de 1965, que reconoce la existencia de una disputa entre los Gobiernos de Argentina y del Reino Unido y en la que se invita a ambos Gobiernos a proseguir sin demora las negociaciones a fin de encontrar una solución pacífica al problema, teniendo debidamente en cuenta las disposiciones y los objetivos de la Carta de las Naciones Unidas y sus resoluciones, así como los intereses de la población de las Islas Malvinas.

Desde 1982, la Asamblea General de Naciones Unidas se ha pronunciado repetidamente instando al necesario diálogo entre las partes para la búsqueda de una solución al conflicto de soberanía existente. La llamada al diálogo y a la negociación también ha sido realizada por distintas instancias de la comunidad internacional, como la Organización de Estados Americanos, Mercosur, la Asociación Latinoamericana de Integración, la Unión Sudamericana de Naciones, el Sistema de Integración Centroamericana, Comunidad Sudamericana de Naciones, Grupo de Río, Alianza Bolivariana para los Pueblos de Nuestra América, Comunidad de Estados Latinoamericanos y del Caribe; Declaraciones de las Cumbres Iberoamericanas, Cumbres Sudamericanas, Primera Cumbre Energética Sudamericana, Cumbres de Países de América Latina y el Caribe, II Cumbre América del Sur-África, Cumbres de Países Sudamericanos y Países Árabes, Grupo de los 77 y China, entre otros.

La región latinoamericana y el Caribe constituyen un territorio de paz y de prosperidad. El Reino Unido incumple las Resoluciones de las Naciones Unidas con su falta de voluntad para dialogar con un país democrático como Argentina, con vocación de paz demostrada, instalando y manteniendo una base militar en las Islas Malvinas, en la que se realizan maniobras militares aéreas y navales, que ponen en serio riesgo la paz en esta parte del mundo.

1. Como Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante de la Unión para la Acción Exterior y Política de Seguridad, ¿puede informar de la posición de la Unión Europea al respecto?
2. ¿Va a interceder y mediar en este conflicto en el que tiene una enorme responsabilidad un Estado Miembro?

**Respuesta de la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta Sra. Ashton en nombre de la Comisión**

(7 de agosto de 2012)

Las Islas Malvinas son uno de los 25 Países y Territorios de Ultramar (PTU) situados fuera de Europa continental que tienen vínculos constitucionales con uno de los siguientes Estados miembros: Dinamarca, Francia, los Países Bajos y el Reino Unido.

Según el artículo 198 del Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión Europea, los Estados miembros convienen en asociar a la UE los 25 países y territorios de ultramar que figuran en el anexo II.

La finalidad de la asociación será promover el desarrollo económico y social de los países y territorios y establecer estrechas relaciones económicas entre éstos y la Unión.

Las cuestiones de soberanía son competencia de los Estados miembros.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001723/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — The European Union's mediation in the conflict regarding the sovereignty of the Falkland Islands between the United Kingdom and the Argentine Republic

As a Member of the Delegation to the Euro-Latin American Parliamentary Assembly, I raise the concern regarding the territorial dispute that the United Kingdom maintains with the Argentine Republic concerning the sovereignty of the Falkland Islands, South Georgia Island and South Sandwich Island. The Argentine Government requests that the United Kingdom comply with United Nations Resolution 2065 of 16 December 1965 that recognises the existence of a dispute between the Argentine and United Kingdom Governments and that invites both Governments to continue negotiations without delay with the aim of finding a peaceful solution to the problem, with due regard to the regulations and purposes of the United Nations Charter and its resolutions, as well as the interests of the population of the Falkland Islands.

Since 1982, the United Nations General Assembly has pronounced repeatedly on the matter, urging the necessary dialogue between the parties in search of a solution to the existing sovereignty conflict. The call for dialogue and negotiations has also been made by different institutions of the international community, such as the Organisation of American States, Mercosur, the Latin American Integration Association, the Union of South American Nations, the Central American Integration System, the South American Community of Nations, the Rio Group, the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America, the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States; the Declarations of the Ibero-American Summit, the South American Summit, the First South American Energy Summit, the Caribbean and Latin American Countries Summit, the Second South America-Africa Summit, the South American and Arab Countries Summits, The Group of 77 and China, among others.

The Latin American Region and the Caribbean make up a territory of peace and prosperity. The United Kingdom fails to comply with the United Nations Resolutions due to its lack of willingness to hold talks with a democratic country such as Argentina, with its demonstrated commitment to peace, installing and maintaining a military base in the Falkland Islands, where military, air and naval manoeuvres are conducted, putting peace in this part of the world at serious risk.

1. As Vice-President/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, can you provide information about the position of the European Union with regard to the conflict?
2. Are you going to intercede and mediate in this conflict in which a Member State has an enormous responsibility?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**

(7 August 2012)

The Falkland Islands are one of 25 Overseas Countries and Territories (OCTs) outside mainland Europe, that have constitutional ties with one of the following Member States: Denmark, France, the Netherlands and the UK.

Under the article 198 of the Treaty on the functioning of the EU, Member States agree to associate to the EU 25 overseas countries and territories listed in Annex II.

The purpose of the association is to promote the economic and social development of the countries and territories and to establish close economic relations between them and the Union.

Sovereignty issues are matters for Member States.

---

(Dansk udgave)

**Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-001725/12**  
**til Kommissionen**  
**Emilie Turunen (Verts/ALE)**  
(13. februar 2012)

Om: Udenlandske hjemløse

Et stort antal hjemløse i Danmark kommer fra andre EU-lande. Det viser bl.a. en undersøgelse foretaget af SFI — Det Nationale Forskningscenter for Velfærd <sup>(1)</sup>.

Tilsvarende har organisationer, der arbejder med hjemløse, anført, at udenlandske hjemløse udgør en stor del af de hjemløse på herberger, særligt i København. En del af de udenlandske hjemløse har psykiske problemer og har ikke udsigt til at finde arbejde i Danmark, og de er derfor bedst tjent med at vende tilbage til deres hjemland, mener fagfolk.

Problemet med udenlandske hjemløse synes at være det samme i en række andre EU-lande. I Det Forenede Kongerige har man af samme årsag oprettet Reconnection, et projekt, der skal hjælpe udenlandske hjemløse tilbage til deres hjemland <sup>(2)</sup>.

1. Er Kommissionen opmærksom på problemet med udenlandske hjemløse, og hvordan forholder man sig til problemet?
2. Har man på EU-niveau taget initiativer til et koordineret samarbejde på området (i form af eksempelvis udveksling af bedste praksis, udvikling af netværk for organisationer, der arbejder med hjemløse, osv.)? I så fald, hvilke konkrete initiativer vil Kommissionen tage for at imødegå problemet?

**Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af László Andor**  
(12. april 2012)

Kommissionen har kendskab til problemet med hjemløse indvandrere. I sin meddelelse om en europæisk dagsorden for integration af tredjelandsstatsborgere <sup>(3)</sup> anfører Kommissionen, at man med politikker bør sikre tredjelandsstatsborgere adgang til bolig og andre støtteforanstaltninger, som »sikrer den sociale infrastruktur og byfornyelse, og som baseres på en integreret tilgang for at undgå opsplnitning«.

Kommissionen forsøger at forbedre videngrundlaget og opfordrer til gensidig læring med hensyn til dette emne. Kommissionen har givet støtte til undersøgelsen »Study on the measurement of homelessness at EU level«, offentliggjort i 2007, og MPHASIS-projektet (2008-09). Det sidstnævnte projekt medvirkede til at fremme udviklingen af nationale informationssystemer om hjemløshed og havde forslag om øget kapacitet til overvågning af hjemløshed og udelukkelse fra boligmarkedet.

I øjeblikket finansierer Kommissionen undersøgelsen »Study on Mobility, Migration and Destitution in the European Union«. Målet er at kortlægge og analysere omfanget af og grunden til dyb fattigdom under hensyntagen til de specifikke vilkår for indvandrere, som kun har ringe eller ingen adgang til basale varer og tjenester, fordi de er udlændinge, samt de socialøkonomiske, politiske og juridiske forhold i modtagerlandene. Kommissionen giver også en omfattende finansiel støtte til ngo-netværk i EU vedrørende hjemløshed og fremskaffelse af boliger for at bidrage til en bedre forståelse af dette spørgsmål.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.sfi.dk/Default.aspx?ID=10305>.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.homeless.org.uk/Reconnection>.

<sup>(3)</sup> KOM(2011)0455 endelig.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001725/12  
to the Commission**

**Emilie Turunen (Verts/ALE)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* Foreign homeless persons

Many homeless persons in Denmark come from other EU countries. *Inter alia* that is demonstrated by a study carried out by the Danish National Centre for Social Research <sup>(1)</sup>.

Similarly, organisations working with the homeless state that foreign homeless persons make up a large proportion of the homeless in shelters, in particular in Copenhagen. Some foreign homeless persons have mental health problems and have no prospect of finding work in Denmark, and experts believe that they are therefore best served by returning to their homeland.

A number of other EU countries seem to be experiencing the same problem with foreign homeless persons. Accordingly, the 'Reconnection' project has been set up in the United Kingdom to help foreign homeless persons return to their homeland <sup>(2)</sup>.

1. Is the Commission aware of the problem of foreign homeless persons and what is its position on the problem?
2. Has there been EU-level action to coordinate cooperation in this area (e.g. by sharing best practice, developing a network for organisations working with the homeless, etc.)? If so, what specific action will the Commission take to address the problem?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission**

(12 April 2012)

The Commission is aware of the issue of homeless migrants. Its communication <sup>(3)</sup> on a European Agenda for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals indicates that policies should provide for access to accommodation for third-country nationals as well as to other supportive measures that 'ensure social infrastructures and urban regeneration, based on an integrated approach in order to avoid segregation'.

The Commission seeks to improve the knowledge base and encourage mutual learning on this subject. The Commission funded a 'Study on the measurement of homelessness at EU level' published in 2007, and the MPHASIS project (2008-09). The latter promoted the development of national information systems on homelessness and proposed improvement of the capacity for monitoring homelessness and housing exclusion.

The Commission is now financing a 'Study on Mobility, Migration and Destitution in the European Union'. The aim is to identify and analyse the extent and causes of destitution, taking into account the characteristics of migrants who have little or no access to basic goods and services because they are non-nationals, as well as the socioeconomic, policy and legal conditions in destination countries. The Commission also provides significant financial support to the EU NGO networks on homelessness and housing to contribute to better understanding of this issue.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.sfi.dk/Default.aspx?ID=10305>.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.homeless.org.uk/Reconnection>.

<sup>(3)</sup> COM(2011) 455 final.

(Dansk udgave)

**Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-001726/12**  
**til Kommissionen**  
**Dan Jørgensen (S&D)**  
(13. februar 2012)

Om: Forbud mod frivillig arbejdskraft i Grækenland

Antallet af gadehunde i Grækenland er enormt, og derfor rejser dyreværnsorganisationer til landet for at hjælpe med neutraliseringsprojekter, medicin og foder. Mange internater i Grækenland får ingen støtte fra det offentlige, de er overfyldte, og de er derfor dybt afhængige af hjælp fra udenlandske organisationer.

Nu er Grækenland imidlertid ved at vedtage lovgivning, som betyder, at udenlandske frivillige dyrlæger ikke længere må arbejde i Grækenland, bl.a. med at neutralisere og kastrere hunde. Argumentet er, at de udenlandske dyrlæger fratager græske dyrlæger deres arbejde. Dette kan ikke være tilfældet, for de frivillige dyrlæger arbejder gratis i Grækenland og overtager på nuværende tidspunkt kun opgaver, som græske dyrlæger ikke selv ønsker at varetage. Derfor er de frivillige dyrlægers tilstedeværelse i Grækenland udelukkende til gavn — især for græske dyr.

1. Hvordan ser Kommissionen på denne sag?
2. Mener Kommissionen, at den græske lovgivning om forbud mod udenlandske dyrlæger i Grækenland er i strid med EU-lovgivning om det indre marked ved at opsætte hindringer for den frie bevægelighed?
3. Og i tilfælde heraf, hvilke initiativer påtænker Kommissionen at tage for at bringe den ulovlige praksis til ophør?

**Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Michel Barnier**  
(20. april 2012)

1. Kommissionen noterer sig påstandene om, at udenlandske dyrlæger i Grækenland står over for problemer med hensyn til den frivillige og vederlagsfri behandling af herreløse dyr, som tilbydes under dyreværnsorganisationerne.
2. Kommissionen er i denne forbindelse ikke bekendt med noget udkast til nye forskrifter ej heller med årsagen til de græske myndigheders påståede modstand mod at tillade, at udenlandske dyrlæger udfører kastrering og sterilisering af herreløse dyr.
3. Disse tjenesteydelsers frivillige og vederlagsfri karakter får imidlertid Kommissionen til at konkludere, at behandlingen af herreløse dyr muligvis ikke anses som værende en tjenesteydelse i EUF-traktatens forstand, da tjenesteydelser i henhold til traktatens artikel 57 normalt udføres mod betaling. Det er derfor Kommissionens opfattelse, at disse specifikke ydelser, som er af midlertidig og lejlighedsvis karakter, ikke er omfattet af de EU-retlige regler om fri bevægelighed for erhvervsdrivende.
4. Direktiv 2005/36/EF om anerkendelse af erhvervsmæssige kvalifikationer <sup>(1)</sup> foreskriver mindstekravene til dyrlægers uddannelse. Medlemsstaterne skal anerkende udenlandske kvalifikationsbeviser, som opfylder de anførte mindstekrav, og er forpligtet til at give disse kvalifikationsbeviser den samme gyldighed på deres område som de eksamensbeviser, de selv udsteder. Direktivet tillader ingen afvigelse fra denne regel. Som det fremgår af den information, der er til rådighed for Kommissionen, er der dog intet, der tyder på, at Grækenland ikke overholder denne forpligtelse.

<sup>(1)</sup> EUT L 255 af 30.9.2005.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001726/12  
to the Commission  
Dan Jørgensen (S&D)  
(13 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Prohibition of voluntary work in Greece

There are a huge number of stray dogs in Greece and animal welfare organisations are therefore travelling to the country to help with neutering projects, medication and animal feed. Many animal shelters in Greece receive no public funding, are overcrowded and are therefore highly dependent on help from foreign organisations.

Greece, however, is currently adopting legislation prohibiting foreign volunteer veterinary surgeons from working in Greece in connection with, *inter alia*, the neutering and castration of dogs. It is argued that foreign veterinary surgeons are taking work from Greek veterinary surgeons. That cannot be the case: volunteer veterinary surgeons work unpaid in Greece and are currently taking on only those tasks which Greek veterinary surgeons are unwilling to handle themselves. Accordingly, the presence of volunteer veterinary surgeons can only be of benefit to Greece and especially to animals in Greece.

1. How does the Commission view this?
2. Does the Commission believe that in prohibiting foreign veterinary surgeons from working in Greece, and erecting barriers to free movement, the Greek legislation is contrary to EU internal-market legislation?
3. If so, what action does the Commission intend to take to put an end to this unlawful practice?

**Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission  
(20 April 2012)**

1. The Commission notes the claims that foreign veterinarians are facing problems in Greece regarding the voluntary and unpaid treatment of stray animals under the umbrella of animal welfare organisations.
2. The Commission is not aware of any draft legislative proposal and of the reasons behind the Greek authorities' alleged reluctance to allow foreign voluntary and unpaid veterinarians to carry out castration or sterilisation of stray animals in this context.
3. The voluntary and unpaid nature of those services leads, however, the Commission to conclude that these activities might not be considered as services within the meaning of the TFEU as, under its Article 57, services are normally provided for remuneration. The Commission considers therefore that these specific activities, which are of a temporary and occasional nature, are not covered by EC law on free movement of professionals.
4. Directive 2005/36/EC on the recognition of professional qualifications <sup>(1)</sup> provides for minimum training requirements for veterinarians. Member States shall recognise foreign formal qualifications satisfying those minimum training conditions and are obliged to give those formal qualifications the same effect on their territory as the formal qualifications which it itself issues. The directive does not allow any derogation from this rule. However, as it transpires from the information at the disposal of the Commission, Greece does not seem to be in breach of this obligation.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 255, 30.9.2005.



(Dansk udgave)

**Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-001727/12**  
**til Kommissionen**  
**Dan Jørgensen (S&D)**  
(13. februar 2012)

Om: Europæisk økologimærke

Som det blev dokumenteret i Tv-avisen (d. 27.1.2012), er der store problemer med økologimærkede pleje- og kosmetikprodukter i EU. Selvom der står økologisk på shampooer, cremer osv., er det ingen garanti for, at de rent faktisk er økologiske. Der er nemlig ingen EU-kontrol med økologiske plejeprodukter, som det f.eks. er tilfældet med madvarer. I stedet er der frit slag for producenterne til at kalde en creme for økologisk, selvom den slet ikke er det.

Informationscenter for Miljø & Sundhed i Danmark har testet 36 påståede økologiske pleje- og kosmetikprodukter i Danmark, og det viste sig, at 80 % af dem ikke var økologiske. De indeholdt enten parfume, parabener eller farvestoffer. Det er dybt problematisk, da disse stoffer er yderst skadelige for miljøet og samtidig kan fremkalde allergi. Forbrugerne bliver derfor vildledt af økologimærker på pleje- og kosmetikprodukter.

1. Mener Kommissionen, at det er problematisk, at produkter bliver certificerede som økologiske uden reelt at være det?
2. Mener Kommissionen, at der er behov for et fælles europæisk økologimærke, som det er tilfældet med madvarer?
3. Hvis ikke, mener Kommissionen så, at der er behov for en udvidelse af de mærker, der allerede findes, eller en stramning af reglerne?

**Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af John Dalli**  
(23. marts 2012)

Kommissionen henviser det ærede medlem til sit svar på skriftlig forespørgsel E-001392/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001727/12  
to the Commission**

**Dan Jørgensen (S&D)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* European eco-labels

As documented in a Danish television news programme on 27 January 2012, there are considerable problems surrounding eco-labelled care and cosmetic products in the EU. Even though the term 'eco' may appear on shampoos and creams, etc., there is no guarantee that they really are eco-products. Unlike in the case of foodstuffs, for example, there are no EU checks on ecological care products. Instead, producers are free to call a cream ecological even if it is no such thing.

The Danish Environment and Health Information Centre has tested 36 supposedly ecological care and cosmetic products, 80 % of which proved not to be ecological, containing either perfume or parabens or dyestuffs. This is a very great problem: those substances are extremely harmful to the environment and may also cause allergies. Consumers are therefore being misled by eco-labels on care and cosmetic products.

1. Does the Commission believe that labelling products as ecological when that is not the case is a problem?
2. Does the Commission believe that there should be a common European eco-label, as is the case with foodstuffs?
3. If not, does the Commission believe that the labelling arrangements already in place should be extended or that the rules should be tightened?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission**

(23 March 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-001392/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.

\_\_\_\_\_

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB>.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001728/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Franz Obermayr (NI)**  
(13. Februar 2012)

*Betrifft:* Datenschutz bei Facebook — Verstoß gegen EU-Recht

Medienberichten zufolge haben Wiener Jusstudenten im September 2011 insgesamt 22 Anzeigen gegen Facebook bei der irischen Datenschutzkommission eingebracht. Die Behörde in Dublin ist nach EU-Datenschutzrecht für die Beschwerden zuständig, weil Facebook Europe seinen Sitz in Irland hat. Nach Ansicht der Studenten verstößt Mark Zuckerbergs Unternehmen in mehrerlei Hinsicht gegen EU-Datenschutzrecht. So habe Facebook auf Verlangen der Betroffenen nicht alle Nutzerdaten herausgegeben; beispielsweise verweigerte der Konzern die Übermittlung von Informationen zu seiner automatischen Gesichtserkennung unter Hinweis auf Schutz seines geistigen Eigentums. Es wurde auch festgestellt, dass Facebook von seinen Nutzern als gelöscht markierte Beiträge nicht wirklich von seinen Servern entfernt. Ende Dezember 2011 veröffentlichte die irische Datenschutzkommission einen ersten Bericht über ihre Ermittlungen bei Facebook und bestätigte dabei viele Kritikpunkte der Wiener Studenten. Vor allem wurde Facebook dazu verpflichtet, die Nutzerdaten auf Anfrage herauszugeben, wie es der Rechtslage in der EU entspricht. Auch einige Funktionen zur Rückverfolgung der Nutzer durch Facebook und seine Partnerfirmen wurden eingeschränkt.

1. Wie steht die Kommission zu diesem Sachverhalt?
2. Welche Kritikpunkte der irischen Datenschutzkommission an Facebook kann die Kommission ebenfalls bestätigen?
3. Wurde die irische Datenschutzkommission erst durch die Anzeigen der Studenten aktiv?
4. Wenn ja, warum wurde die Datenschutzkommission nicht schon vorher — von Amts wegen — aktiv?
5. Welche Strafen sieht die EU für den Verstoß gegen EU-Datenschutzrecht vor?
6. Welche Schritte können Facebook-Nutzer ergreifen, um ihr Recht auf Datenschutz auf EU-Ebene durchzusetzen?
7. Inwiefern wurden die Funktionen zur Rückverfolgung der Nutzer durch Facebook und seine Partnerunternehmen eingeschränkt?
8. Wer sind diese Partnerunternehmen?
9. Was wurde genau eingeschränkt?
10. Wie soll der Datenmissbrauch kontrolliert werden?
11. Muss Facebook in Zukunft als gelöscht markierte Beiträge von seinen Servern entfernen?

**Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission**  
(30. März 2012)

Die Kommission ist sich bewusst, dass die Gewährleistung des Datenschutzes mit der immer häufigeren Nutzung von Online-Diensten, vor allem von sozialen Online-Netzen, zunehmend gefährdet ist. Sie ist sich auch bewusst, dass die in der Richtlinie 95/46/EG<sup>(1)</sup> festgelegten Kriterien zur rechtmäßigen Verarbeitung von personenbezogenen Daten nicht immer eingehalten werden.

<sup>(1)</sup> Richtlinie 95/46/EG schützt die Grundrechte und -freiheiten natürlicher Personen im Hinblick auf ihre personenbezogenen Daten, ABl. L 281 vom 23.11.1995.

Die im Januar 2012 von der Kommission vorgeschlagene Reform der EU-Datenschutzvorschriften hat gezeigt, wie sehr wir durch den technischen Fortschritt heute gefordert sind, den Schutz von personenbezogenen Daten (besonders in der Online-Umgebung) zu gewährleisten. Die Mitteilung <sup>(<sup>1</sup>)</sup> zu den Legislativvorschlägen zeigt auf, dass noch zu klären und zu konkretisieren ist, wie die Datenschutzprinzipien im Zusammenhang mit der anstehenden Reform des EU-Rechtsrahmens auf neue Technologien angewendet werden müssen, damit der wirksame Schutz von personenbezogenen Daten — unabhängig von der Verarbeitungstechnologie — gewährleistet werden kann. Danach hat auch jeder Einzelne das Recht, die dauerhafte Löschung seiner personenbezogenen Daten einzufordern, sofern der ursprüngliche Verarbeitungszweck seine Gültigkeit verloren hat.

Unbeschadet der Befugnisse der Kommission als Hüterin der Verträge obliegt die Überwachung und Durchsetzung des Datenschutzrechts, auch in Bezug auf die Nutzung sozialer Online-Netze und anderen Online-Dienste auf nationaler Ebene insbesondere den Datenschutzbehörden. In Bezug auf das Datenschutzproblem bei Facebook hat die irische Datenschutzbehörde in diesem rechtlichen Rahmen gehandelt. Die Kommission ist nicht befugt, die Einhaltung der EU-Datenschutzvorschriften durch die für die Verarbeitung Verantwortlichen zu beobachten, bei möglichen Verstößen zu ermitteln oder Strafen zu verhängen.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> „Der Schutz der Privatsphäre in einer vernetzten Welt — Ein europäischer Datenschutzrahmen für das 21. Jahrhundert“, KOM(2012)9.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001728/12  
to the Commission**

**Franz Obermayr (NI)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* Data protection on Facebook: infringement of EU legislation

According to media reports, in September 2011 a group of Viennese law students lodged a total of 22 complaints against Facebook with the Irish Data Protection Commission. According to EU legislation on data protection, the Dublin-based authority is responsible for dealing with the complaints because Facebook Europe has its headquarters in Ireland. In the students' opinion, Mark Zuckerberg's company infringes EU legislation on data protection on several counts. For example, Facebook failed to provide all user data at the request of the affected parties; the company refused to transfer information about its automatic face recognition function on the grounds of protection of intellectual property. It was also found that Facebook does not actually delete from its servers material that users mark as deleted. At the end of December 2011, the Irish Data Protection Commission published an initial report into its investigations at Facebook and confirmed many of the criticisms raised by the Viennese students. Above all, Facebook was required to provide user data upon request in accordance with the legal position in the EU. Some restrictions were imposed on several functions that Facebook and its partner companies use to trace users.

1. What is the Commission's opinion on this matter?
2. Which points of criticism raised by the Irish Data Protection Commission in relation to Facebook can the Commission also confirm?
3. Did the Irish Data Protection Commission take action only because of the students' reports?
4. If yes, why did the Data Protection Commission not become active sooner in accordance with its mandate?
5. What penalties are imposed by the EU for infringements of EU legislation on data protection?
6. What steps can Facebook users take to enforce their right to data protection at EU level?
7. To what extent were the functions used by Facebook and its partner companies to trace users restricted?
8. Who are these partner companies?
9. What exactly has been restricted?
10. How will data abuse be controlled?
11. In the future, will Facebook be required to delete material marked as deleted from its servers?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission**

(30 March 2012)

The Commission is aware of the data protection risks arising with ever-growing use of online services and in particular online social networking services. Furthermore, it is aware that the criteria established for lawful processing of personal data by Directive 95/46/EC <sup>(1)</sup> are not always met.

The Commission proposal for a reform of EU data protection rules submitted in January 2012 identified the challenges to the protection of personal data brought about by new technologies, particularly in online environments. The communication <sup>(2)</sup>, which accompanies the legislative proposals, indicates the need to clarify and specify the application of data protection principles to new technologies in the context of the upcoming reform of the EU legal framework, in order to ensure that individuals' personal data are effectively protected, regardless of the technology used to process their data. This includes the right of individuals to have their personal data permanently deleted, if they so desire, and if the purpose for which the data were initially processed is no longer valid.

<sup>(1)</sup> Directive 95/46/EC protects the fundamental rights and freedoms of natural persons with respect to the protection of their personal data, OJ L 281, 23.11.1995.

<sup>(2)</sup> 'Safeguarding Privacy in a Connected World — A European Data Protection Framework for the 21st Century' — COM(2012) 9.

Without prejudice to the powers of the Commission as guardian of the Treaties, the supervision and enforcement of data protection legislation, including for social networking and other online services, falls under the competence of national authorities, in particular data protection supervisory authorities. The action of the Irish Data Protection Authority regarding Facebook took place within this framework. The Commission has no competence to monitor the compliance of data controllers, investigate possible cases of non-compliance, or to impose penalties.

---

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001729/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Konstantinos Roupakis (PPE)**  
(13 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Ακύρωση της κοινωνικής συμφωνίας και των αποτελεσμάτων του κοινωνικού διαλόγου στην Ελλάδα

Στην απάντηση της γραπτής ερώτησης E-012011/2011 με αφορμή την ελαστικοποίηση της αγοράς εργασίας στην Ελλάδα και την αποκέντρωση των συλλογικών διαπραγματεύσεων αναφέρεται, μεταξύ άλλων: «Η Επιτροπή δεσμεύεται να προαγάγει και να υποστηρίξει τον κοινωνικό διάλογο σε ολόκληρη την ΕΕ, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της Ελλάδας, σεβόμενη πλήρως την αυτονομία των κοινωνικών εταίρων και την πολυμορφία των εθνικών συστημάτων εργασιακών σχέσεων». Στην Ελλάδα, στο πλαίσιο διαπραγμάτευσης για την κατάρτιση του μνημονίου που θα συνοδεύσει το νέο δάνειο, υπήρξε επίσημη διεξαγωγή κοινωνικού διαλόγου μεταξύ των κοινωνικών εταίρων, καθώς ετέθησαν — *inter alia* — ζητήματα επαναπροσδιορισμού των κατώτατων ορίων αμοιβών, την ύπαρξη του 13ου και 14ου μισθού και του ύψους των ασφαλιστικών εισφορών και οι κοινωνικοί εταίροι κατέληξαν σε συγκεκριμένες θέσεις.

Σύμφωνα, μάλιστα, με την εθνική πρακτική αυτά τα ζητήματα στην Ελλάδα καθορίζονται μέσω συμφωνίας των κοινωνικών εταίρων, έπειτα από ελεύθερες συλλογικές διαπραγματεύσεις και κυρώνονται μέσω της υπογραφής της Εθνικής Γενικής Συλλογικής Σύμβασης Εργασίας. Στη συνέχεια, όμως, η κυβέρνηση διαφαίνεται να προχωρεί σε νομοθετική ρύθμιση επί αυτών των θεμάτων αγνοώντας τις αποφάσεις των κοινωνικών εταίρων και μάλιστα προς πλήρως αντίθετη κατεύθυνση από αυτή που εξέφρασαν επίσημα ως θέση κατά παράβαση και Διεθνών Συμβάσεων Εργασίας (87, 98, 122, 154). Με βάση τα παραπάνω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Πιστεύει ότι οι εξελίξεις αυτές συνάδουν με τις αρχές του κοινωνικού διαλόγου και των ελεύθερων συλλογικών διαπραγματεύσεων οι οποίες κατοχυρώνονται στη Συνθήκη; Πώς σκοπεύει η Επιτροπή να προάγει και να υποστηρίξει τον κοινωνικό διάλογο στην Ελλάδα δεδομένων των εξελίξεων που δρομολογούνται υπό το πρίσμα της εκταμίευσης του νέου δανείου;
2. Η μείωση του κατώτατου μισθού έχει ως αποτέλεσμα οι ετήσιες αποδοχές του συνόλου των εργαζομένων που αμείβονται με αυτόν να βρίσκονται κάτω από το όριο της φτώχειας. Συνάδει το εν λόγω μέτρο με την ευρωπαϊκή δέσμευση για περιορισμό των φτωχών συμπολιτών μας κατά 20 εκατομμύρια με τη Στρατηγική Ευρώπη 2020;
3. Διαθέτει στοιχεία αναφορικά με τα ποσοστά φτωχών εργαζομένων σε συνάρτηση με το βαθμό αποκέντρωσης των συλλογικών διαπραγματεύσεων; Συγκριτικά σε ποιο σύστημα συλλογικής διαπραγμάτευσης εμφανίζονται πιο επαρκείς οι αμοιβές;

**Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(4 Απριλίου 2012)

1. Σύμφωνα με τη Συνθήκη, η Επιτροπή σέβεται την πολυμορφία των εθνικών συστημάτων εργασιακών σχέσεων. Τα κράτη μέλη και οι κοινωνικοί εταίροι είναι αρμόδια να ρυθμίζουν τον εθνικό κοινωνικό διάλογο σύμφωνα με τις παραδόσεις και τις πρακτικές τους καθώς και με τις σχετικές συμβάσεις της Διεθνούς Οργάνωσης Εργασίας. Στη συγκεκριμένη περίπτωση, η κυβέρνηση αποφάσισε να νομοθετήσει κατ' εξαίρεση επειδή έκρινε ότι η συμφωνία μεταξύ των κοινωνικών εταίρων δεν ήταν ανάλογη με τις προκλήσεις που αντιμετωπίζει η Ελλάδα.
2. Η σχέση μεταξύ αμοιβών και φτώχειας είναι περίπλοκη: οι αμοιβές αφορούν άτομα ενώ η φτώχεια μετράται σε επίπεδο νοικοκυριού και συνεπώς εξαρτάται από τη σύνθεση του νοικοκυριού καθώς και από την κατάσταση απασχόλησης όλων των μελών του και τα λοιπά στοιχεία του εισοδήματός του (π.χ. κοινωνικές παροχές). Παρόλο που στην Ελλάδα η φτώχεια στην εργασία είναι σχετικά υψηλή (13,8 %), τα μέτρα βελτίωσης των ποσοστών απασχόλησης και η συμμετοχή των δεύτερων ενεργών μελών στην αγορά εργασίας, καθώς και η εστίαση των παροχών στους χαμηλόμισθους, παραμένουν τα καλύτερα εργαλεία για τη δυνητική μείωση της φτώχειας των νοικοκυριών και την επίτευξη των στόχων της ΕΕ.
3. Ο βαθμός συγκέντρωσης των συλλογικών διαπραγματεύσεων αποτελεί μία μεταξύ των πολλών πτυχών ενός συστήματος εργασιακών σχέσεων. Ο δυνητικός του αντίκτυπος εξαρτάται από άλλες πτυχές (π.χ. το βαθμό συντονισμού και την κάλυψή του). Κανένα σύστημα δεν θεωρείται καταλληλότερο από τα άλλα, ενώ τα αποτελέσματα ενός συγκεκριμένου συστήματος όσον αφορά τις αμοιβές δεν είναι δυνατό να προκύπτουν μόνο από τον βαθμό της αποκέντρωσής του.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001729/12  
to the Commission  
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)  
(13 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Abrogation of the social agreement and the results of social dialogue in Greece

The answer to Written Question E-012011/2011 concerning the flexibilisation of the labour market in Greece and the decentralisation of collective negotiations states, *inter alia*: 'The Commission is committed to promote and support social dialogue throughout the EU, including Greece, while fully respecting the autonomy of the social partners and the diversity of national systems of industrial relations'. In Greece, in the framework of negotiations to establish the memorandum that is to accompany the new loan, a formal social dialogue took place between the social partners, raising issues including the resetting of the minimum wage, the 13th and 14th months' wages and the level of social contributions, and the social partners reached specific positions.

According to national practice in Greece, these issues are determined by agreement between the social partners following free collective negotiations, and are ratified by the signing of the National General Collective Labour Agreement. However, it now emerges that the government is regulating these issues through legislation, while ignoring the decisions of the social partners, in direct contradiction of their official declarations in breach of International Labour Agreements (87, 98, 122, 154). In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Does it believe that these developments are consistent with the principles of social dialogue and free collective negotiations, as provided for in the Treaty? How does it intend to promote and support the social dialogue in Greece, given the developments under way with a view to securing the disbursement of the new loan?
2. The reduction of the minimum wage means the annual earnings of all minimum wage earners will drop below the poverty line. Is this measure consistent with the EU's commitment to reduce the number of poor people in the EU by 20 million through the Europe 2020 strategy?
3. Does it have any information regarding the rates of poor workers in conjunction with the degree of decentralisation of collective negotiations? Compared to which collective negotiation system do wages appear relatively adequate?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission  
(4 April 2012)**

1. In line with the Treaty, the Commission respects the diversity of national systems of industrial relations. It is up to the Member States and social partners to set up national social dialogue arrangements in line with their traditions and practices as well as with relevant International Labour Organisation conventions.
  2. The relationship between wages and poverty is complex: wages concern individuals while poverty is measured at household level and therefore depends on the composition of the household as well as the employment status of all its members and the other elements of its income (e.g. social transfers). While the in-work poverty in Greece is rather high (13,8 %), measures to improve employment rates and the involvement of second earners in the labour market as well as targeting benefits toward low wage earners remain the best tools to eventually reduce household's poverty and reach the EU targets.
  3. The degree of centralisation of collective bargaining is only one aspect of a system of industrial relations. Its possible impact depends on other aspects (e.g. its degree of coordination, and its coverage). No system would be more adequate than another, and the wage outcome of a system cannot result only from its degree of decentralisation.
-



(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001730/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)**  
(13 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Ισορρόπηση αγοράς στην Ελλάδα

Κατόπιν απαιτήσεων της Τρόικα στην Ελλάδα συμπεζόνονται τα εισοδήματα των εργαζομένων με μέση μείωση των μισθών άνω του 35 %.

Τούτο γίνεται κατά παράβαση των Συνθηκών της Ένωσης, που εξασφαλίζουν την αξιοπρέπεια του ευρωπαϊού πολίτη και το δικαίωμά του στην εργασία, αφού δια του τρόπου αυτού, καταργούνται συλλογικές συμβάσεις εργασίας.

Κατά συνέπεια, η αγοραστική δύναμη των εργαζομένων καταποντίζεται και το ήμισυ σχεδόν του ελληνικού λαού αντιμετωπίζει πρόβλημα προμήθειας στοιχειωδών αγαθών αξιοπρεπούς διαβίωσης.

Η Τρόικα στις απαιτήσεις της αυτές επικαλείται τις ιδιαίτερες συνθήκες που επικρατούν λόγω της οικονομικής κρίσης στην Ελλάδα.

Η κατάσταση επιδεινώνεται από την αδυναμία ελέγχου της αγοράς και την αύξηση που παρατηρείται στις τιμές των αγαθών — βασικών προϊόντων.

Κατόπιν τούτου καθίσταται αναγκαία η εξισορρόπηση της αγοράς με μείωση των τιμών των προϊόντων που διατίθεται στο καταναλωτικό κοινό ενόψει της συγκυρίας αυτής, καθ' όσον μάλιστα η επίκληση της «κατάστασης ανάγκης» που κάνει η Τρόικα δε μπορεί να ενεργεί μονομερώς.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Είναι διατεθειμένη να παραχωρήσει το δικαίωμα στην Ελλάδα να παρέμβει στην τιμολόγηση των προϊόντων της αγοράς και να περιορίσει την ελεύθερη διαμόρφωση των τιμών, καθ' όσον η αγορά είναι ανεξέλεγκτη, και να επιτραπεί στην ελληνική κυβέρνηση ή και σε άλλες κυβερνήσεις (Ιταλία, Πορτογαλία, Ισπανία) που αντιμετωπίζουν παρεμφερές πρόβλημα, να επιβάλουν την διατίμηση προϊόντων των βασικών αγαθών όσο διαρκεί η «κατάσταση ανάγκης» αυτή;

**Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(2 Απριλίου 2012)

Σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 120 της ΣΛΕΕ, τα κράτη μέλη ενεργούν σύμφωνα με την αρχή της ανοικτής οικονομίας με ελεύθερο ανταγωνισμό. Ο ελεύθερος καθορισμός των τιμών αποτελεί μέρος της εν λόγω αρχής. Η αρχή αυτή μπορεί ωστόσο να περιοριστεί από, για παράδειγμα, τον καθορισμό μέγιστων ή ελάχιστων τιμών, ή μέσω της παρακολούθησης των διακυμάνσεων των τιμών, υπό την προϋπόθεση ότι αυτό γίνεται τηρουμένων των αρχών της εσωτερικής αγοράς της ΕΕ και των κανόνων του ανταγωνισμού. Η πείρα δείχνει, ωστόσο, ότι η άμεση παρέμβαση στις τιμές έρχεται σε αντίθεση με την οικονομική αποτελεσματικότητα.

Η ελληνική κυβέρνηση εξετάζει την Υπουργική Απόφαση Α2-3391/2009 σχετικά με τη ρύθμιση της αγοράς, η οποία περιλαμβάνει, μεταξύ άλλων, διατάξεις σχετικά με την τιμολόγηση, την επισήμανση και την εμπορία των προϊόντων λιανικής. Στο πλαίσιο του νέου προγράμματος οικονομικής προσαρμογής, η κυβέρνηση έχει δεσμευθεί να ολοκληρώσει τη σχετική επανεξέταση μέχρι τον Απρίλιο του 2012.

Επιπλέον, για να αντιμετωπίσει το ζήτημα της δυσκαμψίας στη μείωση των τιμών (δηλαδή, το γεγονός ότι οι τιμές καταναλωτή στην Ελλάδα έχουν μειωθεί λιγότερο απ' ό,τι θα περίμενε κανείς με δεδομένη την έκταση της ύφεσης), η κυβέρνηση θα εξετάσει τους κύριους τομείς των υπηρεσιών (συμπεριλαμβανομένης της λιανικής και χονδρικής διανομής) και θα καταρτίσει σχέδιο δράσης για την προώθηση του ανταγωνισμού και για τη διευκόλυνση της ευελιξίας των τιμών στις αγορές προϊόντων, επίσης μέχρι τον Απρίλιο του 2012.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001730/12  
to the Commission  
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)  
(13 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Balancing the market in Greece

At the request of the Troika, the incomes of workers in Greece are being squeezed, with an average wage reduction of more than 35 %.

This is contrary to the EU Treaties that safeguard the dignity of European citizens and their right to work, as it leads to the abrogation of collective labour agreements.

As a result, the purchasing power of workers is being demolished and nearly half of the Greek people face problems in buying the essential goods for a decent life.

In making these demands, the Troika invokes the particular circumstances in Greece owing to the economic crisis.

The situation is exacerbated by the inability to control the market and the increase in prices of goods/basic commodities.

It is therefore necessary to balance the market by reducing the prices of products made available to consumers in view of this trend, as the invocation of an 'emergency' by the Troika cannot be permitted to take effect unilaterally.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

Is it prepared to grant Greece the right to intervene in the pricing of products on the market and restrict free pricing, since the market itself is uncontrolled, and to allow the Greek Government or other governments (Italy, Portugal, Spain), facing similar problems, to impose set prices on basic goods for as long as this 'emergency' lasts?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission  
(2 April 2012)**

According to Article 120 TFEU Member States shall act in accordance with the principle of an open economy with free competition. Free determination of prices is part of this principle. This principle can however be limited by for example, setting maximum or minimum prices or through the monitoring of price variations, provided that this is done in respect of EU Internal Market and Competition rules. Experience shows nonetheless, that direct intervention in prices is at odds with economic efficiency.

The Greek Government is currently reviewing Ministerial Decision A2-3391/2009 on market regulations, which includes among others, provisions on pricing, labelling and marketing of retail products. In the context of the new economic adjustment programme, the government has committed to complete this review by April 2012.

In addition, to address the issue of downward price rigidity (i.e., the fact that consumer prices in Greece have fallen by less than would have been expected given the extent of the recession), the Government will screen the main service sectors (including retail and wholesale distribution) and will prepare an action plan to promote competition and facilitate price flexibility in product markets, also by April 2012.

Lastly, the Commission is aware of the impact of austerity measures on people's lives. Fiscal retrenchment as well as measures to regain competitiveness may lead in the short term to a contraction in economic activity and employment. However, failing to curb the high Greek public deficit and to address the competitiveness problem in earnest will only aggravate the medium-term prospects of the Greek people, starting with the most vulnerable.

---

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001731/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)**  
 (13 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Εκπαίδευση παιδιών Ρομά στο Νομό Καρδίτσας

Με έγγραφό του <sup>(1)</sup> προς τη Δ/ση Α' βάρδιας Εκπαίδευσης Ν. Καρδίτσας, 23.12.2011 το Υπ. Παιδείας εξέφρασε την ανησυχία του «για τη συσσώρευση μαθητών Ρομά σε ορισμένα σχολεία της Πρωτοβάθμιας Εκπαίδευσης Ν. Καρδίτσας, έπειτα μάλιστα και από την προσφυγή Λαβίδα κατά της Ελλάδας <sup>(2)</sup> ενώπιον του Ε.Δ.Δ.Α <sup>(3)</sup>» προτείνοντας διασπορά των μαθητών Ρομά των σχολείων αυτών σε άλλα δημοτικά σχολεία της περιοχής. Στις 26.1.2012 όμως, μετά από αντιδράσεις μερίδας της τοπικής κοινωνίας με δικαιολογία ότι οι αλλαγές γίνονται στο μέσο της σχολικής χρονιάς, το Υπουργείο εξέδωσε δελτίο τύπου <sup>(4)</sup> όπου αποφασίστηκαν:

α) Συνέχιση λειτουργίας του 4ου Δημοτικού Σχολείου Σοφάδων χωρίς αναφορά στην προτεινόμενη διασπορά των μαθητών του σε άλλα σχολεία, κάτι που δημιουργεί εύλογες ανησυχίες ότι το σχολείο θα εξακολουθήσει να λειτουργεί ως σχολείο-γκέτο με μαθητές αποκλειστικά παιδιά Ρομά· β) μετεγγραφή 9 μόνο μαθητών Α' Δημοτικού στο 1ο και 2ο Δημοτικό Σχολείο και ένταξή τους σε τάξεις υποδοχής, που ωστόσο θα λειτουργούν εκτός των εγκαταστάσεων των σχολείων αυτών· γ) η εγγραφή, για το σχολικό έτος 2012-13, των μαθητών του 5ου νηπιαγωγείου, σε σχολεία της περιοχής σε ποσοστό που δεν θα υπερβαίνει το 20 % του μαθητικού πληθυσμού, γεγονός που ενδεχομένως υποδηλώνει τη χρήση φυλετικών κριτηρίων στην εγγραφή των παιδιών.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Θεωρεί ότι οι εξαγγελίες του Υπ. Παιδείας <sup>(5)</sup> για ενέργειες που εντάσσονται στο συγχρηματοδοτούμενο από το Ε.Κ.Τ. <sup>(6)</sup> πρόγραμμα «Εκπαίδευση Παιδιών Ρομά» είναι συμβατές με το άρθρο 153 της ΣΛΕΕ <sup>(7)</sup> καθώς και με την Οδηγία 2000/43/ΕΚ;
2. Ευθυγραμμίζονται οι εξαγγελίες του Υπ. Παιδείας με τους στόχους της στρατηγικής «Ευρώπη 2020» για την άρση του εκπαιδευτικού αποκλεισμού των Ρομά;
3. Σκοπεύει να συνεργαστεί με την Ελλάδα στη διοργάνωση εκστρατείας ενημέρωσης των γονιών της περιοχής και σε πρωτοβουλίες για περιορισμό παρανοήσεων και χρήση στερεοτύπων που οδηγούν σε αναστάτωση κι αντιδράσεις;

**Απάντηση της κας Reding εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
 (2 Απριλίου 2012)

1. Η οδηγία για τη φυλετική ισότητα <sup>(8)</sup> απαγορεύει τις άμεσες και έμμεσες διακρίσεις λόγω φυλετικής ή εθνοτικής καταγωγής στην εκπαίδευση μεταξύ άλλων. Η Ελλάδα έχει μεταφέρει την οδηγία αυτή στην εθνική της νομοθεσία. Επομένως, εναπόκειται στα εθνικά δικαστήρια, υπό το φως των περιστάσεων της συγκεκριμένης περίπτωσης να αποφασίσουν αν μια μεμονωμένη περίπτωση συνιστά διάκριση.

Ένας βασικός στόχος του ελληνικού επιχειρησιακού προγράμματος «Εκπαίδευση και δια βίου μάθηση» του ΕΚΤ είναι να ενισχύσει τη πρόσβαση και τη συμμετοχή όλων στην εκπαίδευση. Το πρόγραμμα υποστηρίζει μια προληπτική ολοκληρωμένη δράση για την αντιμετώπιση της πρόωρης εγκατάλειψης του σχολείου από ομάδες με πολιτιστικές ιδιαιτερότητες, συμπεριλαμβανομένων και των Ρομά. Η δράση περιλαμβάνει ευρύ φάσμα παρεμβάσεων με βάση τις ανάγκες, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της ενισχυμένης πρόσβασης στην προσχολική εκπαίδευση, της πρόσθετης παιδαγωγικής και ψυχοκοινωνικής υποστήριξης, καθώς και της στοχοθετημένης κατάρτισης διδασκάλων.

<sup>(1)</sup> Το από 23-12-2011 έγγραφο της Ειδικής Γραμματέως του Υπουργείου Παιδείας προς τη Διευθύντρια Πρωτοβάθμιας Εκπαίδευσης του Ν. Καρδίτσας: [http://www.ecogreens-gr.org/Docs/Roma\\_Sofades.pdf](http://www.ecogreens-gr.org/Docs/Roma_Sofades.pdf).

<sup>(2)</sup> Προσφυγή Λαβίδα και άλλοι κατά Ελλάδας: <http://goo.gl/feblx>.

<sup>(3)</sup> Ευρωπαϊκό Δικαστήριο Δικαιωμάτων του Ανθρώπου.

<sup>(4)</sup> Δελτίο τύπου Υπουργείου Παιδείας (26-1-2012): <http://goo.gl/xAVwz>.

<sup>(5)</sup> Οι ίδιες ανησυχίες προκύπτουν και για το 19ο Δημοτικό Σχολείο για το οποίο δε γίνεται καμία αναφορά στο δελτίο τύπου.

<sup>(6)</sup> Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο.

<sup>(7)</sup> Συνθήκη για τη Λειτουργία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

<sup>(8)</sup> Οδηγία 2000/43/ΕΚ του Συμβουλίου, της 29ης Ιουνίου, περί εφαρμογής της αρχής της ίσης μεταχείρισης προσώπων ασχέτως φυλετικής ή εθνοτικής τους καταγωγής ΕΕ L 180 της 19.07.2000. σσ. 22-26.

2. Η Επιτροπή συμμερίζεται την άποψη του Αξιότιμου Μέλους ότι τα μέτρα που λήφθηκαν σ'αυτήν την περίπτωση δεν βοηθάνε αρκετά στην αποτελεσματική κατάργηση του διαχωρισμού, παρότι καταδεικνύουν πρόθεση αντιμετώπισης του ζητήματος. Η Επιτροπή, στην ανακοίνωση της του Απριλίου 2011 <sup>(\*)</sup>, ζήτησε από τα κράτη μέλη να καταπολεμήσουν τις διακρίσεις και τον διαχωρισμό στην εκπαίδευση, να παράσχουν πρόσβαση σε εκπαίδευση υψηλού επιπέδου, και να διασφαλίσουν την ολοκλήρωση της παρακολούθησης πρωτοβάθμιας, τουλάχιστον, εκπαίδευσης για όλα τα παιδιά Ρομά. Σ' αυτό το πλαίσιο, η Επιτροπή υπενθυμίζει πως τα κράτη μέλη είναι υπεύθυνα για την οργάνωση και το περιεχόμενο των εκπαιδευτικών τους συστημάτων.

3. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή οργανώνει, προς το τέλος της άνοιξης, μια διαφημιστική εκστρατεία με σκοπό να ενημερώσει τους ευρωπαίους πολίτες για τα δικαιώματά τους και για το ότι οι διακρίσεις είναι παράνομες. Στην Ελλάδα, οι διαφημίσεις θα αναρτηθούν σε εξωτερικούς χώρους, καθώς και σε εφημερίδες. Επιπλέον, προβλέπεται και ένα βιντεοκλίπ.

---

<sup>(\*)</sup> «Πλαίσιο της ΕΕ για Εθνικές Στρατηγικές Ένταξης των Ρομά μέχρι το 2020», Ανακοίνωση της Επιτροπής προς το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, το Συμβούλιο, την Ευρωπαϊκή Οικονομική και Κοινωνική Επιτροπή και την Επιτροπή των Περιφερειών, 05/04/2011, COM(2011)173 τελικό.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001731/12  
to the Commission**

**Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* Education of Roma children in the Prefecture of Karditsa

In its document <sup>(1)</sup> to the Directorate of Primary Education of the Prefecture of Karditsa, dated 23.12.2011, the Ministry of Education expressed its concern over 'the concentration of Roma pupils in specific primary schools of the Prefecture of Karditsa, especially after the Lavidia appeal against Greece <sup>(2)</sup> before the ECHR <sup>(3)</sup>', proposing the dispersion of the Roma pupils at those schools to other primary schools in the area. However, on 26.1.2012, following opposition by a section of the local community on the grounds that these changes are being made in the middle of the school year, the Ministry issued a press release <sup>(4)</sup> deciding the following:

- (a) The 4th Primary School of Sofades will continue to operate, without any mention being made of the proposed dispersion of pupils to other schools, causing justifiable concern that the school will continue operating as a ghetto school exclusively with Roma pupils, (b) the transfer of only nine 1st grade pupils to the 1st and 2nd Primary Schools and their inclusion in reception classes, which will, however, operate outside the premises of those schools, c) the enrolment of pupils of the 5th kindergarten for the school year 2012-2013 in local schools at a percentage not exceeding 20 % of the school population, which suggests the possible use of racial criteria in the children's enrolment.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Does it consider that the announcements by the Ministry of Education <sup>(5)</sup> on actions included in the E.S.F. <sup>(6)</sup> co-financed programme 'Education of Roma Children' comply with Article 153 TFEU <sup>(7)</sup> and with Directive 2000/43/EC?
2. Are the announcements by the Ministry of Education in line with the objectives of the 'Europe 2020' strategy for the elimination of school exclusion for Roma children?
3. Does it intend to cooperate with Greece in organising an information campaign for parents in the area and in initiatives for reducing misunderstandings and the use of stereotypes leading to disruptions and opposition?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission**

(2 April 2012)

1. The Racial Equality Directive <sup>(8)</sup> prohibits direct and indirect discrimination based on racial or ethnic origin, *inter alia* in education. Greece has transposed this directive into national legislation. It is therefore for the national courts, in the light of all the facts of a case, to determine whether a concrete situation constitutes discrimination.

A key objective of the Greek ESF operational programme 'Education and Lifelong Learning' is to reinforce access and participation of all in education. The programme supports a preventive integrated action aiming at combating early school leaving of groups with cultural specificities, including the Roma. The action comprises a wide array of needs-based interventions, including reinforced access to early childhood education, additional pedagogical and psycho-social support, and targeted teacher training.

<sup>(1)</sup> The document of 23-12-2011 of the Special Secretary of the Ministry of Education to the Director of Primary Education of the Prefecture of Karditsa: [http://www.ecogreens-gr.org/Docs/Roma\\_Sofades.pdf](http://www.ecogreens-gr.org/Docs/Roma_Sofades.pdf)

<sup>(2)</sup> Appeal by Lavidia et al. vs Greece <http://goo.gl/feb1x>.

<sup>(3)</sup> European Court of Human Rights.

<sup>(4)</sup> Press Release of the Ministry of Education (26-1-2012): <http://goo.gl/xAVwz>.

<sup>(5)</sup> The same concerns also apply to the 19th Primary School, which is not mentioned at all in the press release.

<sup>(6)</sup> European Social Fund.

<sup>(7)</sup> Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

<sup>(8)</sup> Council Directive 2000/43/EC of 29 June 2000 implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin, OJ L 180, 19.7.2000, p. 22-26.

2. The Commission shares the analysis of the honourable Member that measures taken in this case do not go far enough towards effective desegregation although they reflect some will to address the issue. In its April 2011 Communication <sup>(9)</sup>, the Commission asked Member States to eliminate discrimination and segregation in education, provide access to quality education in non-segregated settings and ensure, as a minimum, primary school completion for all Roma children. In this context, the Commission recalls that Member States are responsible for the organisation and content of their education systems.

3. The European Commission is planning for the end of spring an advertising campaign to inform Europeans about their rights and the fact that discrimination is illegal. In Greece, advertising will be displayed outdoors and in newspapers. A video clip is also foreseen.

---

---

<sup>(9)</sup> 'An EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020', Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, 5.4.2011, COM(2011) 173 final.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001732/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**Marian Harkin (ALDE)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Persecution of Mandeans in Syria

The Mandeans, a community of about 5 000, are stranded in Damascus. Having fled persecution in Iraq, they have been hoping for resettlement for very many years. This minority religion are the original followers of John the Baptist, who have practiced their religion in exactly the same way for the past two thousand years: they are pacifists who cannot bear arms and are unable to protect themselves.

Given the current situation in Syria and the urgent need to resettle these people, what action is the EU taking?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**

(24 May 2012)

The EU is aware of the difficult situation of Mandeans and their wish to be resettled. The European External Action Service has met with representatives of this vulnerable community. Decisions on the resettlement of vulnerable persons are, however, competence of Member States.

As to the situation of religious minorities in Syria, the EU in its Council conclusions and High Representative/Vice-President Ashton in her statements have urged the regime to refrain from all acts susceptible to instigate interethnic and interreligious violence. The EU welcomes the pledge of the Syrian National Council and other opposition groups to work towards a Syria that is respectful of the rights of all its citizens, regardless of their religious or ethnic affiliation. This pledge is in accordance with the EU's continued call on the Syrian opposition to pursue an inclusive and non-sectarian approach to democratic transition.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001733/12  
to the Commission  
Diane Dodds (NI)  
(13 February 2012)**

*Subject:* World Summit on Sustainable Development

The next World Summit on Sustainable Development will be held in Rio de Janeiro in June 2012.

Can the Commission explain in detail how the EU will be represented in this process, and how, if there are any issues relating to oceans and fisheries, the opinions of the EU's fishing industry will be taken into consideration?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission  
(4 April 2012)**

The European Union will be represented at the Rio Conference in accordance with the provisions on external representation laid down in the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

The negotiations at the Rio Conference will include, together with many other issues, oceans and fisheries.

The EU submission to the United Nations <sup>(1)</sup> includes oceans and fisheries (paragraphs 62 to 73). The EU position is based on established positions on marine environment policy, integrated maritime policy and fisheries policy. It focuses on the need to ensure the sustainable management of these resources including upholding the major international commitments.

The submission on oceans and fisheries is fully in line with the objectives of the reform of the common fisheries policy, where the Commission has been in regular contact with the fisheries industry and civil society at large. Thus, the EU position for the Rio Conference on fisheries follows from the extensive consultations with the EU's fishing industry and civil society on EU fisheries policy, including at international level. Furthermore, the position of the broad range of stakeholders for the Rio process was sought in preparing the Commission communication <sup>(2)</sup> of June 2011 on the Rio Conference.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Available at <http://www.uncsd2012.org/rio20/index.php?page=view&type=510&nr=240&menu=20>.

<sup>(2)</sup> Communication from the Commission COM(2011) 363 final of 20.6.2011, Rio+20: towards the green economy and better governance.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001734/12  
to the Commission  
Catherine Stihler (S&D)  
(13 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Harmonisation of legislation on the transport of corpses

Given how difficult it is to repatriate a body from a different Member State, and the shocking state of the complex bilateral agreements in force, will the Commission consider looking into harmonising this important and often overlooked set of agreements?

Since the Cashman report on the adoption of measures concerning the repatriation of mortal remains (2003/2032(INI)), why has the Commission made no progress on the obvious problems highlighted by my colleague?

**Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission  
(19 March 2012)**

The Commission refers the Honourable Members to its answers to Written Questions E-10619/10, E-2731/10, E-1264/08, E-1573/02, Joint Replies E-0923/02 and E-0073/02 and E-000338/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.

The Commission is aware of the Cashman report of the European Parliament of 2003 <sup>(2)</sup> and recognises that the repatriation of the remains of a person who has died in a Member State other than his/her own is a sensitive and difficult issue which can cause great concern for the family involved.

The transfer of corpses in Europe is subject to a number of international agreements, above all those of the 1937 Berlin <sup>(3)</sup> and 1973 Strasbourg <sup>(4)</sup> Agreements. The latter Agreement aims at simplifying formalities and adapting the provisions of the Berlin Agreement to developments in communications, international relations and cross-border traffic for States bound by these agreements.

Seventeen EU Member States have ratified the Strasbourg Agreement, and a further four have ratified the Berlin Agreement which means that a total of 21 EU Member States have been sharing for many decades basically the same rules on the same subject.

In addition, all EU Member States must act in conformity with applicable European law for instance in regard to free movement of services and have to apply all requirements in a non-discriminatory and proportionate manner. The Commission does neither plan to propose any specific harmonisation measures nor to take any other steps on this subject in the immediate future.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB>.

<sup>(2)</sup> Report of 23 October 2003 on the adoption of measures concerning the repatriation of mortal remains (2003/2032(INI)).

<sup>(3)</sup> International Arrangements concerning the conveyance of corpses, signed at Berlin, 10 February 1937, League of Nations Treaty Series 1938, No 4391, 315.

<sup>(4)</sup> Council of Europe Agreement of 26 October 1973 entitled 'Agreement on the Transfer of Corpses', ETS No 80.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001735/12  
to the Commission  
Diane Dodds (NI)  
(13 February 2012)**

*Subject:* European School Milk Scheme

Can the Commission provide information on the amounts spent on the European School Milk Scheme in the UK, under the following headings:

1. the total amount allocated to the UK to spend on this scheme;
2. the total amount received by the UK and the breakdown by region within the UK;
3. the amount spent on milk purchases, together with administrative costs, in the UK and in each region;
4. the amount spent on supplying nursery and primary schools in the UK and in each region;
5. identification of the government departments and companies involved in administering this scheme across the UK?

**Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission  
(14 March 2012)**

1. There is no allocated budget to the United Kingdom (UK) for this scheme. The expenditure depends on the quantity of products distributed during the school year, the number of pupils participating in the scheme and the number of school days during that school year.
  2. A spreadsheet for the last three school years will be sent directly to the Honourable Member and to Parliament's secretariat. The additional national subsidy funded by the UK Government is not included in these figures. All amounts are shown in GBP.
  3. The UK did not provide information on administrative costs.
  4. Please see attached spreadsheet.
  5. In Northern Ireland the scheme is administered by the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (DARD). For England, Scotland and Wales, the scheme is administered by the Rural Payments Agency (RPA).
-

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001737/12  
a la Comisión**

**Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE), Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE) y Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE)**  
(13 de febrero de 2012)

*Asunto:* Construcción de una barrera en el Evros y posibles trabas al derecho de asilo

El 6 de febrero de 2012, el Ministro de Protección del Ciudadano griego, Christos Papoutsis, anunció en la prensa que, además de instalar una red de cámaras de visión nocturna CCTV a lo largo de su frontera con Turquía, el Gobierno griego iba a iniciar la construcción de una barrera de diez kilómetros a lo largo del río Evros. Se ha informado de que esta barrera doble, equipada con alambre de espinos de cuatro metros de altura, estará finalizada en septiembre de 2012 (<sup>1</sup>). El Gobierno griego ha indicado que la finalidad de la barrera y de las medidas adicionales de vigilancia es frenar la inmigración irregular.

— ¿Puede indicar la Comisión si una barrera de dichas características puede socavar de algún modo el derecho de asilo, la protección subsidiaria y la protección temporal de los nacionales de terceros países que soliciten protección internacional?

— ¿Puede indicar la Comisión si una barrera de dichas características cumple lo dispuesto en la Convención de Ginebra de 28 de julio de 1951 y el Protocolo de 31 de enero de 1967 sobre el Estatuto de los Refugiados, y en otros tratados pertinentes de los que es parte el Estado miembro en cuestión?

— ¿Puede indicar la Comisión si una barrera de dichas características cumple con el principio de no devolución, tal y como se contempla en la Convención de Ginebra arriba mencionada y en su Protocolo?

— ¿Puede indicar la Comisión si una barrera de dichas características es conforme con los Tratados, la Carta, la legislación secundaria aplicable, la Convención Europea de Derechos Humanos y la jurisprudencia aplicable del Tribunal de Justicia de la Unión Europea y el Tribunal Europeo de Derechos Humanos?

**Respuesta de la Sra. Malmström en nombre de la Comisión**  
(2 de abril de 2012)

De acuerdo con el Derecho internacional, los Estados Miembros tienen derecho a controlar la entrada de extranjeros en su territorio. Sin embargo, en el ejercicio de este derecho, los Estados Miembros deben garantizar el pleno cumplimiento de las obligaciones legales de la UE y de la Carta de Derechos Fundamentales.

El artículo 6 de la Directiva 2005/85/CE, de 1 de diciembre de 2005, obliga a los Estados Miembros a garantizar que toda persona que se encuentre en su territorio, incluida la frontera, y desee presentar una solicitud de protección internacional tenga acceso efectivo al procedimiento de asilo. El artículo 18 de la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales dispone que el derecho de asilo debe garantizarse de acuerdo con el respeto de las normas de la Convención de Ginebra sobre los Estatutos de los Refugiados y el Tratado de la Unión Europea. Los Estados Miembros deben respetar también el principio de no devolución y velar por que las personas no sean enviadas a zonas donde pueda existir riesgo de persecución, puedan ser sometidas a torturas o a tratos inhumanos o degradantes.

Se ha informado a la Comisión de la intención de Grecia de construir una barrera técnica en un tramo de su frontera terrestre con Turquía. La Comisión velará por que las medidas previstas por las autoridades griegas cumplan con las obligaciones mencionadas.

---

(<sup>1</sup>) <http://www.athensnews.gr/portal/1/53075>.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001737/12  
an die Kommission**

**Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), H el ene Flautre (Verts/ALE), Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE) und Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE)**  
(13. Februar 2012)

**Betrifft:** Bau des Evros-Grenzzaunes und m ogliche Behinderungen des Asylrechts

Am 6. Februar 2012 teilte der griechische Minister f ur Zivilschutz, Christos Papoutsis, in der Presse mit, dass die griechische Regierung neben der Einrichtung eines Netzes aus Nachtsicht- Uberwachungskameras entlang der Grenze zur T urkei mit dem Bau eines 10 Kilometer langen Grenzzauns entlang des Flusses Evros beginnen werde. Berichten zufolge wird dieser doppelreihige, mit vier Meter hohem NATO-Draht gef ullte Zaun im September 2012 fertig sein <sup>(1)</sup>. Die griechische Regierung hat erkl art, dass mit diesem Zaun und den weiteren  Uberwachungsma nahmen die irregul re Einwanderung unterbunden werden soll.

— Kann die Kommission angeben, ob ein derartiger Zaun m oglicherweise in irgendeiner Form das Asylrecht, den subsidi ren Schutz und den vor ubergehenden Schutz eines Staatsangeh rigen eines Drittlandes behindert, der internationalen Schutz ben tigt?

— Kann die Kommission angeben, ob ein solcher Zaun im Einklang mit der Genfer Konvention vom 28. Juli 1951 und dem Protokoll vom 31. Januar 1967  uber die Rechtsstellung der Fl chtlinge sowie anderen einschl gigen Vertr gen st nde, bei denen der betroffene Mitgliedstaat zu den Vertragsparteien geh rt?

— Kann die Kommission angeben, ob ein solcher Zaun im Einklang mit dem Prinzip der Nichtzur ckweisung st nde, wie in der oben genannten Genfer Konvention und dem dazugeh rigen Protokoll dargelegt?

— Kann die Kommission angeben, ob ein solcher Zaun im Einklang mit den Vertr gen, der Charta, dem einschl gigen Sekund rrecht, der Europ ischen Menschenrechtskonvention und der einschl gigen Rechtsprechung des Europ ischen Gerichtshofs und des Europ ischen Gerichtshofs f ur Menschenrechte st nde?

**Antwort von Frau Malmstr m im Namen der Kommission**  
(2. April 2012)

Nach geltendem V lkerrecht sind die Mitgliedstaaten berechtigt, die Einreise von Nichtstaatsangeh rigen in ihr Hoheitsgebiet zu kontrollieren. Bei der Aus bung dieses Rechts m ssen sie jedoch die EU-Rechtsvorschriften und die Charta der Grundrechte in vollem Umfang einhalten.

Gem   Artikel 6 der Richtlinie 2005/85/EG des Rates vom 1. Dezember 2005 stellen die Mitgliedstaaten sicher, dass jede Person, die in ihrem Hoheitsgebiet, einschlie lich an der Grenze, um internationalen Schutz ersucht, wirksamen Zugang zum Asylverfahren erh lt. Artikel 18 der Grundrechtscharta besagt, dass das Recht auf Asyl nach Ma gabe der Genfer Fl chtlingskonvention sowie nach Ma gabe des Vertrags  uber die Europ ische Union gew hrleistet wird. Die Mitgliedstaaten m ssen auch den Grundsatz der Nichtzur ckweisung beachten und gew hrleisten, dass niemand in ein Gebiet abgeschoben wird, in dem f ur sie oder ihn das ernsthafte Risiko der Verfolgung, der Folter oder einer anderen unmenschlichen oder erniedrigenden Strafe oder Behandlung besteht.

Die Kommission wurde  uber die Absicht Griechenlands, in einem Grenzabschnitt zur T urkei einen mit technischen  Uberwachungsger ten ausgestatteten Grenzzaun zu errichten, in Kenntnis gesetzt. Die Kommission wird aufmerksam verfolgen, ob die von der griechischen Regierung geplanten Ma nahmen nicht gegen die vorgenannten Grunds tze versto en.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.athensnews.gr/portal/1/53075>.

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001737/12  
à la Commission**

**Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE), Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE) et Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE)**  
(13 février 2012)

*Objet:* Construction de la clôture à Evros et possibles obstacles au droit d'asile

Le 6 février 2012, le ministre grec de la protection des citoyens, Christos Papoutsis, a annoncé dans la presse qu'en plus de l'installation d'un réseau de caméras vidéo le long de la frontière turque, le gouvernement grec entamera la construction d'une clôture de 10 kilomètres le long du fleuve Évros. Il semblerait que cette double clôture de barbelé de quatre mètres de haut soit prête en septembre 2012 <sup>(1)</sup>. Le gouvernement grec a indiqué que cette clôture et les mesures de surveillance supplémentaires visaient à mettre un terme à l'immigration illégale.

— La Commission peut-elle indiquer si cette clôture éventuellement constituer un quelconque obstacle au droit d'asile, à la protection subsidiaire et à la protection temporaire de tout ressortissant de pays tiers nécessitant la protection internationale?

— La Commission peut-elle indiquer si cette clôture serait conforme à la convention de Genève du 28 juillet 1951 et au protocole relatif au statut des réfugiés du 31 janvier 1967, ainsi qu'à tout autre traité pertinent auquel l'État membre concerné est partie?

— La Commission peut-elle indiquer si cette clôture serait conforme au principe de non-refoulement, tel que promulgué dans la convention de Genève et le protocole y relatif mentionné ci-dessus?

— La Commission peut-elle indiquer si cette clôture serait conforme aux traités, à la Charte, au droit dérivé approprié, à la convention européenne des Droits de l'homme ainsi qu'à la jurisprudence pertinente de la Cour de justice de l'Union européenne et de la Cour européenne des Droits de l'homme?

**Réponse donnée par Mme Malmström au nom de la Commission**

(2 avril 2012)

En vertu du droit international en vigueur, les États membres sont autorisés à contrôler l'entrée des non-nationaux sur leur territoire. Ils sont cependant tenus, lors de l'exercice de ce droit, d'observer pleinement les obligations juridiques de l'UE ainsi que la charte des droits fondamentaux.

L'article 6 de la directive 2005/85/CE du Conseil du 1<sup>er</sup> décembre 2005 fait obligation aux États membres de garantir un accès effectif à la procédure d'asile à chaque personne se trouvant sur leur territoire, y compris à la frontière de celui-ci, et désireuse de solliciter une protection internationale. L'article 18 de la charte des droits fondamentaux dispose que le droit d'asile est garanti dans le respect des règles de la convention de Genève sur les réfugiés et conformément aux traités de l'Union européenne. Les États membres doivent également respecter le principe de non-refoulement et veiller à ce que les demandeurs d'asile ne soient pas envoyés dans des régions où ils pourraient être menacés de persécutions ou être soumis à la torture ou à des traitements inhumains ou dégradants.

La Commission a été informée de l'intention de la Grèce d'ériger une frontière technique le long d'une partie de sa frontière terrestre avec la Turquie. La Commission vérifiera scrupuleusement la conformité des mesures prévues par les autorités grecques aux obligations susmentionnées.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.athensnews.gr/portal/1/53075>.

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001737/12  
aan de Commissie**

**Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE), Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE) en Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE)**  
(13 februari 2012)

*Betref:* Bouw van een heining bij de grens langs de Evros en mogelijke belemmeringen van het asielrecht

Op 6 februari 2012 kondigde de Griekse minister van Burgerbescherming, Christos Papoutsis, in de pers aan dat de Griekse regering niet alleen een netwerk van nachtcamera's ging installeren aan de grenzen met Turkije, maar ook zou beginnen met de bouw van een heining met een lengte van 10 kilometer aan de grens langs de rivier Evros. Er werd aangekondigd dat deze dubbele heining met een vier meter hoge prikkeldraad klaar zal zijn in september 2012 <sup>(1)</sup>. Deze heining en de bijkomende toezichtsmaatregelen hebben volgens de Griekse regering tot doel een halt toe te roepen aan de illegale immigratie.

— Kan de Commissie meedelen of een dergelijke heining op enige manier een belemmering kan vormen voor het asielrecht, de subsidiaire bescherming en de tijdelijke bescherming van een onderdaan van een derde land die internationale bescherming vraagt?

— Kan de Commissie meedelen of een dergelijke heining in overeenstemming is met het Verdrag van Genève van 28 juli 1951 en het Protocol van 31 januari 1967 betreffende de status van vluchtelingen en met alle andere relevante verdragen waaraan de betrokken lidstaat onderworpen is?

— Kan de Commissie meedelen of een dergelijke heining in overeenstemming is met het verbod tot uitzetting of terugleiding (non-refoulement), zoals afgekondigd door het bovenvermelde Verdrag van Genève en het Protocol daarvan?

— Kan de Commissie meedelen of een dergelijke heining in overeenstemming is met de verdragen, het Handvest, het relevante afgeleid recht, het Europees Verdrag van de rechten van de mens en de relevante rechtspraak van het Europees Hof van Justitie en het Europees Hof voor de rechten van de mens?

**Antwoord van mevrouw Malmström namens de Commissie**  
(2 april 2012)

Krachtens de gevestigde internationale wetgeving hebben de lidstaten het recht om de toegang van niet-onderdanen tot hun grondgebied te controleren. Bij de uitoefening van dit recht moeten de lidstaten echter wel zorgen voor de volledige naleving van de wettelijke verplichtingen van de EU en het Handvest van de grondrechten.

Artikel 6 van Richtlijn 2005/85/EG van de Raad van 1 december 2005 verplicht de lidstaten om alle mensen die zich op hun grondgebied bevinden, ook aan de grens, en die internationale bescherming wensen aan te vragen, daadwerkelijk toegang te verlenen tot de asielprocedure. Artikel 18 van het Handvest van de grondrechten bepaalt dat het recht op asiel gegarandeerd moet worden met inachtneming van de voorschriften van het Verdrag van Genève voor vluchtelingen en het Verdrag betreffende de Europese Unie. De lidstaten moeten ook het beginsel van non-refoulement handhaven en ervoor zorgen dat niemand naar gebieden wordt gestuurd waar een gevaar van vervolging bestaat of waar de mensen in kwestie onderworpen kunnen worden aan folteringen of onmenselijke of ontorende behandelingen.

De Commissie is in kennis gesteld van het voornemen van Griekenland om een technische barrière langs een deel van de landgrens met Turkije te bouwen. De Commissie zal er nauwlettend op toezien dat de door de Griekse autoriteiten overwogen maatregelen in overeenstemming zijn met de bovenvermelde verplichtingen.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.athensnews.gr/portal/1/53075>.

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001737/12**

**à Comissão**

**Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE), Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE) e Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE)**

(13 de fevereiro de 2012)

*Assunto:* Construção de vedação nas margens do rio Evros e eventuais obstáculos ao direito de asilo

Em 6 de fevereiro de 2012, o ministro grego da Proteção Civil, Christos Papoutsis, anunciou na imprensa que, a par da instalação de uma rede de câmaras de televisão em circuito fechado (CCTV) de visão noturna ao longo da fronteira com a Turquia, o governo grego irá começar a construir uma vedação fronteiriça com um comprimento de 10 quilómetros ao longo do rio Evros. Estas vedações duplas, preenchidas com 4 metros de altura de arame farpado, deverão estar prontas em setembro de 2012 <sup>(1)</sup>. O governo grego indicou que o objetivo desta vedação e das medidas de vigilância adicionais é acabar com a imigração ilegal.

— A Comissão pode indicar se uma vedação deste tipo pode eventualmente colocar obstáculos ao direito de asilo, à proteção subsidiária e à proteção temporária de qualquer nacional de um país terceiro que peça proteção internacional?

— A Comissão pode indicar se uma vedação deste tipo está em conformidade com a Convenção de Genebra de 28 de julho de 1951 e com o Protocolo de 31 de janeiro de 1967 relativo ao Estatuto dos Refugiados, bem como com outros tratados pertinentes nos quais o Estado-Membro em causa é parte?

— A Comissão pode indicar se uma vedação deste tipo está em conformidade com o princípio da não repulsão, promulgado na Convenção de Genebra e no Protocolo à mesma?

— A Comissão pode indicar se uma vedação deste tipo está em conformidade com os Tratados, a Carta, o direito derivado correspondente, a Convenção Europeia dos Direitos do Homem e a jurisprudência pertinente do Tribunal de Justiça Europeia e do Tribunal Europeu dos Direitos do Homem?

**Resposta dada por Cecilia Malmström em nome da Comissão**

(2 de abril de 2012)

Nos termos do direito internacional, os Estados-Membros têm o direito de controlar a entrada de nacionais de países terceiros no seu território. Todavia, aquando do exercício deste direito, os Estados-Membros devem assegurar o pleno cumprimento das obrigações jurídicas da UE e da Carta dos Direitos Fundamentais.

O artigo 6.º da Diretiva 2005/85/CE do Conselho, de 1 de dezembro de 2005, obriga os Estados-Membros a garantir que qualquer pessoa presente no seu território, incluindo na fronteira, que deseje solicitar proteção internacional tenha acesso efetivo ao procedimento de asilo. O artigo 18.º da Carta dos Direitos Fundamentais estabelece que é garantido o direito de asilo no quadro da Convenção de Genebra relativa ao estatuto dos Refugiados e do Tratado da União Europeia. Os Estados-Membros devem igualmente respeitar o princípio da não-repulsão e devem assegurar que as pessoas não sejam enviadas para zonas em que possa existir risco de perseguição ou onde possam ser sujeitas a tortura ou a outros tratos desumanos ou degradantes.

A Comissão foi informada da intenção da Grécia de criar um entrave técnico ao longo de um troço da sua fronteira terrestre com a Turquia. A Comissão acompanhará de perto as medidas previstas pelas autoridades gregas para verificar se estas cumprem as obrigações acima referidas.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> (<http://www.athensnews.gr/portal/1/53075>).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001737/12  
to the Commission**

**Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE), Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE) and Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE)**  
(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* Construction of Evros border fence and possible impediments to the right to asylum

On 6 February 2012 the Greek Civil Protection Minister, Christos Papoutsis, announced in the press that, as well as installing a network of night-vision CCTV cameras along its border with Turkey, the Greek Government will start constructing a 10-kilometre border fence along the Evros river. It is reported that this twin fence, filled with four-metre-high razor wire, will be ready in September 2012 <sup>(1)</sup>. The Greek Government has indicated that the purpose of this fence and the additional surveillance measures is to halt irregular immigration.

— Can the Commission indicate whether such a fence might possibly impede, in any way, the right to asylum, subsidiary protection and temporary protection of any third-country national requiring international protection?

— Can the Commission indicate whether such a fence would be in accordance with the Geneva Convention of 28 July 1951 and Protocol of 31 January 1967 relating to the Status of Refugees, and with other relevant treaties to which the Member State concerned is a party?

— Can the Commission indicate whether such a fence would be in compliance with the principle of non-refoulement, as promulgated in the aforementioned Geneva Convention and the Protocol thereto?

— Can the Commission indicate whether such a fence would be in accordance with the Treaties, the Charter, the relevant secondary legislation, the European Convention on Human Rights and the relevant case law of the European Court of Justice and the European Court of Human Rights?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission**

(2 April 2012)

Under established international law, Member States have the right to control the entry of non-nationals into their territory. However, when exercising this right, Member States must ensure full compliance with EU legal obligations and the Charter of Fundamental Rights.

Article 6 of Council Directive 2005/85/EC of 1 December 2005 obliges Member States to ensure that any person on their territory, including at the border, who wishes to apply for international protection has effective access to the asylum procedure. Article 18 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights states that the right to asylum shall be guaranteed with due respect for the rules of the Geneva Convention for Refugees and the Treaty of the European Union. Member States must also respect the principle of non-refoulement and shall ensure that persons are not sent to areas where there may be a risk of persecution or where they may be subjected to torture or inhuman or degrading treatment.

The Commission has been informed of Greece's intention to build a technical barrier along a section of its land border with Turkey. The Commission will closely monitor that the measures envisaged by the Greek authorities comply with the abovementioned obligations.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.athensnews.gr/portal/1/53075>.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001740/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — The Jarawa people of the Andaman Islands

The nomadic Jarawa people inhabit India's Andaman Islands, living in bands numbering some forty to fifty. India rightly has legislation in place, including the Protection of Aboriginal Tribes Regulations 1956, to protect the culture and dignity of such peoples.

The Great Andaman Trunk Road passes through areas where the Jarawa live, and sadly some tour operators have been using this road to offer 'sightseeing tours' of the native Jarawa people.

In May 2002 the Supreme Court of India directed the authorities to take steps to protect the Jarawa from encroachment and unnecessary contact. This included the possible closure of part of the Great Andaman Trunk Road's current route. However, the road remains open, with its route unchanged.

The Indian authorities are aware of the problem and are continuing to take steps to prevent the miscreant behaviour of tour operators whose business is fuelled by tourists from around the world — including Europe — who may undertake these tours. I note for instance, the arrests made by the Indian police in January 2012 of 15 people under the Protection of Aboriginal Tribes Regulations.

— However, can the Vice-President/High Representative confirm whether she is aware of this issue, and, if so, specify what representations have been made to her Indian counterparts?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**

(13 March 2012)

The European External Action Service (EEAS) and the High Representative/Vice-President are aware of the situation of the Jarawa in the Andaman Islands and of the threat to their rights and culture posed by tour companies operating along the Great Andaman Trunk Road.

A video recording of a recent incident involving tourists and Jarawa people was widely distributed in the Indian and international media, and the issue is being closely followed by the EU Delegation in Delhi.

The EU regularly addresses subjects such as vulnerable groups and the rights of indigenous people in the framework of its local Human Rights Dialogue with the Indian Government.

The fact that the incident referred to above has prompted the Government to open an investigation into alleged acts of exploitation of the Jarawa is an indication of the importance that the authorities attach to ensuring that their rights are respected. The EEAS and the EU Delegation in Delhi will continue to monitor developments in this respect.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001741/12  
alla Commissione**

**Cristiana Muscardini (PPE), Gianluca Susta (S&D), Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE), Gianni Pittella (S&D) e Roberta Angelilli (PPE)**  
(13 febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: Eccessiva cementificazione urbana e tutela dell'ambiente

Può la Commissione far sapere se:

1. è a conoscenza del rapporto shock di FAI e WWF riportato dai quotidiani italiani Corriere della Sera e Repubblica, secondo il quale da qui a pochi anni saranno scomparsi milioni di ettari di territorio sostituiti da colate di cemento. (L'indagine condotta su 11 regioni italiane corrispondente al 44 % della superficie totale indica come l'area urbana si sia moltiplicata di 3,5 volte e il ritmo sia in aumento in modo esponenziale);
2. è a conoscenza di quale sia la situazione negli altri paesi europei tenuto conto che ormai è dimostrato che, superato un certo limite di urbanizzazione e cementificazione, la situazione diventa irreversibile con i conseguenti danni per l'ambiente e la salute;
3. intende dare vita a un immediato studio del problema sulla base del quale possa partire una seria politica per la conservazione dell'ambiente e per la lotta alla cementificazione selvaggia e all'abusivismo?

**Risposta data da Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione**

(28 marzo 2012)

Nel 2011 la Commissione ha pubblicato lo studio «Overview of best practices for limiting soil sealing or mitigating its effects in EU-27» <sup>(1)</sup>, elaborato per suo conto dall'Agenzia Federale per l'Ambiente austriaca (Umweltbundesamt). Sulla base dei dati armonizzati a livello UE contenuti nel database Corine Land Cover, lo studio stima che in Italia l'edificazione dei terreni (ossia l'espansione delle infrastrutture urbane, industriali e dei trasporti, essenzialmente a scapito dell'agricoltura) è stata di 23,90 ettari al giorno nel periodo 1990-2000 e di 22,05 ettari al giorno nel periodo 2000-2006 <sup>(2)</sup>. Nel 2006 l'impermeabilizzazione (ossia la copertura del suolo con un materiale impermeabile) ha riguardato il 2,8 % del territorio italiano, rispetto ad una media del 2,3 % a livello UE. La Commissione è consapevole del fatto che tali cifre rappresentano una stima per difetto del problema e sta lavorando per acquisire maggiori conoscenze al riguardo. Lo studio al quale fa riferimento l'onorevole parlamentare contribuirà proprio a questo.

La Commissione riconosce che l'attuale edificazione dei terreni nell'UE non è sostenibile. Nel quadro della tabella di marcia per un'Europa efficiente sotto il profilo delle risorse <sup>(3)</sup>, la Commissione ha proposto che entro il 2020 le politiche dell'UE tengano conto dell'impatto che esse hanno, in via sia diretta che indiretta, sull'uso del terreno nell'UE e a livello mondiale, e che il tasso di edificazione dei terreni sia in linea con l'obiettivo di non edificare più su nuove aree entro il 2050. Orientamenti non vincolanti su come limitare, attenuare e compensare l'impermeabilizzazione del suolo saranno messi a punto entro breve e presentati ad un'importante conferenza che la Commissione sta organizzando per il 10 e 11 maggio 2012 a Bruxelles <sup>(4)</sup>.

Inoltre, nel quadro della strategia tematica sul suolo <sup>(5)</sup>, nel 2006 la Commissione ha proposto una direttiva quadro sul suolo <sup>(6)</sup> che contiene una disposizione in base alla quale gli Stati membri sono tenuti a limitare l'impermeabilizzazione del suolo e, qualora ciò non fosse possibile, ad attenuarne gli effetti. La proposta di direttiva è attualmente al vaglio del Consiglio. La Commissione ha pubblicato una relazione sull'attuazione di detta strategia tematica il 13 febbraio 2012 <sup>(7)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/soil/sealing.htm>

<sup>(2)</sup> Cfr. anche <http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/indicators/land-take-2/assessment>.

<sup>(3)</sup> COM(2001)571 definitivo.

<sup>(4)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/soil/conference\\_may2012.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/soil/conference_may2012.htm)

<sup>(5)</sup> COM(2006) 231 definitivo.

<sup>(6)</sup> COM(2006) 232 definitivo.

<sup>(7)</sup> COM(2012) 46 definitivo.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001741/12  
to the Commission**  
**Cristiana Muscardini (PPE), Gianluca Susta (S&D), Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE), Gianni Pittella (S&D) and  
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)**  
(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* Excessive urban concreting and environmental protection

Can the Commission state whether:

1. it is aware of the shocking report by the FAI (Italian Environment Fund) and the WWF (World Wide Fund for Nature) as published in the Italian newspapers *Corriere della Sera* and *La Repubblica*, which states that in just a few years from now, millions of hectares of land will have been replaced by concrete structures. (The survey, which was carried out in 11 Italian regions corresponding to 44 % of the total area of Italy, shows how urban areas have increased by 350 % and how the pace of urbanisation is increasing exponentially);
2. it is aware of the situation in other European countries, since it has already been demonstrated that after a certain degree of urbanisation and concreting the situation becomes irreversible, with subsequent damage to the environment and to health;
3. it intends to carry out an immediate study of the issue, upon which to build a serious policy to preserve the environment and combat uncontrolled and unauthorised concreting?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission**  
(28 March 2012)

In 2011 the Commission published the report 'Overview of best practices for limiting soil sealing or mitigating its effects in EU-27' <sup>(1)</sup> carried out on its behalf by the Austrian Environment Agency. The report, on the basis of harmonised Corine Land Cover data at EU level, estimates that land take (i.e. the expansion of urban, industrial and transport infrastructure, mainly at the expense of agriculture) in Italy stood at 23.90ha/day and 22.05ha/day in the periods 1990-2000 and 2000-2006 respectively <sup>(2)</sup>. Soil sealing (i.e. the covering of soil with an impermeable material) in 2006 affected 2.8 % of the Italian territory, against an EU average of 2.3 %. The Commission is aware that these figures are an underestimate of the problem and is working to improve its knowledge-base. The study referred to by the Honourable Members will contribute to this.

The Commission recognises that current land take in the EU is unsustainable. In the context of the Roadmap to a Resource Efficient Europe <sup>(3)</sup>, it has proposed that by 2020, EU policies take into account their direct and indirect impact on land use in the EU and globally, and that the rate of land take is on track with an aim to achieve no net land take by 2050. Non-binding guidelines on how to limit, mitigate and compensate for soil sealing will be finalised shortly and presented at a major conference the Commission is organising on 10-11 May 2012 in Brussels <sup>(4)</sup>.

Furthermore, the Commission in 2006 proposed a Soil Framework Directive <sup>(5)</sup> in the context of the Soil Thematic Strategy <sup>(6)</sup>. This proposal contains a provision according to which Member States would have to limit soil sealing and, where this is not possible, to mitigate its effects. The proposal is currently with the Council. The Commission published a report on the implementation of the strategy on 13 February 2012 <sup>(7)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/soil/sealing.htm>

<sup>(2)</sup> See also <http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/indicators/land-take-2/assessment>.

<sup>(3)</sup> COM(2001) 571 final.

<sup>(4)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/soil/conference\\_may2012.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/soil/conference_may2012.htm)

<sup>(5)</sup> COM(2006) 232 final.

<sup>(6)</sup> COM(2006) 231 final.

<sup>(7)</sup> COM(2012) 46 final.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001742/12**  
**alla Commissione**  
**Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)**  
(13 febbraio 2012)

**Oggetto:** Gravissimo peggioramento qualità dell'aria a Verona in caso di costruzione dell'inceneritore di Ca' del Bue

Nella città di Verona, in località Ca' del Bue, è prevista la costruzione di un inceneritore di rifiuti solidi urbani dalla capacità di circa 570 tonnellate al giorno i cui lavori di realizzazione sono stati aggiudicati con un bando di gara all'azienda spagnola Urbaser.

Presso la Corte di giustizia UE è pendente la causa C-68/11 Commissione contro Italia che verte sulla reiterata violazione da parte dell'Italia, in particolare a Verona, della direttiva 2008/50/CE (qualità dell'aria) per gli anni 2005-2007 per via del superamento del valore limite di biossido di zolfo, biossido di azoto, ossidi di azoto, polveri sottili e piombo.

Nonostante il contenzioso in corso, a Verona nel 2011 si sono verificati ben 130 sforamenti (contro i 70 del 2010) del limite di 50 microgrammi al metro cubo di aria delle polveri sottili, le cosiddette PM10, anche se la direttiva comunitaria permette un massimo di 35 sforamenti nel corso di un anno intero.

Uno studio redatto dall'Università degli Studi di Trento <sup>(1)</sup> stima che l'impianto di Ca' del Bue potrebbe avere emissioni di ossidi di azoto pari a 460 tonnellate/anno. Con l'entrata in funzione dell'impianto crescerà, quindi, enormemente il livello di inquinamento da polveri sottili nella zona di Verona.

Poiché secondo la direttiva in questione l'obiettivo principale di qualsiasi politica in materia di rifiuti dovrebbe essere quello di ridurre al minimo le conseguenze negative della produzione e gestione dei rifiuti per la salute umana e l'ambiente e l'art. 13 della stessa prevede che «gli Stati membri prendono le misure necessarie per garantire che la gestione dei rifiuti sia effettuata senza danneggiare la salute umana», ritiene la Commissione che l'entrata in funzione dell'inceneritore di Verona violi clamorosamente l'obiettivo della direttiva rifiuti, nonché quello della direttiva relativa alla qualità dell'aria?

Ritiene essa necessario intervenire presso le competenti autorità locali (Comune di Verona e Regione Veneto) affinché sospendano la decisione di avviare un nuovo inceneritore in attesa del pronunciamento della Corte di giustizia sul contenzioso aperto nella causa C-68/11?

**Risposta data da Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione**  
(30 marzo 2012)

La Commissione è consapevole del fatto che in molte città italiane, compresa Verona, i valori limite per il particolato PM10 nell'aria, fissati dalla direttiva 2008/50/CE relativa alla qualità dell'aria <sup>(2)</sup>, sono stati frequentemente superati. Come sottolineato dall'onorevole parlamentare, la Commissione ha già agito, deferendo l'Italia alla Corte di giustizia il 24 novembre 2010. Va sottolineato, tuttavia, che la Commissione non può sostituirsi alle autorità nazionali, regionali e locali nell'adottare le misure necessarie per conformarsi alla normativa UE sulla qualità dell'aria.

Parimenti, la Commissione non può intervenire nelle decisioni delle autorità competenti degli Stati membri relative all'autorizzazione di nuovi impianti di incenerimento dei rifiuti in un'area in cui i valori limite di qualità dell'aria sono già superati, a meno che non abbia la prova che l'impianto non è autorizzato, costruito e gestito in conformità con la legislazione comunitaria pertinente. Le informazioni fornite dall'onorevole parlamentare non consentono alla Commissione, in questa fase, di individuare alcuna violazione della normativa UE applicabile in relazione con l'impianto previsto.

<sup>(1)</sup> Università di Trento: Proposta di piano d'azione e risanamento della qualità dell'aria per l'adozione da parte dei comuni di (...) Verona [http://portale.comune.verona.it/media/\\_ComVR/Cdr/Ambiente/Allegati/Elaborato\\_Tecnico\\_Scientifico\\_UNITN.pdf](http://portale.comune.verona.it/media/_ComVR/Cdr/Ambiente/Allegati/Elaborato_Tecnico_Scientifico_UNITN.pdf).

<sup>(2)</sup> Direttiva 2008/50/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 21 maggio 2008, relativa alla qualità dell'aria ambiente e per un'aria più pulita in Europa, GU L 152 dell'11.6.2008.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001742/12  
to the Commission**

**Andrea Zaroni (ALDE)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* Extremely serious worsening of air quality in Verona foreseen if planned construction of Ca' del Bue incinerator is given the green light

Plans are currently underway for the construction of a solid urban waste incinerator with a capacity of around 570 tons per day in the Ca' del Bue area in the city of Verona. The contract for the construction work has been awarded to the Spanish company Urbaser, following a call for tenders.

Case C-68/11 of the Commission against Italy, which is currently pending at the European Court of Justice, focuses on the repeated breaching of Directive 2008/50/EC (air quality) by Italy, more specifically in the Verona area, during 2005-2007 on account of the exceeding of limit values for sulphur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide, nitrogen oxides, fine particulates and lead.

Despite the ongoing dispute, in 2011 there were over 130 cases (compared to 70 in 2010) in Verona where the 50 µg/m<sup>3</sup> of air limit for fine particulates (known as PM<sub>10</sub>) was exceeded, although the EU Directive allows a maximum of 35 breaches over the course of an entire year.

A study carried out by the University of Trento <sup>(1)</sup> estimates that the Ca' del Bue plant could produce as much as 460 tons of nitrogen oxide emissions per year. The level of pollution from fine particulates in the Verona area will thus increase enormously when the plant goes into operation.

Since, according to the directive in question, the principal objective of any policy related to waste should be that of reducing the negative consequences of production and management of waste for human health and the environment to a minimum and Article 13 of the same Directive states that 'Member States shall take the necessary measures to ensure that waste management is carried out without endangering human health', does the Commission consider that the entering into operation of the Verona incinerator blatantly violates the objective of the waste Directive, as well as that of the air quality Directive?

Does it consider it necessary to intervene with the relevant local authorities (the Municipality of Verona and the Veneto Region) to ask them to suspend the decision to start operating a new incinerator until the Court of Justice gives judgment on Case C-68/11?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission**

(30 March 2012)

The Commission is aware that in many Italian cities, including Verona, the limit values for particulate matters PM10 in the air, fixed by Directive 2008/50/EC on air quality <sup>(2)</sup>, have been frequently exceeded. As the Honourable Member points out, the Commission has already acted by taking Italy to the Court of Justice on 24 November 2010. It has to be pointed out, however, that the Commission cannot replace the national, regional and local authorities in adopting the measures necessary to fully comply with EU air quality legislation.

Likewise, the Commission cannot intervene in the decisions of the competent authorities of Member States concerning the authorisation of new waste incineration installations in an area where air quality limit values are already exceeded, unless it has evidence that the installation is not authorised, built and operating in compliance with the relevant EU legislation. The information provided by the Honourable Member does not allow the Commission, at this stage, to identify any breach of the applicable EU legislation, in connection with the foreseen installation.

<sup>(1)</sup> University of Trento: Proposal for action plan and plan for recovery of air quality for adoption by the municipalities of (...) Verona. [http://portale.comune.verona.it/media/\\_ComVR/Cdr/Ambiente/Allegati/Elaborato\\_Tecnico\\_Scientifico\\_UNITN.pdf](http://portale.comune.verona.it/media/_ComVR/Cdr/Ambiente/Allegati/Elaborato_Tecnico_Scientifico_UNITN.pdf).

<sup>(2)</sup> Directive 2008/50/EC of the Parliament and of the Council of 21 May 2008 on ambient air quality and cleaner air for Europe, OJ L 152, 11.6.2008.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001743/12  
alla Commissione  
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)  
(13 febbraio 2012)**

Oggetto: Scuole per lo sviluppo agricolo locale dell'area euromediterranea

Lo sviluppo dell'area euromediterranea e la sua crescita economica dipende dalla capacità della regione di impegnarsi in attività preposte allo sviluppo. Corsi di formazione per addetti all'agricoltura dei paesi di tale area possono offrirne il know-how necessario per ampliare la cultura agricola dei paesi in questione sia livello tecnologico che di produzione. Le scuole diventano quindi uno strumento per lo sviluppo locale e sociale delle vaste aree agricole del continente africano.

Può la Commissione riferire:

1. su eventuali progetti di finanziamento per progetti educativi in ambito agricolo nell'area mediterranea o nel continente africano;
2. se esistono scuole di formazione agricola nell'Unione europea specificamente rivolte ai giovani dei paesi del continente africano;
3. quali strumenti ha l'Europa per sostenere progetti di sviluppo locale e sociale basati sul trasferimento di know-how tecnologico e cognitivo nell'area;
4. se intende promuovere scuole per la formazione nel settore agricolo nel caso in cui al momento non esistano?

**Risposta data da Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione  
(16 aprile 2012)**

1. L'UE sostiene diverse istituzioni e iniziative che si occupano delle necessità formative del settore agricolo dei paesi in via di sviluppo, prevalentemente in Africa <sup>(1)</sup>. Nell'area mediterranea dell'UE, il Fondo europeo agricolo per lo sviluppo rurale (FEASR) sostiene il passaggio di conoscenze attraverso progetti formativi per il settore agricolo.
2. Il programma Erasmus Mundus sostiene la formazione agraria a livello universitario per studenti provenienti da paesi in via di sviluppo tramite una rete di università europee specializzate nell'agricoltura di questo tipo di paesi. Molte di queste università sono membri di Agrinatura <sup>(2)</sup>, Agris Mundus e del Centro internazionale di alti studi agronomici mediterranei.
3. I progetti di sviluppo locale e sociale all'interno dell'UE possono ricevere il sostegno del FEASR anche attraverso l'approccio LEADER. L'UE sostiene programmi di sviluppo rurale in gran parte dei paesi partner del vicinato meridionale. Tali programmi comprendono, nella maggioranza dei casi, attività di formazione e di rafforzamento delle capacità rivolte agli agricoltori. Anche il programma europeo di vicinato per l'agricoltura e lo sviluppo rurale (ENPARD) è in grado di fornire sostegno alla formazione professionale agricola. L'UE sostiene le associazioni locali di agricoltori e i programmi di formazione locale decentralizzata attraverso il finanziamento delle organizzazioni della società civile.
4. La Commissione concentra i propri sforzi sul dialogo politico con i governi partner al fine di promuovere le riforme e lo sviluppo sostenibile del settore agricolo. Ciò comprende lo sviluppo di metodi di divulgazione volti a far accedere gli agricoltori ai risultati della ricerca e alle opportunità del mercato.

<sup>(1)</sup> Ad es. INADES <http://www.inadesfo.net>.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.agrinatura.eu/About-us/Association/Members/>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001743/12  
to the Commission**

**Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* Schools for local agricultural development in the Euro-Mediterranean area

The development of the Euro-Mediterranean area and its economic growth depend on the region's ability to undertake activities that promote development. Training courses for agricultural workers in the countries in this area can offer the necessary know-how in order to broaden the agricultural tradition of the countries in question in terms of both technology and production. The schools can therefore become a tool for local and social development in the vast agricultural areas of the African continent.

Can the Commission provide the following information:

1. whether there are any financing schemes for educational projects concerning agriculture in the Mediterranean area or on the African continent;
2. whether any agricultural training schools exist in the European Union that are specifically targeted at young people from countries on the African continent;
3. what tools are available to Europe to sustain local and social development projects based on the transfer of technological and cognitive know-how in the area;
4. whether it intends to promote agricultural training schools where they do not currently exist?

**Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission**

(16 April 2012)

1. The EU supports several institutions and initiatives addressing educational needs in the agricultural sector of the developing world, mostly in Africa <sup>(1)</sup>. In the EU's Mediterranean area, the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) supports knowledge transfer through training measures for the farming sector.
2. Graduate agricultural training to students from developing countries is supported through Erasmus Mundus and is delivered through a network of European universities specialised in agriculture of developing countries. Most of them are the direct members of Agrinatura <sup>(2)</sup>, Agris Mundus, Centre International des Hautes Études Agronomiques.
3. Local and social development projects within the EU might also be supported by the EAFRD through the Leader approach. In most partner countries of the southern Neighbourhood, the EU supports rural development programmes. These include in most cases training and capacity building activities for farmers. The European Neighbourhood Programme for Agriculture and Rural Development (ENPARD) will also be able to support agricultural training. The EU supports local farmers' associations and local decentralised trainings through grants to Civil Society Organisations.
4. The Commission concentrates its efforts on policy dialogue with partner governments to promote reform and sustainable development of the agricultural sector. This includes the development of extension methods that link farmers with agricultural research results and with market opportunities.

<sup>(1)</sup> e.g. INADES <http://www.inadesfo.net>.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.agrinatura.eu/About-us/Association/Members/>.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001744/12  
alla Commissione**

**Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE)**

(13 febbraio 2012)

**Oggetto:** Scadenza dei bond greci, possibile default e conseguente effetto domino sugli Stati membri dell'Unione europea

Nel maggio 2010 la Commissione, la Banca centrale europea e il Fondo Monetario Europeo valutavano positivamente l'austerità plan presentato dal Ministro delle finanze greco, e con il benestare della Germania, concedevano alla Grecia un «pacchetto di aiuti» dell'ammontare di 110 miliardi di euro.

Nonostante gli ingenti contributi concessi dalle istituzioni europee, i tagli nelle pubbliche amministrazioni e sulle pensioni effettuati dal governo greco, è chiaro che la situazione è pressoché immutata e sembra non ci sia un effettivo margine di miglioramento. Il debito greco continua ad aumentare e l'imminente scadenza dei suoi bond a marzo 2012, mese in cui dovrà pagare 14.4 miliardi di euro, fa intravedere chiari segnali di pericolo e preoccupazione. Le trattative tra la troika e il governo greco, per la concessione di un ulteriore prestito da 130 miliardi di euro, sono attualmente in fase di stallo, senza questo nuovo aiuto da parte dell'Unione europea la Grecia andrà in default, creando un effetto a catena che coinvolgerà in primis Spagna, Italia, Portogallo e di conseguenza l'intera zona euro.

Tutto ciò premesso, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se dispone di una valutazione d'impatto sugli effetti di un potenziale default della Grecia (o in generale di uno Stato della zona euro) e sulle conseguenze che ciò comporterebbe;
2. se ha varato un risk assessment ed un piano per contrastare un eventuale effetto domino che si verrebbe a creare a causa del potenziale default della Grecia;
3. qual è lo stato attuale dei negoziati tra il governo greco, le istituzioni europee e l'FMI in relazione alla concessione del prestito e come essa valuterebbe il potenziale inserimento di altri partner come gli USA al tavolo dei negoziati quali possibili sostenitori di un ulteriore intervento finanziario a favore della Grecia?

**Risposta data da Olli Rehn a nome della Commissione**

(25 aprile 2012)

I negoziati della Commissione e dei suoi partner della Troika con le autorità greche per il nuovo programma intendevano riconciliare il necessario risanamento del bilancio e la svalutazione interna con la coesione sociale e le riforme a sostegno della crescita per affrontare le sfide della competitività greca e della sostenibilità del debito. I leader dei principali partiti greci hanno espresso per iscritto il loro impegno a attuare il programma, indipendentemente dalla composizione del nuovo governo. Questa evoluzione riflette la forte approvazione del programma greco che era necessario per convincere gli Stati creditori nonché i mercati. Le autorità greche hanno posto in essere una serie di interventi preliminari. Questo, oltre al successo nella ristrutturazione volontaria del debito, ha fornito la base per l'approvazione del nuovo programma dall'Eurogruppo il 12 marzo 2012 e dal Consiglio del FMI, compresi gli Stati Uniti, che detengono la maggior parte delle quote del FMI, il 15 marzo 2012.

La Commissione si è sempre adoperata per presentare in modo equilibrato i rischi del programma nelle sue relazioni in materia di conformità anche per il nuovo programma (vedasi: [http://ec.europa.eu/economy\\_finance/eu\\_borrower/greek\\_loan\\_facility/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/eu_borrower/greek_loan_facility/index_en.htm)). Saranno attuati meccanismi per ridurre i rischi di una revisione al ribasso: la capacità di controllo sul terreno sarà potenziata e dalla *task force* greca verrà fornita assistenza tecnica sostanziale.

La Commissione, in quanto parte della Troika, nonché gli Stati membri dell'area dell'euro si sono adoperati per evitare un fallimento sovrano. Inoltre l'UE ha lavorato con successo alla costruzione di sbarramenti in modo da contenere l'eventuale espansione di qualsiasi tipo di crisi. L'UE collabora strettamente con altri partner esterni <sup>(1)</sup> per affrontare le lacune e le sfide in materia di stabilità globale.

---

(<sup>1</sup>) Ad esempio nell'ambito del G20.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001744/12  
to the Commission**

**Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* Expiry of Greek bonds, possible default and the consequent domino effect on the Member States of the European Union

In May 2010, the Commission, the European Central Bank and the European Monetary Fund gave a positive assessment of the austerity plan presented by the Greek Finance Minister and, with the approval of Germany, granted Greece an 'assistance package' worth EUR 110 billion.

Notwithstanding the enormous contributions made by the European institutions and the cuts to public authorities and pensions made by the Greek Government, it is clear that the situation is practically unchanged and it seems there is no effective room for improvement. Greek debt continues to grow and the imminent expiry of Greek bonds in March 2012, when the country will have to pay EUR 14.4 billion, are clear warning signs and a cause for concern. Negotiations between the troika and the Greek Government for the granting of a further EUR 130 billion loan have reached a stalemate. Without this additional assistance from the European Union, Greece will default. This will have a knock-on effect that will involve first Spain, Italy and Portugal, and subsequently the entire eurozone.

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

1. whether it has an impact assessment on the effects of a potential default by Greece (or in general by any eurozone country) and on its consequences;
2. whether it has prepared a risk assessment and a plan to counteract a possible domino effect created by the potential default of Greece;
3. what the latest developments are, with regard to the granting of the loan, in the negotiations between the Greek Government, the European institutions and the IMF, and how it would view the potential inclusion of other partners, such as the USA, at the negotiating table as possible supporters of further financial intervention in favour of Greece?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission**

(25 April 2012)

The negotiations of the Commission and its Troika partners with the Greek authorities on the new programme aimed to reconcile the necessary fiscal consolidation and internal devaluation with social cohesion and growth enhancing reforms to address the challenges of Greek competitiveness and debt sustainability. The leaders of the main Greek parties expressed in writing their commitment to implement the programme regardless of the compositions of the next government. This reflects the strong ownership of the Greek programme which was needed to convince both creditor countries as well as markets. The Greek authorities fulfilled a number of prior actions. This, together with the successful voluntary debt exchange, paved the way for the approval of the new programme by the Eurogroup on 12 March 2012 and by the IMF Board, including by the US, the biggest shareholder of the IMF, on 15 March 2012.

The Commission has always endeavoured to present a fair and balanced presentation of the programme risks in its compliance reports including for the new programme (see: [http://ec.europa.eu/economy\\_finance/eu\\_borrower/greek\\_loan\\_facility/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/eu_borrower/greek_loan_facility/index_en.htm)). Mechanisms will be put in place to reduce the downside risks: the monitoring capacity on the ground will be strengthened and substantial technical assistance will be provided by the Task Force Greece.

The Commission as part of the Troika as well as euro area MS have been working to avoid a sovereign default. Moreover, the EU has successfully worked on building firewalls so as to contain any crisis, should it occur, from spreading further. The EU is cooperating closely with other external partners <sup>(1)</sup> to address weaknesses and challenges for global stability.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> e.g. in the context of G-20.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-001746/12  
a la Comisión**

**Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)**

(13 de febrero de 2012)

*Asunto:* Posibilidad de que bancos con ayuda pública puedan adquirir otras instituciones bancarias

En una nota informativa en su página web el FROB (Fondo de Reestructuración Ordenada Bancaria) ha anunciado que: «en su reunión del pasado 17 de enero, la Comisión Rectora del FROB ha acordado eximir, a las entidades que han recibido apoyo financiero del FROB por importe no superior al 2 % de sus activos ponderados por riesgo, del cumplimiento del requisito de no llevar a cabo planes de expansión mediante la adquisición de otras entidades que se estableció en los acuerdos de la Comisión Rectora de 29 de enero y 27 de julio de 2010 por los que se aprobaron los criterios y las condiciones aplicables a la intervención del FROB en los procesos de integración de las entidades de crédito. Esta decisión se ha comunicado a las entidades afectadas y a la Comisión Europea.»

Esta decisión implica que unas entidades que han recibido ayudas con dinero público en su proceso de reestructuración y reconversión bancaria puedan ahora participar en la subasta de ciertas entidades que actualmente son propiedad del FROB. El Gobierno español también ha aprobado en su decreto de reforma financiera nuevas normas ad-hoc sobre el tamaño mínimo de aumento que debe suponer una fusión en el sector bancario. Desde el pasado día 3 de febrero, y en determinadas circunstancias, se podrá realizar una fusión con otra entidad si como resultado la mayor entidad de las dos aumenta un 10 %.

Por otro lado, según el artículo 107 del TFUE: «Salvo que los Tratados dispongan otra cosa, serán incompatibles con el mercado interior, en la medida en que afecten a los intercambios comerciales entre Estados miembros, las ayudas otorgadas por los Estados o mediante fondos estatales, bajo cualquier forma, que falseen o amenacen falsear la competencia, favoreciendo a determinadas empresas o producciones.»

1. ¿Tiene la Comisión constancia de los hechos descritos? ¿Cuál es su opinión sobre estos cambios?
2. ¿No cree la Comisión que permitir a una entidad bancaria que actualmente recibe ayudas públicas adquirir otras entidades representa una distorsión de la competencia como se desprende del artículo 107 del TFUE y del resto de normas europeas?

**Respuesta del Sr. Almunia en nombre de la Comisión**

(15 de marzo de 2012)

La Comisión tiene muy presente la reciente decisión del Fondo de Reestructuración Ordenada Bancaria (FROB), que permite que los bancos que hayan recibido ayuda financiera de un importe de hasta el 2 % de sus activos ponderados en función del riesgo (RWA) lleven a cabo planes de expansión a través de la adquisición de otras entidades de crédito.

La Comisión desearía recordar que, de acuerdo con su Comunicación sobre la ayudas estatales al sector financiero en vigor hasta diciembre de 2010, las entidades de crédito fundamentalmente sólidas (es decir, los bancos que, entre otras cosas, han recibido ayuda estatal en forma de recapitalizaciones hasta el 2 % del RWA) no tenían prohibido adquirir otras instituciones.

Es importante señalar, sin embargo, que, la distinción original <sup>(1)</sup> entre los bancos fundamentalmente sólidos y las entidades de crédito en crisis ya no es aplicable. Por tanto, todas las entidades de crédito salvadas están obligadas, desde el 1 de enero de 2011, a presentar un plan de reestructuración, independientemente de la cantidad de ayuda estatal recibida. Mientras la Comisión estudia dichos planes de reestructuración, espera que los bancos rescatados emprendan medidas para limitar el falseamiento de la competencia que, por supuesto, reflejen el importe de la ayuda recibida y que, por lo general, incluyan, entre otras cosas, una prohibición del crecimiento no orgánico.

<sup>(1)</sup> Comunicación de la Comisión — La recapitalización de las instituciones financieras en la crisis financiera actual: limitación de las ayudas al mínimo necesario y salvaguardas contra los falseamientos indebidos de la competencia; DO C 10 de 15.1.2009, p. 2.

La Comisión considera que las normas sobre ayudas estatales no se infringen por la adquisición de una entidad de crédito por parte de otra que haya recibido previamente ayudas estatales limitadas del FROB y que no haya estado obligada hasta la fecha a presentar un plan de reestructuración a la Comisión. Sin embargo, la Comisión desea recordar de nuevo que una solicitud de ayuda adicional por su parte, o por cualquier otro banco, provocaría la reestructuración de la entidad de crédito ayudada, lo que normalmente supondría una prohibición de las prácticas de crecimiento no orgánico.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-001746/12  
to the Commission**

**Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* Possibility that banks receiving public aid may acquire other banking institutions

In a notice on its website <sup>(1)</sup>, the FROB (Fund for Orderly Bank Restructuring) announced the following: 'At its meeting on 17 January, the Governing Committee of the FROB agreed that institutions which have received financial support of less than 2 % of their risk-weighted assets from the FROB should be made exempt from complying with the requirement of not carrying out expansion plans through the acquisition of other institutions, which was established in the agreements of the Governing Committee of 29 January and 27 July 2010 in which the criteria and conditions applicable to the intervention of the FROB in the integration processes of credit institutions were approved. This decision was communicated to the affected institutions and to the European Commission'.

This decision means that some institutions which received aid from public funds during their banking restructuring process may now participate in the auctioning of certain institutions that are currently the property of the FROB. In its financial reform decree, the Spanish Government also introduced new ad hoc regulations regarding the minimum increase that a merger in the banking sector must entail. Since 3 February 2012, under certain circumstances a merger of two institutions may be carried out where the larger one grows by 10 % as a result.

Nonetheless, it is stated in Article 107 TFEU: 'Save as otherwise provided in the Treaties, any aid granted by a Member State or through State resources in any form whatsoever which distorts or threatens to distort competition by favouring certain undertakings or the production of certain goods shall, in so far as it affects trade between Member States, be incompatible with the internal market'.

1. Does the Commission have any evidence of the facts described above? What is its opinion regarding these changes?
2. Does the Commission not believe that allowing a banking institution that currently receives public aid to acquire other institutions is a distortion of competition, under Article 107 TFEU and the other applicable EU legislation?

**Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission**

(15 March 2012)

The Commission is well aware of the recent decision of the Fund for Orderly Bank Restructuring (FROB), to allow banks that have received financial support of an amount of up to 2 % of their risk-weighted assets (RWA) to carry out expansion plans through the acquisition of other credit institutions.

The Commission would like to recall that according to its communications on state aid to the financial sector in force until December 2010, fundamentally sound credit institutions (i.e. banks that, *inter alia*, received state aid in the form of recapitalisations up to 2 % of RWA) were not banned from acquiring other institutions.

It is important to note, however, that, the original <sup>(2)</sup> distinction between fundamentally sound and distressed credit institutions no longer applies. Thus, all rescued credit institutions are, as of 1 January 2011, under the obligation to submit a restructuring plan regardless of the amount of state aid received. When the Commission is examining such restructuring plans, it expects that the rescued bank will undertake measures to limit the distortion of competition which would, of course, reflect the amount of aid received by the bank and would ordinarily include, *inter alia*, a ban on non-organic growth.

The Commission considers that the state aid rules are not violated by the acquisition of a credit institution by another that has previously received limited state aid from FROB and which was not required to present a restructuring plan to the Commission. However, the Commission would like to recall again that a request for additional aid from them or any other bank would trigger the restructuring of the aided credit institution, which would ordinarily involve a ban on non-organic growth practices.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.frob.es/notas/notas.html>

<sup>(2)</sup> Communication from the Commission — The recapitalisation of financial institutions in the current financial crisis: limitation of aid to the minimum necessary and safeguards against undue distortions of competition; OJ C 10, 15.1.2009, p. 2.

(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001747/12**  
**adresată Comisiei**  
**Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE)**  
(13 februarie 2012)

*Subiect:* Site-ul internet lansat de către Geert Wilders, lider al Partidului Olandez al Libertății (PVV)

La 8 februarie 2012, liderul PVV a lansat un site internet pentru raportarea reclamațiilor cu privire la imigranții central și est-europeni din Țările de Jos. Site-ul internet publică întrebări precum: „Aveți probleme cu cetățenii din Europa Centrală și de Est?” și este ilustrată printr-o prezentare alcătuită din fragmente din ziare cu titluri precum „Nu ar fi mai bine dacă v-ați întoarce?” Nu este contestat dreptul cetățenilor UE la libertatea de exprimare, nici libertatea mass-media de a raporta cu privire la conflicte și controlul public.

Cu toate acestea, există îngrijorare cu privire la creșterea nejustificată a acțiunilor care alimentează discriminarea și xenofobia în relația dintre comunitățile românească și olandeză. Ar trebui subliniat faptul că Țările de Jos reprezintă unul dintre principalii investitori în România.

Este recunoscut faptul că toți cetățenii UE au datoria comună de a respecta legea și că tulburările civile și încălcarea legii trebuie pedepsite în consecință, însă există, în același timp, o preocupare reală față de faptul că noul site internet tolerat de către guvernul olandez este de natură să creeze un precedent grav. În aceste condiții Comisia este invitată să răspundă și să facă ceea ce este necesar pentru a opri promovarea unor astfel de atitudini pe acel site internet, care contravin în mod flagrant valorilor fundamentale ale UE.

1. Ce măsuri va lua Comisia pentru a determina guvernul olandez să respecte Tratatul de la Lisabona, Carta drepturilor fundamentale a Uniunii Europene și Directivele 2004/38/CE a Parlamentului European și a Consiliului din 29 aprilie 2004 privind dreptul la liberă circulație și ședere pe teritoriul statelor membre pentru cetățenii Uniunii și membrii familiilor acestora și 2000/78/CE a Consiliului din 27 noiembrie 2000 de creare a unui cadru general în favoarea egalității de tratament în ceea ce privește încadrarea în muncă și ocuparea forței de muncă? Cum este posibil ca guvernul olandez să poată tolera poziția unuia dintre partidele coaliției sale, care doar profită de piața unică, luând numai de ceea ce este avantajos pentru sine din acquis-ul comunitar și neoferind nimic în schimb?
2. Având în vedere faptul că site-ul internet permite doar colectarea de informații cu privire la „probleme” determinate de europenii din centru și din est în termeni de tulburări civile, cu reclamanți care trebuie să aleagă dintr-o listă de „experiențe negative”, care îi implică pe est-europeni, care este poziția Comisiei cu privire la colectarea unor informații atât de constrângătoare? Își exprimă Comisia îngrijorarea cu privire la faptul că o colectare a unor astfel de date ar putea produce și promova în continuare o reprezentare denaturată a faptelor?
3. Cum va răspunde Comisia în cazul în care colectarea datelor prin intermediul acestui site internet conduce, în cele din urmă, la încălcarea Directivei 95/46/CE și a legislației conexe privind protecția datelor, potrivit căreia, *inter alia*, este interzisă prelucrarea datelor cu caracter personal care dezvăluie originea rasială sau etnică, opiniile politice, convingerile religioase sau filozofice, apartenența sindicală etc.?

**Răspuns dat de dna Reding în numele Comisiei**  
(25 aprilie 2012)

Comisia dorește să aducă în atenția onorabilului membru declarația făcută în cadrul ședinței plenare din 13 martie 2012 <sup>(1)</sup>. Comisia sprijină pe deplin rezoluția comună adoptată de Parlamentul European la 15 martie 2012 <sup>(2)</sup>.

În conformitate cu articolul 8 din Directiva 95/46/CE, statele membre interzic prelucrarea datelor cu caracter personal care dezvăluie, printre altele, originea etnică. Asemenea date sensibile pot fi prelucrate numai în cazul în care un anumit număr de criterii specifice sunt îndeplinite. Principiile protecției nu se aplică datelor anonime astfel încât persoana vizată să nu mai fie identificabilă. Monitorizarea legalității prelucrării datelor este de competența autorităților naționale pentru protecția datelor, care sunt responsabile de supravegherea punerii în aplicare a legislației în materie de protecție a datelor.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=CRE&reference=20120313&secondRef=ITEM-012&language=EN>.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P7-TA-2012-0087+0+DOC+XML+V0//RO>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001747/12  
to the Commission**

**Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* Website launched by Geert Wilders, leader of the Dutch Party for Freedom (PVV)

On 8 February 2012 the PVV leader launched a website for reporting complaints about central and eastern European immigrants in the Netherlands. The website posts questions such as: 'Do you have problems with people from central and eastern Europe?' and is illustrated by a slideshow of newspaper cuttings with headlines such as 'Wouldn't it be better if you went back?' The right of EU citizens to freedom of expression is not disputed, and nor is the freedom of the media to report on conflicts and public scrutiny.

Nonetheless, there is concern at the unwarranted increase in actions fuelling discrimination and xenophobia in the relationship between the Romanian and Dutch communities. It should be stressed that the Netherlands is one of the main investors in Romania.

It is acknowledged that all EU citizens have a shared duty to abide by the law, and civil disturbances and lawbreaking must be punished accordingly; but, at the same time, there is genuine concern that the new website tolerated by the Dutch Government is likely to create a serious precedent. Under the circumstances, the Commission is called on to respond and do what is necessary to stop the promotion of such attitudes on that site, which flagrantly contradicts the EU's fundamental values.

1. What action will the Commission take to make the Dutch Government comply with the Lisbon Treaty, the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights and Directives 2004/38/EC on free movement of workers and 2000/78/EC on equal treatment in employment? How is it possible that the Dutch Government can tolerate the stance of one of its coalition parties which takes the single market to mean a one-way street, taking advantage only of what is profitable for itself from the EU *acquis*?
2. Bearing in mind that the website allows only the collection of information on 'problems' caused by central and eastern Europeans in terms of civil disturbance, with complainants having to choose from a list of 'bad experiences' involving eastern Europeans, what is the Commission's position regarding the collection of such restrictive data? Is the Commission concerned that collecting such data might produce and further promote a distorted representation of the facts?
3. How will the Commission respond if collecting data via this website ultimately infringes Directive 95/46/EC and related legislation on data protection under which, *inter alia*, the processing of personal data revealing racial or ethnic origin, political opinions, religious or philosophical beliefs, trade-union membership, etc. is prohibited?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission**

(25 April 2012)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to the statement made in the plenary debate on 13 March 2012 <sup>(1)</sup>. The Commission fully supports the joint resolution adopted by the European Parliament on 15 March 2012 <sup>(2)</sup>.

As regards Directive 95/46/EC, according to its Article 8, Member States shall prohibit the processing of personal data revealing, among other things, ethnic origin. Such sensitive data may only be processed if a number of specific criteria are satisfied. The principles of protection do not apply to data rendered anonymous in such a way that the data subject is no longer identifiable. The monitoring of the legality of data processing is the task of national data protection authorities, which are responsible for the supervision of the implementation of data protection legislation.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=CRE&reference=20120313&secondRef=ITEM-012&language=EN>.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P7-TA-2012-0087+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN&language=EN>.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001748/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Niki Tzavela (EFD)**  
(13 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Νέα δανειακή σύμβαση της Ελλάδας

Παρά τις διαβεβαιώσεις του έλληνα πρωθυπουργού Λουκά Παπαδήμου για το αντίθετο, η νέα δανειακή σύμβαση της Ελλάδας υπογράφηκε με το αγγλικό δίκαιο. Πιο συγκεκριμένα, με βάση τη σελίδα 28 του παραρτήματος I, το δίκαιο της ανταλλαγής των ελληνικών ομολόγων θα είναι αγγλικό. Η παρούσα σύμβαση και κάθε εξωσυμβατική αξίωση που γεννάται σε σχέση με αυτήν θα διέπονται και θα ερμηνεύονται σύμφωνα με το αγγλικό δίκαιο, ενώ τα μέρη υποχρεούνται να υπαγάγουν κάθε διαφορά που ενδέχεται να προκύψει σε σχέση με τη νομιμότητα, εγκυρότητα, ερμηνεία ή εκτέλεση της παρούσας σύμβασης στην αποκλειστική αρμοδιότητα των δικαστηρίων του Μεγάλου Δουκάτου του Λουξεμβούργου.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Γιατί επιλέγει το αγγλικό δίκαιο για τη νέα δανειακή σύμβαση και όχι κάποιο από τα δίκαια της ηπειρωτικής Ευρώπης, όπως το γερμανικό;

**Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(12 Απριλίου 2012)

Η ερώτηση αφορά μια συμφωνία μεταξύ της Ελλάδας και του Ευρωπαϊκού Ταμείου Χρηματοοικονομικής σταθερότητας. Η Επιτροπή δεν αποτελεί μέρος αυτής της συμφωνίας και κατά συνέπεια δεν είναι σε θέση να προβεί σε σχόλια όσον αφορά τις διατάξεις της.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001748/12  
to the Commission  
Niki Tzavela (EFD)  
(13 February 2012)**

*Subject:* New loan agreement for Greece

Despite the assurances to the contrary furnished by the Greek Prime Minister, Lucas Papademos, Greece's new loan agreement has been concluded under English law. Specifically, according to page 28 of Annex I, English law will be applied to the exchange of Greek bonds. This agreement together with any non-contractual claim that arises in connection with it will be governed by and interpreted in accordance with English law, while the parties to the agreement are obliged to refer any difference that may arise in connection with its legality, validity, interpretation and execution to the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

Why did it choose English law for the new loan agreement and not the law of a continental European country, such as Germany?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission  
(12 April 2012)**

The question concerns an agreement between Greece and the European Financial Stability Facility. The Commission not being party to that agreement, is not in a position to comment on provisions thereof.

---



(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001749/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Niki Tzavela (EFD)**  
(13 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Ειδικός λογαριασμός για την Ελλάδα 2

Η τελευταία ιδέα στην οποία φαίνεται να συμφώνησαν η γερμανίδα καγκελάρια Άνγκελα Μέρκελ και ο γάλλος πρόεδρος Νικολά Σαρκοζί είναι η δημιουργία ενός «κλειστού λογαριασμού» που θα διασφαλίσει την πληρωμή των τόκων των ελληνικών δανείων. Το νέο ταμείο θα διασφαλίζει την πληρωμή των κατόχων ομολόγων, ενώ παράλληλα θα προσφέρει τα απαραίτητα χρήματα στο ελληνικό κράτος. Επιπλέον, οι υπεύθυνοι οικονομικοί διαχειριστές θα μπορούν να διακόψουν τη στήριξη προς την Ελλάδα εάν κι εφόσον παρατηρήσουν παρατυπίες, ασυνενοησία, λάθος χρήση των χρημάτων ή αποτυχία εκτέλεσης των συμφωνηθέντων από ελληνικής πλευράς.

Σύμφωνος σε αυτή την ιδέα φαίνεται να είναι και ο πρόεδρος του Eurogroup Jean Claude Juncker ο οποίος ανέφερε χαρακτηριστικά ότι δεν είναι «εσφαλμένη ιδέα να διασφαλιστεί ότι οι Έλληνες φίλοι μας θα εξοφλήσουν τα χρέη τους».

— Θεωρεί η Επιτροπή ότι αυτή η πρόταση συνιστά άμεση διαχείριση και επιτροπεία της οικονομίας της Ελλάδας;

— Ποια θεωρεί ότι είναι η διαφορά με την προηγούμενη (και απορριφθείσα) πρόταση των Μέρκελ-Σαρκοζί για ορισμό ειδικού επιτρόπου για την Ελλάδα;

**Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(10 Απριλίου 2012)

Ο στόχος της δημιουργίας ειδικού χωριστού λογαριασμού για την Ελλάδα είναι η δημιουργία ενός μηχανισμού για τον ευκολότερο εντοπισμό και την παρακολούθηση του επίσημου δανεισμού και των εσωτερικών κεφαλαίων που προορίζονται για την εξόφληση του χρέους της Ελλάδας, ο οποίος καταυτών τον τρόπο διασφαλίζει ότι δίνεται προτεραιότητα στην εξόφληση του χρέους. Η Ελλάδα προτίθεται να ενσωματώσει στο θεσμικό της πλαίσιο μια διάταξη που θα διασφαλίζει ότι θα δίνεται προτεραιότητα στις πληρωμές εξόφλησης του χρέους. Η διάταξη αυτή θα ενσωματωθεί στο Σύνταγμα της Ελλάδας το συντομότερο δυνατό κατά το παράδειγμα του Συντάγματος της Ισπανίας.

Η Επιτροπή δεν σχολιάζει προτάσεις που δημοσιεύονται στον τύπο και δεν προέρχονται από την ίδια.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001749/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Niki Tzavela (EFD)**  
(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* Special account for Greece 2

The latest idea on which the German chancellor Angela Merkel and the French President Nicolas Sarkozy appear to agree is the creation of an 'escrow account' to ensure the payment of interest on Greek loans. The new fund will ensure that bondholders are paid while also providing the required funds for the Greek state. Furthermore, the financial managers responsible will be able to cancel support to Greece if they notice irregularities, a breakdown in communication, the misuse of funds or a failure by the Greek side to do what has been agreed.

The President of the Eurogroup, Jean-Claude Juncker, appears to agree with this idea. Typically, he said that it is not 'a mistaken idea to ensure that our Greek friends will repay their debts.'

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

- Does it believe that this proposal amounts to direct management and tutelage of the Greek economy?
- How does it think that this differs from the previous (rejected) proposal by Merkel and Sarkozy on designating a special representative for Greece?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission**  
(10 April 2012)

The intention of creating a special segregated account for Greece is to put in place a mechanism that allows better tracing and monitoring of the official borrowing and internally-generated funds destined to service Greece's debt, which therefore ensures that priority is given to the debt servicing. Greece intends to introduce over the next months in its legal framework a provision ensuring that priority is granted to debt servicing payments. This provision will be introduced in the Greek Constitution as soon as possible, based on the recent example of the Spanish Constitution.

The Commission does not comment on proposals reported on by the press not originating from the Commission.

---

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001750/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Konstantinos Roupakis (PPE)**  
 (13 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Κατώτατος μισθός και ενίσχυση της απασχόλησης

Στην Ελλάδα, έπειτα από προτάσεις/συστάσεις των εκπροσώπων της τριόικια, στο πλαίσιο διαπραγματεύσεων για την κατάρτιση του δευτέρου μνημονίου αποφασίστηκε η δρομολόγηση νομοθετικής ρύθμισης που μεταξύ άλλων προβλέπει τη μείωση του κατώτατου μισθού, αγνοώντας ότι το απότοκο των ελεύθερων συλλογικών διαπραγματεύσεων μεταξύ των κοινωνικών εταίρων κινείται προς την αντίθετη κατεύθυνση (ομοφωνία μεταξύ των εργοδοτικών οργανώσεων και των εκπροσώπων των εργαζομένων για τη διατήρηση της κατώτατης προβλεπόμενης αμοιβής). Διαφαίνεται μάλιστα ότι το εν λόγω μέτρο λαμβάνεται με την πρόφαση ότι θα εξυπηρετήσει την αύξηση της ανταγωνιστικότητας της χώρας, τη διατήρηση της απασχόλησης και την καταπολέμηση της ανεργίας καθώς και — σε συνδυασμό με τη μείωση του μη μισθολογικού κόστους — την πάταξη της εισφοροδιαφυγής. Δεδομένου ότι ήδη το τελευταίο διάστημα έχει δρομολογηθεί ελαστικοποίηση της ελληνικής αγοράς εργασίας και βίαιη αποκέντρωση των συλλογικών διαπραγματεύσεων σε επιχειρησιακό και επίπεδο — σε πλήρη αντίθεση με την εθνική παράδοση, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Ποια η σχέση μεταξύ επιπέδου ανεργίας και ύψους του κατώτατου μισθού, μελετώντας τις αγορές εργασίας των κρατών μελών της ΕΕ; Σε τι επίπεδα βρίσκεται ο κατώτατος μισθός σε κράτη που εμφανίζουν τη χαμηλότερη και την υψηλότερη ανεργία αντίστοιχα, στο πλαίσιο της ευρωζώνης;
2. Σε ποιες χώρες της ΕΕ εμφανίζονται τα μεγαλύτερα ποσοστά ευέλικτων μορφών απασχόλησης και ποια τα ποσοστά ανεργίας των χωρών αυτών; Πιστεύει η Επιτροπή ότι η ευελιξία με ασφάλεια εφαρμόζεται επαρκώς στα κράτη μέλη; Η ευελιξία με ασφάλεια απέτελεσε επαρκές όπλο απέναντι στην κρίση της απασχόλησης την οποία διέρχεται η Ένωση γενικότερα αλλά και κάποια κράτη μέλη ειδικότερα;
3. Ποιες χώρες στην ευρωζώνη διαθέτουν κατώτατο μισθό χαμηλότερο από αυτόν της Ελλάδας; Διαθέτουν οι χώρες αυτές εργαλεία προάσπισης από τη φτώχεια γενικότερα και ειδικότερα τη φτώχεια στην εργασία, όπως σύστημα ελάχιστου εγγυημένου εισοδήματος, κάτι το οποίο δεν διαθέτει η Ελλάδα;
4. Υπάρχει σχέση μεταξύ αδήλωτης εργασίας και κατώτατων αμοιβών, ποια η κατάταξη των κρατών μελών αναφορικά με τα ποσοστά μαύρης εργασίας που παρουσιάζουν καθώς και το επίπεδο κατώτατου μισθού τους;

**Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
 (3 Απριλίου 2012)

1. Όταν οι κατώτατοι μισθοί ορίζονται σε υπέρμετρα υψηλό επίπεδο αυξάνεται ο κίνδυνος να αντιμετωπίζουν οι επιχειρήσεις τις αναστατώσεις με απόλυση των μειωμένης παραγωγικότητας εργαζομένων και έτσι να πλήττονται οι προοπτικές απασχόλησής τους. Η Eurostat παρέχει εκτενή στοιχεία τόσο για την ανεργία όσο και για τα ποσά των κατώτατων μισθών<sup>(1)</sup>.
2. Όσον αφορά τις ευέλικτες μορφές απασχόλησης, η Πολωνία, η Ισπανία, η Πορτογαλία και η Ολλανδία έχουν τα μεγαλύτερα ποσοστά προσωρινής απασχόλησης. Τα ποσοστά ανεργίας στις χώρες αυτές κυμαίνονται από τον μέσο όρο της ΕΕ και κάτω (PL και NL), έως υψηλότερα του μέσου όρου επίπεδα (PT και ES). Όσον αφορά τη σημασία της ευελιξίας με ασφάλεια κατά τη διάρκεια της κρίσης, η εικόνα που προβάλλει είναι ανάμικτη: Στις χώρες της Σκανδιναβίας και της ηπειρωτικής Ευρώπης όπου εφαρμόστηκε η ευελιξία με ασφάλεια σημειώθηκε μικρότερη αύξηση της ανεργίας, στις χώρες της Κεντρικής/Ανατολικής Ευρώπης οι επιδόσεις ήταν ανάλογες με τον μέσο όρο της ΕΕ, ενώ οι χώρες του Νότου γνώρισαν μεγάλες έως πολύ μεγάλες αυξήσεις ανεργίας.
3. Τα στοιχεία της Eurostat<sup>(2)</sup> δείχνουν ότι μεταξύ των 12 κρατών μελών της ζώνης ευρώ με εθνικό κατώτατο μισθό ο οποίος καλύπτει το σύνολο ή το πλείστο των εργαζομένων, το επίπεδο του κατώτατου μισθού της Ελλάδας κατατάσσεται με νομισματικούς όρους στο μέσο της κλίμακας. Μετά τις τελευταίες αλλαγές, τα επίπεδα του κατώτατου μισθού συγκαταλέγονται στα χαμηλότερα (χωρίς όμως να είναι τα κατώτατα) της ευρωζώνης, αλλά είναι ανώτερα από τον εθνικό κατώτατο μισθό σε ορισμένα κράτη μέλη, ιδίως εκείνα που δεν συμμετέχουν στο κοινό νόμισμα και έχουν προσχωρήσει στην ΕΕ την τελευταία δεκαετία<sup>(3)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> Στοιχεία που αφορούν την κατάσταση την 1η Ιανουαρίου 2012· πιο πρόσφατα δεδομένα μπορείτε να αποκτήσετε από εθνικές πηγές.

<sup>(2)</sup> Πριν από τις πλέον πρόσφατες νομοθετικές αλλαγές στην Ελλάδα.

<sup>(3)</sup> Ορισμένα κράτη μέλη με χαμηλότερους κατώτατους μισθούς έχουν πράγματι κάποιες ρυθμίσεις κοινωνικής πρόνοιας, και ιδίως συστήματα εγγυημένου ελάχιστου εισοδήματος, τα οποία παρέχουν προστασία κατά της φτώχειας.

4. Εάν οι κατώτατοι μισθοί και οι λοιποί συντελεστές εργασιακού κόστους είναι υπέρμετρα υψηλοί και φθάσουν να είναι υπερβολικά επαχθείς για τους εργοδότες, είναι δυνατόν να οδηγήσουν σε αδήλωτη εργασία, συνεπαγόμενοι σειρά από επιβαρύνσεις, όπως απώλειες εσόδων από φόρους και εισφορές, ευάλωτα δικαιώματα των εργαζομένων και έλλειψη όρων ισότιμου ανταγωνισμού. Για την καταπολέμηση της αδήλωτης εργασίας, θα πρέπει να υιοθετηθεί μια ολοκληρωμένη προσέγγιση. Η Eurostat παρέχει στοιχεία σχετικά με τους κατώτατους μισθούς και, πρόσφατα, από την Παγκόσμια Τράπεζα <sup>(4)</sup> και από το Ευρωβαρόμετρο <sup>(5)</sup> εκπονήθηκαν μελέτες με εκτιμήσεις της αδήλωτης εργασίας στην ΕΕ.

---

<sup>(4)</sup> [http://www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2011/12/13/000158349\\_20111213090401/Rendered/PDF/WPS5912.pdf](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2011/12/13/000158349_20111213090401/Rendered/PDF/WPS5912.pdf)

<sup>(5)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/public\\_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs\\_284\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_284_en.pdf)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001750/12  
to the Commission**

**Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* Minimum wage and measures to promote employment

In Greece, following proposals/recommendations by the Troika's representatives, as part of the negotiations over the drafting of the second Memorandum, it was agreed to draw up legislation specifying, among other things, a reduction in the minimum wage. This failed to take account of collective bargaining between management and labour leading to a contrary outcome (agreement between the employers' organisations and employees' representatives to retain the minimum wage). It emerges that the measure in question is being taken under the pretext of helping to increase the country's competitiveness, retain jobs and combat unemployment and — in combination with reducing non-wage costs — stamp out contribution evasion. Given that employment market flexibility is already being introduced in Greece, together with the rapid decentralisation of collective bargaining to company and local level — in direct opposition to the national tradition, does the Commission know:

1. What is the relationship between the level of unemployment and the minimum wage which emerges from a study of the employment markets of the EU Member States? At what level is the minimum wage set in eurozone countries with the lowest and highest unemployment rates respectively?
2. Which EU Member States have the highest percentages of flexible employment and what are the unemployment rates in those countries? Does the Commission believe that flexicurity is being implemented adequately in the Member States? Was flexicurity sufficiently effective to prevent the employment crisis affecting the entire EU, and certain Member States in particular?
3. Which eurozone countries have a lower minimum wage than Greece? Do these countries have any instruments to protect citizens from poverty in general and, in particular, poverty while in employment — a minimum guaranteed income system — which Greece does not have?
4. Is there a relationship between undeclared work and minimum wages? What is the ranking of each of the Member States in terms of undeclared employment and minimum wage levels?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission**

(3 April 2012)

1. Too high minimum wages increase the risk of firms adjusting to shocks by making low-productivity workers redundant and thereby hurting their employment prospects. Eurostat provides extensive data on both unemployment and minimum wage figures <sup>(1)</sup>.
2. Regarding flexible employment, Poland, Spain, Portugal and the Netherlands have the highest percentages of temporary employment. The unemployment rates in these countries range from the EU average and below (PL and NL) to higher levels (PT and ES). Regarding the importance of flexicurity during the crisis, a mixed image appears: Nordic and Continental flexicurity countries have seen less unemployment growth, Central/Eastern Europe performed at EU average while the Southern countries experienced large to very large unemployment increases.
3. Eurostat data <sup>(2)</sup> indicate that among the 12 eurozone Member States with a national minimum wage covering all or the large majority of employees, Greece's minimum wage ranked in the middle of the scale in monetary terms. After the latest changes, the levels of the minimum wage are among the lowest (but not the lowest) of the eurozone but above the national minimum wage in a number of Member States, notably those not sharing the common currency that have acceded to the EU in the past decade <sup>(3)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> Situation at 1 January 2012; more recent data may be obtained from national sources.

<sup>(2)</sup> Prior to the latest legislative changes in Greece.

<sup>(3)</sup> Some Member States with lower minimum wages indeed have social assistance arrangements, notably guaranteed minimum income schemes, protecting against poverty.

4. If minimum wages or other labour costs are too high and prove to be too large a burden for employers, they can drive undeclared employment, with an array of costs such as losses of taxes and contributions revenue, vulnerability of workers rights and lack of a level playing field. To combat undeclared work, a comprehensive approach has to be taken. Eurostat provides data on minimum wages and recently studies were prepared by the World Bank <sup>(4)</sup> and by Eurobarometer <sup>(5)</sup> on estimates of undeclared work in the EU.

---

---

(4) [http://www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2011/12/13/000158349\\_20111213090401/Rendered/PDF/WPS5912.pdf](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2011/12/13/000158349_20111213090401/Rendered/PDF/WPS5912.pdf)

(5) [http://ec.europa.eu/public\\_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs\\_284\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_284_en.pdf)

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001751/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Konstantinos Roupakis (PPE)**  
(13 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Κίνδυνος έκρηξης των πλειστηριασμών κατοικίας από ενδεχόμενη κατάργηση του Οργανισμού Εργατικής Κατοικίας (ΟΕΚ)

Σε προηγούμενη ερώτηση E— 005517/2011 αναφορικά με την προστασία των καταναλωτών μέσω της αναστολής των πλειστηριασμών, η Επιτροπή στην απάντησή της υπογράμμισε ότι «... θεωρεί σημαντικό τα κράτη μέλη να συνεχίσουν να παρακολουθούν στενά την οικονομική κατάσταση και να ξεετάζουν το ενδεχόμενο, εάν απαιτείται, καθιέρωσης κανόνων με στόχο είτε την πρόληψη των κατασχέσεων, είτε, στις περιπτώσεις που έχουν θεσπιστεί τέτοιου είδους διαδικασίες, τον περιορισμό των κοινωνικών και οικονομικών τους επιπτώσεων ...». Στο πλαίσιο της κατάρτισης της νέας δανειακής σύμβασης για τη συνέχιση του χρηματοδοτικού προγράμματος προς την Ελλάδα δρομολογείται η κατάργηση του ΟΕΚ, ως οργανισμού που ασχολείται με κοινωνικές δαπάνες οι οποίες δεν αποτελούν προτεραιότητα.

Συγκεκριμένα ο ΟΕΚ ιδρύθηκε το 1954 με αποκλειστικό στόχο τη στεγαστική αποκατάσταση των εργαζομένων και κυρίως των οικονομικά ασθενέστερων (έχει κατασκευάσει περίπου 50 000 κατοικίες, χρηματοδοτεί την κατασκευή 1 300 κατοικιών και κατέχει 230 οικόπεδα συνολικής επιφάνειας 5 500 στρεμμάτων για μελλοντικές ανεγέρσεις κατοικιών, έχει επιδοτήσει περίπου 50 000 στεγαστικά δάνεια και έχει καταβάλλει 1,13 δισ. ευρώ για επιδοτήσεις ενοικίου) ενώ οι πόροι του προέρχονται αποκλειστικά από εισφορές εργαζομένων και εργοδοτών χωρίς καμία επιβάρυνση του κρατικού προϋπολογισμού. Με βάση τα παραπάνω ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Πώς αξιολογεί το γεγονός ότι μια ενδεχόμενη κατάργηση του ΟΕΚ όχι μόνο θα επιβαρύνει τους δανειολήπτες με το ποσό του επιτοκίου που κάλυπτε ο οργανισμός προς τις τράπεζες, αλλά επί της ουσίας, θα πλήξει τη δυνατότητα τους να πληρώνουν τις δόσεις, καθώς είχαν κάνει συμβάσεις-συμβόλαια με άλλα δεδομένα τα οποία άλλαξαν βίαια με υπαιτιότητα του κράτους, σε μια εποχή που τα εισοδήματα των ελλήνων πολιτών –σύμφωνα και με όλα τα επίσημα στοιχεία– μειώνονται ραγδαία (ενδεικτικά 16 000 έχουν στην κατοχή τους κατοικίες χωρίς τίτλο ιδιοκτησίας αφού δεν την έχουν αποπληρώσει ακόμα);

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001752/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Konstantinos Roupakis (PPE)**  
(13 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Δυσχερείς οικονομικές και κοινωνικές συνέπειες θα σημάνει η κατάργηση των Οργανισμών Εργατικής Κατοικίας (ΟΕΚ) και Εργατικής Εστίας (ΟΕΕ)

Ο Οργανισμός Εργατικής Εστίας και ο Οργανισμός Εργατικής Κατοικίας αποτελούν δύο από τους σημαντικότερους φορείς άσκησης κοινωνικής πολιτικής στην Ελλάδα, με αποστολή αφενός τη στήριξη των ευπαθών κοινωνικών ομάδων και αφετέρου τη στεγαστική αποκατάσταση των εργαζομένων. Οι πόροι τους προέρχονται αποκλειστικά από εισφορές εργαζομένων και εργοδοτών και δεν επιβαρύνουν ούτε κατ' ελάχιστο τον κρατικό προϋπολογισμό. Οι δράσεις τους είναι απόλυτα συμβατές με τους κοινωνικούς στόχους της στρατηγικής «Ευρώπη 2020» και αποκτούν ζωτική σημασία και αναγκαιότητα σήμερα, με τη μετεξέλιξη της οικονομικής κρίσης σε μια βαθιά κοινωνική κρίση.

Ταυτόχρονα τα προγράμματα που υλοποιούν έχουν ιδιαίτερη προστιθέμενη αναπτυξιακή αξία καθώς αφορούν σημαντικούς τομείς της πραγματικής οικονομίας, όπως η οικοδομική δραστηριότητα, ο τουρισμός, ο επισιτισμός αλλά και ο πολιτισμός. Στο πλαίσιο της κατάρτισης της νέας δανειακής σύμβασης για τη συνέχιση του χρηματοδοτικού προγράμματος προς την Ελλάδα ξεετάζεται η κατάργηση των δύο αυτών οργανισμών ως μέσο για τη μείωση του μη μισθολογικού κόστους. Σε αυτή την κατεύθυνση ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Δεδομένης και της κινητοποίησης της στην πρόληψη του φαινομένου των αστέγων, πώς κρίνει μια ενδεχόμενη κατάργηση των οργανισμών αυτών που δραστηριοποιούνται στο χώρο της στέγασης (επίδοτηση ενοικίου οικονομικά ασθενεστερών, χορήγηση στεγαστικών δανείων με ευνοϊκούς όρους, παροχή κατοικιών κ.α), με αποτέλεσμα να οδηγηθούν στο δρόμο χιλιάδες οικογένειες;
2. Στο κείμενο των δεσμεύσεων της Ελλάδας προς τους θεσμικούς της εταίρους αναφέρεται ρητά η δέσμευση προστασίας των ευάλωτων κοινωνικών ομάδων. Κατά αυτό τον τρόπο η κατάργηση των δύο οργανισμών θα μετακυλήσει το βάρος της κοινωνικής προστασίας στον κρατικό προϋπολογισμό, με την αύξηση των κοινωνικών δαπανών, π.χ. επιδόματα κ.λπ., με συνέπεια την επιδείνωση της δημοσιονομικής κατάστασης της Ελλάδος. Πώς αντιμετωπίζει αυτή την εξέλιξη;

3. Συνάδει η κατάργηση της δραστηριότητας των φορέων αυτών με τους στόχους της στρατηγικής «Ευρώπη 2020» για την αύξηση της απασχόλησης και την καταπολέμηση του κοινωνικού αποκλεισμού, καθώς αυτό θα σημαίνει και την αναστολή λειτουργίας παιδικών σταθμών που διευκολύνουν την πρόσβαση γυναικών στην απασχόληση στο πλαίσιο προαγωγής της συμφιλίωσης επαγγελματικής και οικογενειακής ζωής;

### **Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**

(10 Απριλίου 2012)

Σύμφωνα με το νέο Πρόγραμμα Οικονομικής Προσαρμογής για την Ελλάδα, όπως ορίστηκε στο Μνημόνιο Οικονομικής και Χρηματοπιστωτικής Πολιτικής και στο Μνημόνιο Συνεννόησης στις Συγκεκριμένες Προϋποθέσεις Οικονομικής Πολιτικής, που υπογράφηκαν από τις ελληνικές αρχές, αποφασίστηκε η μείωση του μη μισθολογικού εργασιακού κόστους μέσω της μείωσης των συντελεστών κοινωνικών εισφορών (κατά 5 ποσοστιαίες μονάδες). Αυτό προϋποθέτει την εφαρμογή μέτρων για την αντιστάθμιση της απώλειας εσόδων που απορρέει από την αναφερόμενη μείωση, με σκοπό την αποφυγή ζημιών στους κρατικούς λογαριασμούς. Το σκεπτικό στο οποίο βασίζεται το παρόν μέτρο είναι να μειωθεί το εργατικό κόστος χωρίς να επηρεαστούν άμεσα οι μισθοί, με σκοπό την υποστήριξη της απόλυτα αναγκαίας δημιουργίας θέσεων απασχόλησης και τη μείωση του κόστους παραγωγής.

Όσον αφορά τη διάρθρωση των εισφορών κοινωνικής ασφάλισης, υπάρχουν συγκεκριμένοι συντελεστές για τον ΟΕΕ και τον ΟΕΚ. Συνεπώς, συμφωνήθηκε πως τα ταμεία αυτά θα κλείσουν, ώστε να μειωθούν οι δαπάνες και, επομένως, να αντισταθμιστεί η δημοσιονομική επιβάρυνση που προκαλείται από χαμηλότερες εισφορές. Δεν θα υπάρξουν νέες αναλήψεις υποχρεώσεων και θα γίνει εξοικονόμηση των σχετικών δαπανών. Πρόσθετα μέτρα, κυρίως προσαρμογές των συντάξεων και διεύρυνση της βάσης των κοινωνικών εισφορών, κρίνονται απαραίτητα ώστε να επιτευχθεί μείωση κατά 5 π.μ. των συντελεστών εισφορών χωρίς να είναι εις βάρος του ελλείμματος του προϋπολογισμού. Τα αντισταθμιστικά αυτά μέτρα θα υποβληθούν τον Σεπτέμβριο του 2012.

Οι ελληνικές αρχές έχουν συστήσει μια προσωρινή επιτροπή υπεύθυνη για τον καθορισμό των εκτελεστικών λεπτομερειών σχετικά με την εκκαθάριση των υποχρεώσεων, των δικαιωμάτων των δύο φορέων, καθώς και οποιαδήποτε άλλη έννομη και υφιστάμενη ακόμη σχέση των δύο καταργηθέντων φορέων.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001751/12  
to the Commission**

**Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* Risk of a massive increase in the auctioning of homes as a result of the possible elimination of the Social Housing Organisation (OEK)

In a previous Question E-005517/2011 on consumer protection through the suspension of auctions, the Committee in its answer stressed that it '... considers it important that Member States continue to closely monitor the economic situation and examine the potential, if necessary, for establishing rules aiming either to prevent seizures, or, in cases where such proceedings have been established, to limit their social and economic impact ...' The new loan agreement for the continuance of the financing package to Greece provides for the elimination of the OEK as an organisation involved in social expenses which are not a priority.

Specifically, the OEK was established in 1954 with the sole aim of housing workers and particularly the financially weakest (the organisation has constructed approximately 50 000 homes, funds the construction of 1 300 homes and owns 230 plots covering a total area of 550 hectares for future construction of homes; it has funded approximately 50 000 housing loans and has spent EUR 1.13 billion on rent allowances), and its resources originate exclusively from the contributions of employees and employers without any cost to the State.

In the light of this:

1. How does the Commission view the fact that the potential abolition of the OEK will not only burden borrowers with bank interest payments hitherto met by this organisation, but will also effectively undermine their ability to make repayments, the terms of the contract agreements signed by them having been abruptly altered by the State, at a time when incomes in Greece — according to all official data — are rapidly dwindling (with the result, for instance, that 16 000 people now occupy homes without titles of ownership, since they have not finished paying for them)?

**Question for written answer E-001752/12  
to the Commission**

**Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* The closure of the Greek Workers' Housing and Greek Workers' Home Organisations will have unfortunate economic and social consequences

The Greek Workers' Housing and Greek Workers' Home Organisations are two of the most important organisations in Greece implementing social policy: their mission is a) to support vulnerable social groups and b) to provide housing for workers. Their resources are derived exclusively from contributions by workers and employers and do not create any burden whatsoever on the state budget. Their activities are wholly in line with the social aims of the *Europe 2020* strategy and are of vital importance and necessity today, as the economic crisis develops into a profound social crisis.

Moreover, the remaining programmes have a specific added growth value since they concern major sectors of the real economy, such as construction, tourism, food supplies and culture. As part of drawing up the new loan agreement for continuing the funding programme for Greece, the closure of these two organisations is being examined as a means of reducing non-wage costs. In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Given its mobilisation to prevent the homelessness problem, how does it view the possible closure of organisations active in the housing field (subsidising the rents of economically vulnerable people, providing housing loans at favourable terms, providing housing, etc.), with the result that thousands of families will be thrown out onto the streets?
2. Regarding Greece's commitments to its institutional partners, specific reference has been made to the commitment to protect vulnerable social groups. Thus the closure of the two organisations will transfer the burden of social protection to the state budget, with an increase in social expenditure, e.g. benefits, etc., leading to a worse situation in terms of Greece's public finances. How will it address this development?

3. Is the cessation of these organisations' activities in line with the objectives of the *Europe 2020* strategy to increase employment and combat social exclusion, since it will mean the suspension of childcare facilities, which enable women to access employment as part of efforts to promote a work-life balance?

**Joint answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission**

*(10 April 2012)*

Under the new Economic Adjustment Programme for Greece, as specified in the Memorandum of Economic and Financial Policies and in the memorandum of understanding on Specific Economic Policy Conditionality signed by the Greek authorities, it was decided to reduce non-wage labour costs by means of a reduction of social contribution rates (by 5 percentage points). That will be conditional on the implementation of measures that offset the revenues losses deriving from that reduction in order to avoid damage to the government accounts. The rationale for this measure is to reduce labour costs without directly affecting wages in order to support the much needed employment creation and lowering of production costs.

In the structure of social contributions, there are earmarked rates for OEE and OEK. Therefore, it was agreed that these funds will be closed in order to reduce expenditure and thereby offset the budgetary drag caused by lower contributions. No new commitments will take place and the associated spending will be saved. Additional measures, notably adjustments in pensions and a broadening of the basis for social contributions, will be necessary in order to allow a 5 pps reduction in contribution rates without harming the budget deficit. These offsetting measures will be presented by September 2012.

The Greek authorities have set up a temporary committee in charge of setting the operational modalities for the clearing of obligations and rights of the two entities and any other legal and still subsisting relationship of the two extinguished entities.

---

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001754/12**

προς την Επιτροπή

**Pino Arlacchi (S&D), Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D), Catherine Trautmann (S&D), Guido Milana (S&D),  
Silvia Costa (S&D), Mara Bizzotto (EFD), Ivo Vajgl (ALDE), Rolandas Paksas (EFD), Nikolaos Salavrakos  
(EFD) και Claudiu Cîrșian Tănăsescu (S&D)**

(13 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Η κοινωνική διάσταση της μεταρρύθμισης της κοινής αλιευτικής πολιτικής της ΕΕ

Στις προτάσεις της για την ουσιαστική μεταρρύθμιση της κοινής αλιευτικής πολιτικής της ΕΕ, η Επιτροπή θέτει μια ριζική προσέγγιση για τη διαχείριση της αλιείας στην Ευρώπη. Στόχος είναι να διασφαλιστούν μελλοντικά τόσο τα αλιευτικά αποθέματα όσο και η διαβίωση των αλιέων καθώς και να τεθεί τέρμα στην υπεραλίευση και στην εξάντληση των αλιευτικών αποθεμάτων. Δεδομένης της θεμελιώδους σημασίας της κοινωνικής διάστασης της εν λόγω μεταρρύθμισης και λαμβάνοντας υπόψη, με μια πρώτη επισκόπηση του ζητήματος, ότι η δέσμη των μεταρρυθμίσεων φαίνεται να παρουσιάζει ελλείψεις στον συγκεκριμένο τομέα:

1. Τι είδους μέτρα σκοπεύει η Επιτροπή να λάβει προκειμένου να διασφαλίσει τον αναπροσανατολισμό της δραστηριότητας των αλιευτικών σκαφών και τη μελλοντική διαβίωση των αλιέων;

**Απάντηση της κας Δαμανάκη εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**

(19 Μαρτίου 2012)

Η δέσμη των μεταρρυθμίσεων περιέχει μια σημαντική κοινωνική διάσταση. Όπως εξηγείται με περισσότερες λεπτομέρειες στο ανεπίσημο έγγραφο σχετικά με την κοινωνική διάσταση της μεταρρύθμισης της Κοινής Αλιευτικής Πολιτικής (ΚΑΛΠ) <sup>(1)</sup>, η κοινωνική βιωσιμότητα αποτελεί έναν από τους κείριους στόχους της ΚΑΛΠ. Η μεταρρυθμιζόμενη ΚΑΛΠ στοχεύει στην επίτευξη των παρακάτω μεσοπρόθεσμων και μακροπρόθεσμων κοινωνικών στόχων:

- στο να αυξηθεί η απασχόληση στον αλιευτικό τομέα, ειδικότερα στον τομέα της αλίευσης·
- στην αύξηση της ελκυστικότητας στον τομέα της αλιείας και στη μετατροπή του εν λόγω τομέα σε πηγή θέσεων εργασίας υψηλής ποιότητας·
- στην εξασφάλιση της βιωσιμότητας των παράκτιων κοινοτήτων μέσω της προώθησης της ανάπτυξης και των θέσεων εργασίας·
- στη διευκόλυνση της μετάβασης σε βιώσιμη αλιεία, μετάβαση η οποία θα επιτρέψει την εκ νέου αποκατάσταση των αλιευτικών αποθεμάτων·
- στην αξιοποίηση του δυναμικού της υδατοκαλλιέργειας στην Ευρώπη ώστε αυτή να επεκταθεί και να δημιουργηθούν νέες θέσεις εργασίας τόσο στην ηπειρωτική όσο και στη θαλάσσια υδατοκαλλιέργεια.

Όλα τα εργαλεία της νέας ΚΑΛΠ πρέπει να συμβάλουν στην επίτευξη των εν λόγω στόχων· εντούτοις, το κύριο εργαλείο της νέας ΚΑΛΠ από την άποψη αυτή είναι το νέο Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Θάλασσας και Αλιείας (ΕΤΘΑ). Σε σύγκριση με το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Αλιείας (ΕΤΑ), το ΕΤΘΑ θα επιφέρει θεμελιώδη μεταβολή στην προσέγγιση ως προς τη δημόσια χρηματοδότηση στον τομέα της αλιείας μέσω της εστίασης σε συλλογικές δράσεις και στη βιωσιμότητα των παράκτιων περιοχών μάλλον παρά σε επιδοτήσεις σε στόλους από τις οποίες επωφελούνται κυρίως οι ιδιοκτήτες σκαφών. Συνεπώς, το ΕΤΘΑ προτείνει την εξάλειψη των περισσότερων από τα υφιστάμενα μέτρα σχετικά με τους στόλους και αντί αυτών τη χρησιμοποίηση αυτού του μέρους της χρηματοδότησης για την επίτευξη βιώσιμης και αιφόρου αλιείας και υδατοκαλλιέργειας και για την ανάπτυξη περιοχών που εξαρτώνται από την αλιεία.

(<sup>1</sup>) [http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/reform/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/reform/index_en.htm)

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001754/12  
à la Commission**

**Pino Arlacchi (S&D), Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D), Catherine Trautmann (S&D), Guido Milana (S&D),  
Silvia Costa (S&D), Mara Bizzotto (EFD), Ivo Vajgl (ALDE), Rolandas Paksas (EFD), Nikolaos Salavrakos  
(EFD) et Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D)**

(13 février 2012)

*Objet:* La dimension sociale de la réforme de la politique commune de la pêche de l'UE

Dans ses propositions en faveur d'une réforme majeure de la politique commune de la pêche de l'UE, la Commission a proposé une approche radicale à la gestion des activités de pêche en Europe. L'objectif est de garantir les stocks de poissons et les sources de revenus des pêcheurs pour l'avenir tout en mettant un terme à la surpêche et à la réduction des stocks de poissons. Au vu de l'importance fondamentale de la dimension sociale de cette réforme, et considérant que, sur la base d'une première vue d'ensemble, le paquet de réformes semble faire défaut dans ce domaine en particulier:

1. quelles mesures la Commission envisage-t-elle de prendre afin de garantir le redéploiement des navires de pêche et les futures sources de revenus des pêcheurs?

**Réponse donnée par Mme Damanaki au nom de la Commission**

(19 mars 2012)

Le paquet de réformes a une importante dimension sociale. Comme il est expliqué plus en détail dans le document informel concernant la dimension sociale de la réforme de la politique commune de la pêche (PCP) <sup>(1)</sup>, la durabilité sociale est au cœur de la PCP. La politique réformée vise à atteindre les objectifs sociaux à moyen et long termes suivants:

- inverser la tendance au déclin de l'emploi dans le secteur de la pêche, en particulier dans le segment de la capture;
- améliorer l'attractivité du secteur de la pêche et en faire une source d'emplois de haute qualité;
- assurer la viabilité des communautés côtières par la promotion de la croissance économique et de l'emploi;
- faciliter la transition vers une pêche durable et permettre ainsi la reconstitution des stocks de poissons;
- valoriser le potentiel d'expansion et de création d'emploi de l'aquaculture européenne, que ce soit en eau douce ou dans les zones marines.

Tous les outils de cette nouvelle PCP devraient contribuer à la réalisation de ces objectifs, mais le principal d'entre eux est le Fonds européen pour les affaires maritimes et la pêche (FEAMP). Par comparaison avec le Fonds européen pour la pêche (FEP), le FEAMP introduit un changement essentiel dans le financement public du secteur de la pêche en se concentrant sur des actions collectives et sur la viabilité des régions côtières plutôt que sur des subventions à la flotte qui profitent essentiellement aux propriétaires de navires. Le FEAMP propose donc d'éliminer la plupart des mesures actuelles en faveur de la flotte et d'utiliser cette partie du financement pour assurer la viabilité et la durabilité de la pêche et du secteur de l'aquaculture et le développement des zones tributaires de la pêche.

---

(1) [http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/reform/index\\_fr.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/reform/index_fr.htm)

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001754/12  
alla Commissione**

**Pino Arlacchi (S&D), Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D), Catherine Trautmann (S&D), Guido Milana (S&D),  
Silvia Costa (S&D), Mara Bizzotto (EFD), Ivo Vajgl (ALDE), Rolandas Paksas (EFD), Nikolaos Salavrakos  
(EFD) e Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D)**

(13 febbraio 2012)

*Oggetto:* Dimensione sociale della riforma della politica comune della pesca dell'UE

Nell'ambito delle proposte avanzate per un'importante riforma della politica comune della pesca dell'UE, la Commissione ha definito un approccio radicale alla gestione della pesca in Europa. I piani mirano a garantire la futura sopravvivenza sia del patrimonio ittico sia dei mezzi di sussistenza dei pescatori, ponendo fine al contempo allo sfruttamento eccessivo e al depauperamento del patrimonio ittico.

Vista l'importanza fondamentale della dimensione sociale di tale riforma e considerando che, a un primo esame, il pacchetto di riforme sembra carente proprio in quest'ambito specifico, quali misure intende adottare la Commissione al fine di assicurare il reimpiego dei pescherecci e garantire il futuro dei mezzi di sussistenza dei pescatori?

**Risposta data da Maria Damanaki a nome della Commissione**

(19 marzo 2012)

Il pacchetto di riforma ha una componente sociale importante: come illustra in maggiore dettaglio il documento informale sulla dimensione sociale della politica comune della pesca (PCP) <sup>(1)</sup>, la sostenibilità sociale è uno degli obiettivi fondamentali della PCP. La PCP riformata si prefigge i seguenti obiettivi sociali a medio e lungo termine:

- invertire la tendenza al calo dell'occupazione nel settore della pesca, in particolare nel comparto delle catture;
- aumentare l'attrattiva del settore della pesca trasformandolo in una fonte di occupazione di qualità;
- assicurare la vitalità delle comunità costiere promuovendo la crescita e l'occupazione;
- favorire la transizione a una pesca sostenibile che permetta la ricostituzione degli stock ittici;
- liberare le potenzialità di espansione e di creazione di occupazione dell'acquicoltura europea, sia marina sia in acque dolci.

Al conseguimento di questi obiettivi dovranno concorrere tutti gli strumenti della nuova PCP, ma principalmente il nuovo Fondo europeo per gli affari marittimi e la pesca (FEAMP). Rispetto al Fondo europeo per la pesca (FEP), il FEAMP rivoluziona l'approccio al finanziamento pubblico al settore della pesca, spostando l'accento dalle sovvenzioni alle flotte, che vanno a vantaggio soprattutto degli armatori, agli interventi collettivi e alla vitalità delle zone costiere. Con il FEAMP si propone quindi di sopprimere la maggior parte delle attuali misure dirette alle flotte dirottando la relativa quota di finanziamenti verso la realizzazione di una pesca e un'acquicoltura vitali e sostenibili e lo sviluppo delle zone dipendenti dalla pesca.

---

(<sup>1</sup>) [http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/reform/index\\_it.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/reform/index_it.htm)

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

**Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-001754/12**

**Komisijai**

**Pino Arlacchi (S&D), Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D), Catherine Trautmann (S&D), Guido Milana (S&D),  
Silvia Costa (S&D), Mara Bizzotto (EFD), Ivo Vajgl (ALDE), Rolandas Paksas (EFD), Nikolaos Salavrakos  
(EFD) ir Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D)**

(2012 m. vasario 13 d.)

*Tema:* ES bendros žuvininkystės politikos reformos socialinis aspektas

Savo pasiūlymuose dėl labai svarbios ES bendros žuvininkystės politikos reformos Komisija išdėstė esminį požiūrį į žuvininkystės valdymą Europoje. Šių pasiūlymų tikslas – apsaugoti ir žuvų išteklius, ir žvejų pragyvenimo šaltinį ateityje ir kartu nutraukti žvejybos išteklių pereikvojimą ir žuvų išteklių išekvojimą. Atsižvelgiant į esminę šios reformos socialinio aspekto svarbą ir tai, kad atlikus pirminę apžvalgą atrodo, kad reformos dokumentų rinkinys turi trūkumų, kyla konkrečiai šis klausimas:

1. Kokių priemonių Komisija ketina imtis siekdama užtikrinti, kad žvejybos laivai būtų perkeltami, ir garantuoti būsimą žvejų pragyvenimo šaltinį?

**Komisijos narės M. Damanaki atsakymas Komisijos vardu**

(2012 m. kovo 19 d.)

Reformos dokumentų rinkinys yra labai svarbus socialiniu požiūriu. Neoficialiame dokumente dėl bendros žuvininkystės politikos (BŽP) reformos socialinio aspekto <sup>(1)</sup> socialinis tvarumas įvardijamas kaip vienas pagrindinių BŽP tikslų. BŽP reforma siekiama tokių vidutinės trukmės ir ilgalaikių socialinių tikslų:

- stabdyti užimtumo mažėjimą žuvininkystės (visų pirma žvejybos) sektoriuje;
- didinti žuvininkystės sektoriaus patrauklumą ir pasiekti, kad jame būtų kuriamos aukštos kokybės darbo vietos;
- užtikrinti pakrančių bendruomenių perspektyvumą skatinant ekonomikos augimą ir naujų darbo vietų kūrimą;
- sudaryti geresnes sąlygas pereiti prie tausios žvejybos ir taip atkurti žuvų išteklius;
- išnaudoti Europos akvakultūros galimybes plėstis ir kurti naujas darbo vietas gėlyjū vandenų ir jūrų akvakultūros sektoriuose.

Siekti šių tikslų turėtų padėti visos naujosios BŽP priemonės, tačiau pagrindinė naujosios BŽP priemonė – naujasis Europos jūrų reikalų ir žuvininkystės fondas (EJRŽF). Palyginti su Europos žuvininkystės fondu (EŽF), įsteigiant EJRŽF iš esmės keičiamas požiūris į viešąjį žuvininkystės sektoriaus finansavimą, nes daugiausia dėmesio skiriama bendriems veiksams ir pakrančių rajonų perspektyvumui, o ne laivynų subsidijoms, iš kurių daugiausia naudos turi laivų savininkai. Todėl EJRŽF siūlo panaikinti daugelį dabartinių laivynams skirtų priemonių ir atitinkamą lėšų dalį skirti perspektyviai bei tausiai žvejybai ir akvakultūrai užtikrinti, taip pat nuo žvejybos priklausomų rajonų plėtrai skatinti.

(1) [http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/reform/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/reform/index_en.htm)

(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001754/12  
adresată Comisiei**

**Pino Arlacchi (S&D), Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D), Catherine Trautmann (S&D), Guido Milana (S&D),  
Silvia Costa (S&D), Mara Bizzotto (EFD), Ivo Vajgl (ALDE), Rolandas Paksas (EFD), Nikolaos Salavrakos  
(EFD) și Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D)**

(13 februarie 2012)

*Subiect:* Dimensiunea socială a reformei politicii comune în domeniul pescuitului a UE

În propunerile sale de reformă majoră a politicii comune în domeniul pescuitului a UE, Comisia a stabilit o abordare radicală în ceea ce privește gestionarea pescuitului în Europa. Scopul este acela de a asigura atât conservarea stocurilor de pește, cât și menținerea în viitor a mijloacelor de subsistență ale pescarilor, punând capăt în același timp pescuitului excesiv și epuizării stocurilor de pește. Având în vedere importanța fundamentală a dimensiunii sociale a acestei reforme și faptul că la o primă privire pachetul de reformă pare deficitar în acest domeniu:

1. ce măsuri intenționează să ia Comisia pentru a asigura redistribuirea navelor de pescuit și a garanta menținerea în viitor a mijloacelor de subsistență ale pescarilor?

**Răspuns dat de dna Damanaki în numele Comisiei**

(19 martie 2012)

Pachetul de reforme are o dimensiune socială importantă. Astfel cum se explică în detaliu în documentul neoficial privind dimensiunea socială a reformei politicii comune în domeniul pescuitului (PCP) <sup>(1)</sup>, sustenabilitatea socială este unul dintre obiectivele de bază ale PCP. Reforma politicii comune în domeniul pescuitului vizează îndeplinirea următoarelor obiective sociale pe termen mediu și lung:

- inversarea tendinței de scădere a ocupării forței de muncă în sectorul pescuitului, în special în sectorul capturării;
- creșterea atractivității sectorului pescuitului și transformarea acestuia într-o sursă de locuri de muncă de înaltă calitate;
- asigurarea viabilității comunităților costiere prin promovarea creșterii economice și a creării de locuri de muncă;
- facilitarea tranziției către un pescuit sustenabil, permițând astfel refacerea stocurilor de pescuit;
- exploatarea, în sectorul acvaculturii europene interioare și marine, a potențialului de dezvoltare și de creare de noi locuri de muncă.

Toate instrumentele noii politici comune în domeniul pescuitului ar trebui să contribuie la realizarea acestor obiective, însă principalul instrument al noii politici comune în domeniul pescuitului în acest sens este noul Fond european pentru pescuit și afaceri maritime (*European Maritime and Fisheries Fund — EMFF*). Față de Fondul European pentru Pescuit (FEP), Fondul european pentru pescuit și afaceri maritime introduce o schimbare fundamentală în privința abordării finanțării din fonduri publice a sectorului pescuitului, pentru că pune accentul pe acțiuni colective și pe viabilitatea zonelor costiere, și nu pe subvenții alocate flotelor, de care ar beneficia în principal proprietarii de nave. Astfel, Fondul european pentru pescuit și afaceri maritime propune să se elimine majoritatea măsurilor actuale privind flota și să se utilizeze, în schimb, această parte a finanțării pentru a asigura viabilitatea și sustenabilitatea pescuitului și a acvaculturii și pentru a dezvolta zonele dependente de pescuit.

(<sup>1</sup>) [http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/reform/index\\_ro.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/reform/index_ro.htm)

(Slovenska različica)

**Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-001754/12  
za Komisijo**

**Pino Arlacchi (S&D), Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D), Catherine Trautmann (S&D), Guido Milana (S&D),  
Silvia Costa (S&D), Mara Bizzotto (EFD), Ivo Vajgl (ALDE), Rolandas Paksas (EFD), Nikolaos Salavrakos  
(EFD) in Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D)**

(13. februar 2012)

*Zadeva:* Socialna razsežnost reforme skupne ribiške politike EU

V predlogu za obsežno reformo skupne ribiške politike EU je Komisija predstavila radikalen pristop do upravljanja ribištva v Evropi. Namen je zagotoviti preživetje tako staležev rib kot tudi ribičev, obenem pa končati prekomeren ribolov in izčrpavanje staležev rib. Glede na temeljni pomen socialne razsežnosti te reforme in glede na to, da se na prvi pogled zdi, da ima sveženj reform na tem področju pomanjkljivosti:

1. Kakšne ukrepe namerava Komisija sprejeti, da bi zagotovila prerazporeditev ribiških plovil in preživetje ribičev tudi v prihodnje?

**Odgovor gospe Damanaki v imenu Komisije**

(19. marec 2012)

Sveženj reform ima pomembno socialno razsežnost. Kot je podrobneje razloženo v neuradnem dokumentu o socialnih vidikih reforme skupne ribiške politike (SRP) <sup>(1)</sup>, je socialna trajnost eden od poglavitnih ciljev SRP. Cilj reforme SRP je doseči naslednje srednje- in dolgoročne cilje:

- preusmeriti trend izgube delovnih mest v ribiškem sektorju, zlasti na področju ribolova;
- povečati privlačnost ribiškega sektorja in ga preoblikovati v vir visokokakovostnih delovnih mest;
- s spodbujanjem rasti in ustvarjanjem delovnih mest zagotoviti preživetje obalnih skupnosti;
- olajšati prehod na trajnostni ribolov in tako omogočiti obnovo ribolovnih staležev;
- sprostiti potencial evropske akvakulture ter omogočiti njen razvoj in ustvarjanje novih delovnih mest na področju sladkovodne in morske akvakulture.

Vsa orodja nove SRP bi morala prispevati k doseganju teh ciljev; glavni instrument nove SRP je v tem pogledu novi Evropski sklad za pomorstvo in ribištvo. V primerjavi z Evropskim skladom za ribištvo prinaša Evropski sklad za pomorstvo in ribištvo bistveno spremembo pristopa k financiranju ribiškega sektorja, ki bo bolj kot na subvencije za ladjevje, od katerih imajo večinoma korist lastniki plovil, osredotočen na skupne ukrepe in preživetje obalnih skupnosti. Tako naj bi Evropski sklad za pomorstvo in ribištvo ukinil večino veljavnih ukrepov za ladjevje in namesto tega ta del financiranja uporabil za oblikovanje ribištva in akvakulture, ki bosta uspešna in trajnostna, ter za razvoj področij, ki so odvisna od ribolova.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/reform/index\\_sl.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/reform/index_sl.htm)



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001754/12  
to the Commission**

**Pino Arlacchi (S&D), Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D), Catherine Trautmann (S&D), Guido Milana (S&D),  
Silvia Costa (S&D), Mara Bizzotto (EFD), Ivo Vajgl (ALDE), Rolandas Paksas (EFD), Nikolaos Salavrakos  
(EFD) and Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* The social dimension of the reform of the EU common fisheries policy

In its proposals for a major reform of the EU's common fisheries policy, the Commission has set out a radical approach to fisheries management in Europe. The aim is to secure both fish stocks and fishermen's livelihood for the future while putting an end to overfishing and depletion of fish stocks. Given the fundamental importance of the social dimension of this reform, and considering that, on a first overview, the reform package seems lacking in this specific area:

1. What measures is the Commission planning to take in order to secure the redeployment of fishing vessels and to guarantee fishermen's future livelihood?

**Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission**

(19 March 2012)

The reform package has an important social dimension. As explained in more detail in the non-paper on the social dimension of the common fisheries policy (CFP) reform <sup>(1)</sup>, social sustainability is one of the core CFP objectives. The reformed CFP aims at achieving the following mid-and long-term social objectives:

- reversing the decline in employment in the fisheries sector, particularly in the catching segment;
- increasing the attractiveness of the fisheries sector and turning it into a source of high quality jobs;
- ensuring the viability of coastal communities by promoting growth and jobs;
- facilitating the transition to a sustainable fishing, thus allowing for the rebuilding of fishing stocks;
- unlocking the potential of European aquaculture to expand and create new jobs in inland as well as in marine aquaculture.

All tools of the new CFP would need to contribute to achieving these objectives; however the main instrument of the new CFP in this respect is the new European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF). Compared to the European Fisheries Fund (EFF), the EMFF brings about a fundamental change of approach to public funding to the fisheries sector through a focus on collective actions and on the viability of coastal areas rather than fleet subsidies benefitting mostly vessel owners. Thus, the EMFF proposes to eliminate most of the current fleet measures and instead use this part of the funding for achieving viable and sustainable fisheries and aquaculture and for the development of areas depending on fishing.

---

(1) [http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/reform/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/reform/index_en.htm)

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001756/12  
alla Commissione  
Mario Borghezio (EFD)  
(13 febbraio 2012)**

*Oggetto:* Acquisti di armi imposti alla Grecia in cambio del sostegno finanziario

Anche sulla stampa tedesca si dà atto che sul governo di Atene si è continuato ad esercitare fortissime pressioni da parte del governo di Berlino per imporre ingenti acquisti di armamenti prodotti dall'industria bellica tedesca.

Risulterebbero parimenti esercitate pressioni su Atene, sempre per acquisti di armi, anche da parte del governo di Parigi in favore dell'industria francese degli armamenti mentre, analoghe pressioni, sempre da parte della Germania e della Francia sembrano esercitate sul governo portoghese.

Come valuta la Commissione il fatto che la Grecia in evidente gravissima difficoltà sia stata costretta, in cambio del promesso sostegno finanziario, a simili esorbitanti acquisti di armamenti, che portano il bilancio della sua difesa al livello record del 3 %, nel momento in cui ai cittadini greci vengono imposti sacrifici esorbitanti per via dei diktat europei?

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001825/12  
alla Commissione  
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)  
(15 febbraio 2012)**

*Oggetto:* Commesse militari in Grecia

Mentre la Grecia è sull'orlo della bancarotta, le spese militari del governo ellenico bruceranno ancora una volta in un anno il 3 % del Pil. In tutto il mondo solo gli Stati Uniti possono permettersi una spesa militare maggiore.

È stata la stampa tedesca negli ultimi giorni a offrire una chiave di lettura della vicenda. Il governo tedesco e quello francese avrebbero fatto pressioni su Atene per farle acquistare materiale militare tedesco e francese in cambio di aiuto per far fronte alle difficoltà economiche del paese. Insomma, tagli e sacrifici per i cittadini greci da una parte e aumento delle commesse belliche dall'altra.

Alla luce dei fatti sopraesposti, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. come giudica le nuove spese militari della Grecia, equivalenti al 3 % del Pil, in considerazione anche dei tagli agli stipendi e alle pensioni dei cittadini greci;
2. se intende verificare le presunte pressioni esercitate da Germania e Francia per far aumentare la spesa bellica ellenica in cambio di aiuto per rimanere nella zona euro come denunciato dalla stampa tedesca?

**Risposta congiunta data da Olli Rehn a nome della Commissione  
(2 aprile 2012)**

La Commissione non è a conoscenza delle pressioni esercitate sul governo greco da parte della Francia e della Germania per l'acquisto di armi prodotte da questi due paesi.

Inoltre, la Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alle proprie risposte alle interrogazioni scritte E-000616/2012 e E-000812/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.

---

(1) <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=IT>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001756/12  
to the Commission  
Mario Borghezio (EFD)  
(13 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Pressure on Greece to purchase arms in exchange for financial support

There are reports in the German press as well that the German Government has consistently been putting great pressure on Athens to buy and import huge quantities of weapons produced by the German arms industry.

Athens has reportedly also come under pressure from the French Government to purchase arms from the French arms industry, whilst Germany and France also seem to have exerted similar pressure on the Portuguese Government.

What view does the Commission take of the fact that Greece, which is in the throes of a calamitous economic crisis, has been pressurised into making such costly purchases in exchange for the promise of financial support, bringing its defence budget to a record level of 3 %, at a time when massive sacrifices are being imposed on Greek citizens by European diktats?

**Question for written answer E-001825/12  
to the Commission  
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)  
(15 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Defence procurement in Greece

While Greece is on the brink of bankruptcy, the military expenditure of the Greek Government will once again eat up 3 % of its GDP in one year. Worldwide, only the United States can afford greater military spending.

In the past few days, the German press has given its interpretation of events. The German and French governments have apparently put pressure on Athens to purchase German and French military equipment in exchange for assistance in dealing with Greece's economic difficulties. In other words, cuts and sacrifices for Greek citizens on the one hand and an increase in defence procurement on the other.

In light of the above, can the Commission say:

1. how it judges Greece's further military expenditure, equivalent to 3 % of its GDP, also in view of the cuts to Greek salaries and pensions;
2. whether it intends to ascertain whether Germany and France did indeed exert pressure to increase Greek military spending in exchange for assistance to remain within the eurozone, as reported in the German press?

**Joint answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission  
(2 April 2012)**

The Commission is not aware of pressure from the French and German Governments on the Greek Government to purchase arms from the two countries.

Furthermore, the Honourable Member is referred to the Commission's reply to Written Questions E-000616/2012 and E-000812/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp>

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001757/12**

**alla Commissione**  
**Aldo Patriciello (PPE)**  
(13 febbraio 2012)

**Oggetto:** Protesi mammarie difettose

La polizia francese ha arrestato Jean-Claude Mas, fondatore dell'azienda di protesi mammarie Poly Implant Prothese (PIP). L'azienda è accusata di aver prodotto migliaia di protesi con gel non corrispondente agli standard richiesti, dieci volte meno cari del materiale a norma, con un'alta probabilità di rottura dell'involucro, un'elevata possibilità di infiammare i tessuti e il rischio di provocare un tumore al seno. Nel mondo sarebbero tra 400 e 500 mila le donne con protesi PIP, in Francia 30 mila, in Italia 4300.

Sulla scia dello scandalo per la pericolosità delle protesi al seno PIP, la Commissione UE intende modificare le leggi europee per garantire in particolare la tracciabilità di tutte le protesi mediche. La legge attuale che regola il grande universo delle protesi mediche risale al 2007.

In Italia vige il decreto legge 2515 che prevede l'istituzione del registro nazionale e dei registri regionali degli impianti protesici mammari, oltre agli obblighi informativi alle pazienti, mentre il divieto di intervento di plastica mammaria alle persone minori è in corso di esame in commissione.

Grazie a una legislazione diversa da quella europea, gli USA sono l'unico paese ad essere rimasto immune e aver evitato l'obbligo di prendere contromisure drastiche come il richiamo e il reimpianto su donne già operate. In USA infatti i dispositivi medici, quindi protesi, bypass, valvole cardiache, stent, filler antirughe, sono soggetti alle stesse regole che valgono per i farmaci. Poiché l'autorizzazione dipende dall'agenzia regolatoria FDA (Food and drugs administration), le aziende devono presentare dossier scientifici per dimostrare che i loro prodotti sono sicuri ed efficaci.

In Europa è diverso perché è sufficiente che il prodotto abbia il bollino CE ed è automaticamente autorizzato dalle autorità nazionali senza ulteriori verifiche. Il bollino è rilasciato da società private, che non sono autorità regolatorie statali.

Considerato l'esempio USA, può la Commissione precisare se l'UE potrebbe prendere in esame la proposta fatta in Italia, ma mai realizzata fino in fondo, di far rientrare i dispositivi medici sotto il controllo di un'agenzia europea?

**Risposta data da John Dalli a nome della Commissione**

(28 marzo 2012)

Una revisione della legislazione sui dispositivi medici, che copre tra l'altro le protesi mammarie, era già prevista nel programma di lavoro della Commissione per il 2012 <sup>(1)</sup>. Gli obiettivi principali di tale revisione sono migliorare la vigilanza e la sorveglianza del mercato per quanto concerne tutti i dispositivi medici, rafforzare la designazione, il monitoraggio e il funzionamento degli organismi notificati per assicurare che i dispositivi medici siano debitamente valutati prima di venire immessi sul mercato europeo, e rafforzare la tracciabilità dei dispositivi medici per il tramite di un sistema unico d'identificazione dei dispositivi basato sul rischio.

Per quanto concerne la gestione del sistema normativo, la partecipazione di un'agenzia è una delle opzioni attualmente all'esame nel contesto della valutazione d'impatto.

Delle carenze identificate nel caso PIP si terrà conto nel contesto della proposta summenzionata. La Commissione ha anche preparato un elenco di misure che si potrebbero adottare immediatamente in forza della legislazione vigente per rafforzare il sistema, in particolare ricorrendo a audit non preannunciati, a controlli a campione e a una migliore condivisione dei dati a livello europeo ma anche a livello globale con i nostri principali partner commerciali.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2011)777 definitivo del 15.11.2012.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001757/12  
to the Commission  
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)  
(13 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Defective breast implants

The French police have arrested Jean-Claude Mas, the founder of the Poly Implant Prothèse (PIP) breast implant company. The company is accused of manufacturing thousands of implants with gel that does not comply with the standards required, costing ten times less than the approved material, with a high probability of rupture of the casing, highly possible inflammation of the surrounding tissues and the risk of causing breast cancer. Between 400 000 and 500 000 women worldwide have PIP implants, 30 000 in France and 4 300 in Italy.

In the wake of the scandal concerning the danger of PIP breast implants, the EU Commission intends to amend European legislation so as to guarantee, in particular, the traceability of all medical implants. The current law regulating the extensive area of medical implants dates back to 2007.

In Italy, Decree-Law 2515 is in force, which requires the setting-up of a national register and regional registers for breast implants, in addition to the obligation to inform patients, while a ban on breast plastic surgery for underage women is being examined in committee.

Thanks to legislation that differs from European law, the USA is the only country to be unaffected and to have avoided having to take drastic countermeasures such as recalling and re-operating on women who have already had breast implants. In fact, in the US, medical devices, such as implants, bypasses, cardiac valves, stents and anti-wrinkle fillers, are subject to the same rules as for pharmaceuticals. Since authorisation depends on the FDA (Food and Drugs Administration) regulatory body, companies must submit scientific dossiers demonstrating the safety and effectiveness of their products.

In Europe, it is different because it is sufficient that a product has the CE mark and it is then automatically authorised by the national authorities without any further checks. The CE mark is issued by private companies that are not government regulatory authorities.

Considering the example of the USA, can the Commission state whether the EU could examine the proposal put forward in Italy, but never fully implemented, of bringing medical devices under the control of a European agency?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission  
(28 March 2012)**

A revision of the legislation on medical devices, which covers among others breast implants, was already foreseen in the 2012 Commission Work Programme <sup>(1)</sup>. The main objectives of this revision are to improve vigilance and market surveillance for all medical devices, strengthen the designation, monitoring and functioning of Notified Bodies to ensure that medical devices are appropriately assessed before their placing on the European market, and reinforce the traceability of medical devices by means of a risk-based Unique Device Identification system.

With respect to the management of the regulatory system, the involvement of an agency is one of the options that is being considered in the context of the impact assessment.

Any shortcomings identified in the PIP case will be taken into account in the abovementioned proposal. The Commission has also prepared a list of measures that could be taken immediately under existing legislation to reinforce the system, in particular with regard to unannounced audits, sample testing and better data sharing at European level but also at global level with our major trading partners.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2011) 777 final, 15.11.2012.

(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001760/12**  
**adresată Comisiei**  
**Cătălin Sorin Ivan (S&D)**  
(13 februarie 2012)

*Subiect:* Transpunerea directivei 2006/24/CE

Pe 16 iunie 2011, Comisia Europeană a declanșat procedura în constatarea neîndeplinirii obligațiilor împotriva României cu privire la neimplementarea Directivei 2006/24/CE privind păstrarea datelor generate sau prelucrate în legătură cu furnizarea serviciilor de comunicații electronice accesibile publicului sau de rețele de comunicații publice. Pe 27 octombrie 2011, Comisia a remis României un aviz motivat, a doua etapă a procedurii.

Ca răspuns, a fost inițiat un nou proiect de lege, menit să transpună în legislația română prevederile directivei, care se află în prezent în dezbateră în Parlamentul României. Simultan, există reacții din partea unor ONG-uri care se opun adoptării acestei legi din rațiuni de securitate a datelor reținute, de acces la aceste date, dar și de respectare a drepturilor cetățenești (dreptul la viața privată, etc). Printre aceste organizații se numără: Asociația pentru Apărarea Drepturilor Omului — Comitetul Helsinki (APADOR-CH), Activewatch — Agenția de Monitorizare a Presei, Asociația Națională a Internet Service Providerilor (ANISP), Centrul pentru Jurnalism Independent (CJI).

1. Date fiind aspectele prezentate, doresc să întreb Comisia ce se întâmplă într-o astfel de situație, în care într-un stat devenit membru după adoptarea directivei părțile interesate se poziționează împotriva legislației?
2. Care este poziția Comisiei față de acest caz concret?

**Răspuns dat de dna Malmström în numele Comisiei**  
(30 martie 2012)

Directiva 2006/24/CE (Directiva privind păstrarea datelor) face parte din ordinea juridică a Uniunii Europene. Toate statele membre au obligația de a transpune directiva în legislația lor națională, inclusiv statele membre care au aderat la UE după adoptarea directivei. Pentru a deveni stat membru, o țară trebuie să accepte acquis-ul Uniunii.

În conformitate cu articolul 258 din Tratatul privind funcționarea Uniunii Europene, Comisia este responsabilă pentru asigurarea faptului că legislația UE, inclusiv Directiva privind păstrarea datelor, este corect aplicată. Dacă un stat membru nu respectă legislația UE, Comisia dispune de puteri proprii pentru a încerca să pună capăt acestei încălcări și, după caz, poate deferi cazul Curții de Justiție Europene. Comisia este la curent cu situația complexă rezultată din decizia Curții Constituționale a României care a declarat neconstituțională legea națională de transpunere a Directivei privind păstrarea datelor. Prin urmare, Comisia a acordat României o perioadă considerabilă de timp pentru a transpune Directiva privind păstrarea datelor în legislația sa națională în urma deciziei Curții Constituționale a României, pronunțate la 8 octombrie 2009. Comisia consideră că autoritățile române au obligația de a pune în aplicare acele proceduri care sunt necesare pentru se conforma Directivei privind păstrarea datelor.

Obiectivul principal al procedurilor în constatarea neîndeplinirii obligațiilor este asigurarea faptului că statele membre respectă legislația UE. Comisia este în legătură cu autoritățile române pentru a sprijini transpunerea Directivei privind păstrarea datelor în legislația națională.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001760/12  
to the Commission**

**Cătălin Sorin Ivan (S&D)**

(13 February 2012)

*Subject:* Transposition of Directive 2006/24/EC

On 16 June 2011, the European Commission launched infringement proceedings against Romania for failure to implement Directive 2006/24/EC on the retention of generated or processed data associated with the provision of publicly accessible electronic communications services or public communications networks. On 27 October 2011 the Commission issued a reasoned opinion to Romania, this being the second stage of the procedure.

In response, a new bill has been proposed, aimed at transposing the provisions of the directive into Romanian law, which is currently being debated in the Romanian Parliament. At the same time there are reactions from a number of NGOs that are opposed to the adoption of this bill on the grounds of security of the retained data, access to this data and also respect for the rights of citizens (right to a private life, etc.). Among these organisations are: The Association for the Defence of Human Rights — the Helsinki Committee (APADOR-CH), ActiveWatch — the Press Monitoring Agency, the National Association of Internet Service Providers (ANISP), and the Centre for Independent Journalism (IJC).

In view of this:

1. Can the Commission say what happens where, in a state that became a member after adoption of the directive, the interested parties now oppose the legislation?
2. What is the Commission's position on this specific case?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission**

(30 March 2012)

Directive 2006/24/EC (the Data Retention Directive) is part of the legal order of the EU. All Member States are obliged to transpose the directive into national law. This includes Member States that joined the EU after the adoption of the directive. In order to become a Member State, a country has to accept the *acquis* of the Union.

According to Article 258 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the Commission is responsible for ensuring that EC law, including the Data Retention Directive, is correctly applied. Where a Member State fails to comply with EC law, the Commission has powers of its own to try to bring the infringement to an end and, where necessary, may refer the case to the European Court of Justice. The Commission is aware of the complex situation that arose from the judgment of the Constitutional Court of Romania which declared the national law transposing the Data Retention Directive to be unconstitutional. Therefore, the Commission has given a considerable amount of time to Romania to transpose the Data Retention Directive into national law following the judgment of its Constitutional Courts on 8 October 2009. The Commission considers that it is for the authorities of Romania to implement whatever procedures are necessary in order to comply with the Data Retention Directive.

The main purpose of infringement procedures is to ensure compliance of Member States with EC law. The Commission is in contact with the authorities of Romania to support the transposition of the Data Retention into national law.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-001761/12  
to the Commission  
Daniel Hannan (ECR)  
(16 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Conflicting figures for official EU contributions per country

The figures for the Member States' contributions to the EU given on the 'EU budget at a glance' tool on Parliament's website <sup>(1)</sup> do not match the figures given on the Commission's website <sup>(2)</sup>.

Could the Commission explain the discrepancy in the figures?

**Answer given by Mr Lewandowski on behalf of the Commission  
(8 March 2012)**

The European Commission's website 'The budget in figures' as mentioned by the Honourable Member <sup>(3)</sup> includes the latest available information during the budgetary year in question. Thus, for year 2010 the data displayed corresponds to the Amending Budget 8/2010.

The final data concerning the implementation of the 2010 budget is to be found in the other section of the European Commission's website, namely the 'Annual Accounts of the European Union' <sup>(4)</sup>

The comprehensive set of data concerning revenue and expenditure of the 2010 EU budget by Member State is available in the publication of the Commission titled 'EU budget 2010 Financial Report' <sup>(5)</sup>. The data published in the Financial Report is coherent with these published in the Annual Accounts.

Thus, the figures for the Member States' contributions to the EU given on the 'EU budget at a glance' tool on Parliament's website <sup>(6)</sup> are coherent with those published in the 'EU budget 2010 Financial Report' (page 73, Annex Ac 'Expenditure and revenue by Member State').

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/headlines/content/20111107MUN30717/html/EU-budget-at-glance-updated-with-latest-figures>.

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/budget/figures/2010/2010\\_en.cfm](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/figures/2010/2010_en.cfm).

<sup>(3)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/budget/figures/2010/2010\\_en.cfm](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/figures/2010/2010_en.cfm).

<sup>(4)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/budget/biblio/documents/2010/2010\\_en.cfm#comptes\\_annuels](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/biblio/documents/2010/2010_en.cfm#comptes_annuels).

<sup>(5)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/budget/biblio/documents/2010/2010\\_en.cfm#rap\\_fin](http://ec.europa.eu/budget/biblio/documents/2010/2010_en.cfm#rap_fin).

<sup>(6)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/headlines/content/20111107MUN30717/html/EU-budget-at-glance-updated-with-latest-figures>.



(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-001763/12  
do Komisji**

**Jacek Saryusz-Wolski (PPE)**

(14 lutego 2012 r.)

*Przedmiot:* Monitoring sytuacji w odniesieniu do praw pracowników z krajów UE w Królestwie Niderlandów

W odpowiedzi na moją interpelację w sprawie prac nad prawem dotyczącym migrantów zarobkowych z państw UE w Holandii (P-004521/2011) Pani Komisarz Viviane Reding udzieliła odpowiedzi, w której zapewniła o tym, że Komisja Europejska, będąc w kontakcie z władzami holenderskimi, wyjaśnia wszelkie wątpliwości dotyczące tworzenia projektowanego prawa pod kątem jego zgodności z dyrektywą o swobodnym przepływie osób (dyrektywa 2004/38/WE). Pani Komisarz w swojej odpowiedzi potwierdziła również jednoznacznie, że na terenie Królestwa Niderlandów obywatele krajów UE powinni być objęci prawami równymi do tych, którymi cieszą się obywatele holenderscy.

Chciałbym uzyskać od Komisji informację, czy w powyższym zakresie, w wyniku monitoringu i dialogu z władzami holenderskimi, Komisja uzyskała wszelkie wyjaśnienia od strony holenderskiej i czy w ocenie Komisji nie zachodzi groźba złamania podstawowych zasad zawartych w dyrektywie o swobodnym przepływie osób?

W tym kontekście również, dziękując Komisarz Viviane Reding za jednoznaczne potępienie w oświadczeniu prasowym powstania portalu pod patronatem holenderskiej partii PVV „Meldpunt middenenooosteuropæen”, chciałbym zapytać, czy KE zamierza zbadać, czy istnienie portalu jest legalne w świetle prawa europejskiego i czy Komisja, we współpracy z władzami holenderskimi, podejmie ewentualne kroki, aby tego typu dyskryminacyjne i ksenofobiczne praktyki nie miały miejsca w Unii Europejskiej?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Viviane Reding w imieniu Komisji**

(23 marca 2012 r.)

Komisja pozostaje w ścisłym kontakcie z władzami holenderskimi. Oprócz wymiany korespondencji pomiędzy Wiceprzewodniczącą Viviane Reding i komisarzem László Andorem z holenderskim ministrem do spraw społecznych i zatrudnienia i ministrem ds. imigracji i azylu zapewniono również kontakty na szczeblu technicznym.

Władze holenderskie przekazały informacje dotyczące planów na przyszłość.

Komisja podkreśliła w swoim ostatnim piśmie, że nadal istnieją poważne wątpliwości co do zgodności holenderskich planów dotyczących praw pracowników przygranicznych i osób poszukujących zatrudnienia w strefie przygranicznej.

Komisja nadal oczekuje na odpowiedź, którą dokładnie przeanalizuje w świetle przepisów prawa UE.

W odniesieniu do holenderskiego portalu utworzonego przez partię PVV Komisja przypomina, że decyzja ramowa Rady 2008/913/WSiSW zakazuje podżegania do nienawiści z powodu przynależności państwowej<sup>(1)</sup>. Państwa członkowskie były zobowiązane dokonać transpozycji decyzji ramowej do krajowego porządku prawnego do dnia 28 listopada 2010 r. Niderlandy zgłosiły środki wykonawcze. W dniu 11 lutego br. Wiceprzewodnicząca Viviane Reding potępiła stronę internetową partii PVV.

Komisja przedstawiła swoje poglądy Parlamentowi Europejskiemu podczas posiedzenia plenarnego w dniu 13 marca 2012 r.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Decyzja ramowa Rady 2008/913/WSiSW z dnia 28 listopada 2008 r. w sprawie zwalczania pewnych form i przejawów rasizmu i ksenofobii za pomocą środków prawnokarnych, Dz.U. L 328 z 6.12.2008.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-001763/12  
to the Commission**

**Jacek Saryusz-Wolski (PPE)**

(14 February 2012)

*Subject:* Monitoring of the situation regarding the rights of EU workers in the Netherlands

In answer to my question concerning work on a law on workers from other EU countries who have migrated to the Netherlands in search of employment (P-004521/2011), Commissioner Reding issued a response in which she gave an assurance that the European Commission, having been in contact with the Dutch authorities, is clarifying all doubts in respect of the drafting of this law, paying special attention to its conformity with the directive on the free movement of persons (Directive 2004/38/EC). In her response the Commissioner also affirmed unequivocally that in the Netherlands citizens of EU countries must be protected by rights equal to those enjoyed by Dutch citizens.

I would like to receive information from the Commission on whether, as a result of monitoring and dialogue with the Dutch authorities, the Commission has received from the Dutch side any explanations relating to the issue referred to above. I would also like to enquire whether the Commission is of the opinion that the basic principles contained within the directive on the free movement of persons are in danger of being violated.

In this context, too, whilst thanking Commissioner for her unequivocal condemnation of an announcement in the press of the creation of a web portal under the auspices of the Dutch PVV Party, 'Meldpunt middelooosteneuropeanen', I would like to ask if the Commission intends to investigate the legality of this portal in the light of European legislation, and whether, in cooperation with the Dutch authorities, it will take the necessary steps to ensure that discriminatory and xenophobic practices of this nature do not take place in the European Union.

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission**

(23 March 2012)

The Commission is in close contact with the Dutch authorities. In addition to an exchange of correspondence between VP Reding and Commissioner Andor with the Dutch Minister of Social Affairs and Employment and the Dutch Minister of Immigration and Asylum, contact at technical level has been ensured.

The Dutch authorities have provided information about their future plans.

The Commission underlined in its last letter that serious doubts remained about the compatibility of the Dutch plans concerning the rights of frontier workers and jobseekers.

The Commission is awaiting a reply to its last letter and will examine it carefully in the light of EC law.

As regards the Dutch portal created by the Dutch party PVV, the Commission recalls that Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA prohibits inciting to hatred against persons because of their national origin<sup>(1)</sup>. Member States were obliged to transpose the framework Decision into their national laws by 28 November 2010. The Netherlands has notified its implementing measures. Vice-President Reding condemned the PVV website on 11 February.

The Commission had the opportunity to present its views to the Parliament during the plenary debate on 13 March 2012.

---

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

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001764/12  
an die Kommission  
Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE)  
(14. Februar 2012)**

*Betrifft:* Verwendung der PE-Rohre bei Lagerstättenwasserleitungen

In Deutschland sind mittlerweile bei der Erdgasförderung einige Leitungen aus dem Kunststoff PE 80 oder 100 verantwortlich für undichte Lagerstättenwasserleitungen, welche Flächen mit krebserregendem Benzol kontaminiert haben.

Eine Umweltverträglichkeitsprüfung war bei diesen Rohren nicht vorgesehen, obwohl gefährliche Flüssigkeiten unter anderem durch Wasserschutzgebiete geleitet wurden.

In diesen Rahmen wird die Kommission Folgendes gefragt:

1. Sind ihr vergleichbare Fälle in anderen Mitgliedstaaten bekannt?
2. Warum wird in diesem Bereich keine Umweltverträglichkeitsprüfung vorgesehen? Beabsichtigt die Kommission, dies in der gegenwärtigen Prüfung der Umweltverträglichkeitsrichtlinie zu ändern?
3. Welche Maßnahmen unternimmt die Kommission, um solche Fälle zu vermeiden?

**Antwort von Herrn Potočnik im Namen der Kommission  
(4. April 2012)**

Der Kommission liegen keine Informationen über Benzolkontaminationen infolge undichter Lagerstättenwasserleitungen aus PE-Kunststoff in anderen Mitgliedstaaten als Deutschland vor.

Die Umweltverträglichkeitsprüfung<sup>(1)</sup> betrifft nicht die Auswirkungen von Produkten oder Materialien, sondern ist vielmehr eine Ex-ante-Bewertung der möglichen nachteiligen Umweltauswirkungen von Projekten. Es ist Sache der einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten, durch angemessene Genehmigungsverfahren und Überwachungsregelungen sicherzustellen, dass die vereinbarten technischen Normen und Vorschriften für Planung, Konstruktion, Betrieb und Projektüberwachung sowie die Materialvorgaben im Interesse des Schutzes der menschlichen Gesundheit und der Umwelt umfassend eingehalten werden.

Im Rahmen der laufenden Überprüfung der Richtlinie über die Umweltverträglichkeitsprüfung prüft die Kommission zurzeit verschiedene Vorschläge, die während der öffentlichen Konsultation vorlegt wurden, um die Wirksamkeit, Effizienz und Relevanz der Richtlinie zu verbessern.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> ABl. L 26 vom 28.1.2012.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001764/12  
to the Commission**

**Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE)**

(14 February 2012)

*Subject:* Use of PE pipes in storage facility water pipelines

A number of pipes made from PE 80 or PE 100 plastic used in the transport of natural gas in Germany have been responsible for leaks in storage facility water pipelines, which have contaminated certain areas with carcinogenic benzene.

There was no provision for an environmental impact assessment for these pipes, despite the fact that dangerous liquids were channelled through protected water areas.

For this reason I would like to ask:

1. Is the Commission aware of similar cases in other Member States?
2. Why is there no provision for an environmental impact assessment in this area? Does the Commission intend changing this in the current review of the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive?
3. What steps are being taken by the Commission to avoid such cases?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission**

(4 April 2012)

The Commission has no information on benzene contamination caused by leakages of formation water pipelines using PE plastic pipes in Member States other than Germany.

The Environmental Impact Assessment <sup>(1)</sup> is not related to the effects from products or material but to the *ex-ante* assessment of possible adverse environmental effects of projects. It is for each Member State through appropriate permitting procedures and monitoring arrangements to ensure that the agreed technical standards and requirements applicable for the design, construction, operation and supervision of projects and the materials employed are fully respected to protect public health as well as the environment.

In the context of the ongoing review of the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive, the Commission is considering several proposals put forward during the public consultation with a view to enhancing the effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of the directive.

---

(1) OJ L 26, 28.1.2012.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001765/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**  
(14. Februar 2012)

*Betrifft:* Finanztransaktionssteuer

Die Einnahmen aus einer möglichen Finanztransaktionssteuer (FTT) könnten als Eigenmittel für den Haushalt der Europäischen Union dienen. Es werden hierbei Zahlen von bis zu 50 Mrd. EUR und mehr pro Jahr diskutiert.

1. Inwieweit hat die Kommission geprüft, ob die Einführung einer FTT sich negativ auf die Produktion in den Mitgliedstaaten auswirken könnte? Wenn ja, inwieweit wären hiervon KMU betroffen? Wenn ja, welche Vorkehrungen beabsichtigt die Kommission zu treffen, damit dieser Negativeffekt verhindert wird?
2. Sieht die Kommission die Möglichkeit der Beeinträchtigung europäischer Exporte bzw. der Exportfähigkeit, die sich aus der Einführung einer FTT ergeben könnten?
3. Welche Vorkehrungen beabsichtigt die Kommission zu treffen, damit Finanzunternehmen nicht einfach durch Verlagerung ihres Unternehmenssitzes aus der EU heraus versuchen, einer FTT auszuweichen?
4. Welche Anstrengungen unternimmt die Kommission im Detail, um die Einführung einer weltweit geltenden FTT zu unterstützen?

**Antwort von Herrn Šemeta im Namen der Kommission**  
(2. April 2012)

1. In der Folgenabschätzung und ihren Anhängen hat die Kommission eingeräumt, dass der Vorschlag gewisse Auswirkungen auf die Kapitalkosten und damit auf das Wirtschaftswachstum haben wird. Auch wenn keine detaillierte Analyse vorliegt, sind nur geringe Auswirkungen auf die KMU zu erwarten, da das von den KMU genutzte einfache Privatkundengeschäft von der Steuer ausgenommen ist und diese zudem nicht für Erstemissionen gilt.
  2. Die Ein- und Ausfuhrkapazität der EU wäre von dem Vorschlag für eine Finanztransaktionssteuer nicht direkt betroffen, jedoch sind sehr begrenzte Auswirkungen auf die Kosten bestimmter Hedging-Geschäfte denkbar.
  3. Die Kommission hat Mindeststeuersätze vorgeschlagen, die so gering sind, dass die Verlagerungsrisiken minimiert werden. Gleichzeitig sind die Steuersätze hoch genug, um das Ziel einer Harmonisierung zu erreichen. Des Weiteren ist die Steuer so angelegt, dass sie mit einer einfachen Standortverlagerung nicht umgangen werden kann, sofern der europäische Markt und europäische Kunden bedient werden sollen.
  4. Die Kommission setzt den Dialog mit ihren internationalen Partnern in den entsprechenden Gremien wie der G20 oder den Vereinten Nationen fort, um Unterstützung für einen globalen gemeinsamen Rahmen für eine Finanztransaktionssteuer zu gewinnen.
-

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001765/12  
to the Commission  
Angelika Werthmann (NI)  
(14 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Financial transaction tax

The income generated by a possible financial transaction tax (FTT) could be used as a budgetary resource for the European Union. Figures of up to EUR 50 billion or more per year are being discussed.

1. To what extent has the Commission investigated whether the introduction of an FTT could have a negative impact on production in the Member States? If so, to what extent would SMEs be affected? If so, what steps does the Commission plan to take to prevent this negative effect?
2. Does the Commission foresee the possibility of any impairment of European exports or export capacity as a result of the introduction of an FTT?
3. What steps does the Commission plan to take to ensure that financial undertakings do not avoid an FTT by simply relocating their registered offices to a location outside the EU?
4. What specific efforts is the Commission making to support the introduction of a worldwide FTT?

**Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission  
(2 April 2012)**

1. The Commission has acknowledged in the impact assessment and its annexes a certain impact the proposal would have on the cost of capital and therefore on economic growth. There is no detailed analysis of the impact on the SMEs, but it can be expected to be limited because basic retail banking activities used by SMEs are not subject to the tax nor does it apply to primary issuance.
  2. The capacity of the EU to export or import would not be affected directly by the FTT proposal, but a very limited impact on the cost of certain hedging operations could be envisaged.
  3. The Commission has proposed minimum tax rates low enough so that delocalisation risks are minimised. These rates are, at the same time, sufficiently high for the harmonisation objective to be achieved. Moreover, *the tax is designed in a way that simple relocation does not help to avoid paying the tax for as long as one wants to serve the European market and European clients.*
  4. The Commission is continuing its dialogue with international partners in relevant fora, such as the Group of 20 or the United Nations, to get support for a global common framework for a financial transaction tax.
-

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001766/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**  
(14. Februar 2012)

*Betrifft:* Nächster MFF — Jugendarbeitslosigkeit in Europa

Der kommende Mehrjährige Finanzrahmen 2014-2020 (MFF) der Europäischen Union stellt auf besondere Unterstützung der 2020-Strategie ab, damit die darin vereinbarten Ziele der Union erreicht werden.

Als eines von 5 Kernzielen wurde das Ziel definiert, dass bis 2020 dann 75 % Prozent der 20- bis 64-jährigen EU-Bürger in Arbeit stehen sollen.

Heute beträgt die Jugendarbeitslosigkeit in der EU 27 22,1 %; sie beläuft sich in Italien auf 31,0 %, in Spanien auf 48,7 %, in Portugal auf 30,8 %, in Griechenland auf 47,2 %. Insbesondere in den genannten Krisenstaaten dürften die Zahlen noch ansteigen. Die Verfasserin verweist auf die konkrete Gefahr, dass die weiterhin erforderlichen radikalen Sparprogramme in vielen Mitgliedstaaten dazu führen, dass Jugendarbeitslosigkeit im genannten Umfang zum Dauerzustand wird. Damit ist aber bereits jetzt absehbar, dass die Kommission ihr o. g. Kernziel bei der Beschäftigung im Jahr 2020 nicht erreichen wird.

1. Wie beabsichtigt die Kommission, auf diese erschreckenden Zustände bei der Jugendarbeitslosigkeit in Europa zu reagieren?
2. Welche weiteren Maßnahmen und Programme beabsichtigt sie als Antwort auf die aktuelle Entwicklung im nächsten MFF vorzusehen, um diese Problematik effizienter als bisher sowie sehr gezielt zu bekämpfen?
3. Hält die Kommission die von ihr vorgesehenen Maßnahmen für ausreichend?

**Antwort von Herrn Andor im Namen der Kommission**  
(12. April 2012)

1. Als Reaktion auf die hohe Jugendarbeitslosigkeit hat die Kommission im Dezember 2011 die Initiative „Chancen für junge Menschen“ vorgelegt <sup>(1)</sup>. Die Kommission verweist die Frau Abgeordnete in diesem Zusammenhang auf die Beantwortung anderer schriftlicher Fragen <sup>(2)</sup>, die zu den konkreten Maßnahmen im Rahmen dieser Initiative gestellt wurden.

2. Innerhalb des nächsten mehrjährigen Finanzrahmens bleibt der Europäische Sozialfonds (ESF) weiterhin das wichtigste Finanzinstrument der EU für Investitionen in Humankapital, während aus dem Europäischen Fonds für regionale Entwicklung (EFRE) und dem Kohäsionsfonds anderweitige wachstums- und beschäftigungsfördernde Investitionen wie beispielsweise im Infrastrukturbereich unterstützt werden. Die Vorschläge der Kommission für die Kohäsionspolitik nach 2013 werden derzeit mit dem Parlament und dem Rat erörtert. Die Vorschläge für den Kohäsionsfonds, den EFRE und den ESF sind in vollem Umfang auf die Strategie Europa 2020 ausgerichtet und tragen zum Erreichen der drei Kernziele Beschäftigung, Bildung und Fähigkeiten sowie soziale Integration bei. Beim ESF wird mit einem spezifischen Investitionsschwerpunkt besonders auf die Förderung junger Menschen gesetzt. Ein verstärktes Überwachungssystem soll der Weiterverfolgung der speziell für junge Menschen durchgeführten Maßnahmen dienen. Darüber hinaus soll eine Stärkung der strategischen Planung gewährleisten, dass künftige ESF-Programme noch besser darauf ausgerichtet sind, wie wichtige Themen wie die Jugendarbeitslosigkeit angegangen werden können. Die Investitionen aus dem EFRE zielen schwerpunktmäßig auf wachstums- und beschäftigungsfördernde Maßnahmen ab, insbesondere auf solche zur Stärkung der Wettbewerbsfähigkeit von KMU, im Bereich Forschung und Innovation sowie zur Verringerung der CO<sub>2</sub>-Emissionen.

3. Wachstumsfördernde Maßnahmen sind notwendig und können die Schaffung von Arbeitsplätzen fördern, wenn sie mit anderen Maßnahmen verknüpft werden. Die Initiative „Chancen für junge Menschen“ umfasst zudem Maßnahmen, die jungen Menschen die richtigen Fähigkeiten und Qualifikationen vermitteln sollen, um ihre Integration in den Arbeitsmarkt zu erleichtern <sup>(3)</sup>. Die Hauptverantwortung für beschäftigungs- und bildungspolitische Maßnahmen liegt jedoch nach wie vor bei den Mitgliedstaaten.

<sup>(1)</sup> KOM(2011)933.

<sup>(2)</sup> E-0010895/2011, E-0011594/2011, E-001002/2012, E-001371/2012 und E-001812/2012;  
<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=DE>

<sup>(3)</sup> Verringerung frühzeitiger Schulabgänge, Stärkung der Berufsbildungssysteme, Förderung von Lehrstellen und Praktika, Einführung der Jugendgarantie, Stärkung der Jugendmobilität usw.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001766/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**  
(14 February 2012)

*Subject:* Next multiannual financial framework (MFF)/youth unemployment in Europe

The European Union's forthcoming multi-annual financial framework for 2014-2020 (MFF) aims to provide particular support for the 2020 strategy, so that the Union objectives agreed therein can be achieved.

One of the five key objectives defined is that 75 % of EU citizens in the 20 to 64 age bracket should be in employment by 2020.

At present, youth unemployment in the 27 EU Member States stands at 22.1 %, running to 31.0 % in Italy, 48.7 % in Spain, 30.8 % in Portugal and 47.2 % in Greece. These figures may rise further, particularly in these countries in crisis. The author points to the specific risk that the radical cost-cutting programmes still required in many Member States will mean that youth unemployment will remain at these levels in the long term. It is already apparent that the Commission will not attain the aforementioned employment targets in 2020.

1. How does the Commission intend to respond to the shocking levels of youth unemployment in Europe?
2. What further measures and programmes is it planning to include in the next MFF in response to current developments, so that this problem can be combated in a more efficient and targeted way?
3. Does the Commission consider the measures it has planned to be sufficient?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission**  
(12 April 2012)

1. In response to the high youth unemployment, the Commission has presented in December 2011 the Youth Opportunities Initiative (YOI) <sup>(1)</sup>. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its replies to other written questions <sup>(2)</sup> concerning the specific actions taken under this initiative.

2. In the next MFF, the European Social Fund (ESF) will remain the main EU financial instrument to invest in human capital while the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and the Cohesion Fund will make a number of other growth and employment creating investments such as in infrastructure. The Commission's proposals for Cohesion Policy after 2013 are currently being discussed with Parliament and Council. The Cohesion Fund, ERDF and ESF proposals are fully aligned with the EU 2020 strategy, contributing to the achievement of the three headline targets on employment, education and skills and social inclusion. For the ESF particular attention is given to youth through a specific investment priority. The monitoring system is strengthened in order to be able to follow the actions carried out specifically for youth. Moreover, a reinforced strategic programming should ensure that future ESF programmes are even more aligned on tackling major issues such as youth unemployment. The ERDF will concentrate investments in growth and employment creating measures in particular on increasing the competitiveness of SMEs, research and innovation as well as supporting the shift to low carbon economy.

3. Growth enhancing measures are necessary and can increase employment creation if combined with other measures. YOI also includes measures to equip young people with right skills and competences to facilitate their integration in the labour market <sup>(3)</sup>. Nevertheless, the main responsibility for employment and education policies remains with Member States.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2011) 933.

<sup>(2)</sup> E-0010895/2011, E-0011594/2011, E-001002/2012, E-001371/2012 and E-001812/2012  
<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp>

<sup>(3)</sup> Reducing early school-leaving, strengthening vocational education and training systems, promoting apprenticeships, introducing youth guarantees, enhancing youth mobility, etc.



(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001767/12**

**an die Kommission**

**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**

(14. Februar 2012)

*Betrifft:* Chance für junge Menschen

Am 20. Dezember 2011 hat die Kommission die Initiative „Chance für junge Menschen“ gestartet, um durch gezielte Maßnahmen die Situation junger Menschen am Arbeitsmarkt zu verbessern und die Jugendarbeitslosigkeit in Europa zu reduzieren.

1. Unter anderem sieht die Initiative vor, im Jahr 2012 mindestens 130 000 Praktikumsstellen im Rahmen des Erasmus- und Leonardo-da-Vinci-Programms zu vermitteln. Bezieht sich diese Maßnahme vordergründig auf die Vermittlung von Stipendien im Rahmen der genannten Programme oder bietet die Kommission auch konkrete Hilfestellungen bei der Suche nach einem Praktikumsplatz?
2. Außerdem sieht die Initiative vor, 1,3 Mio. EUR aus dem Europäischen Sozialfonds für die Schaffung von Lehrstellen bereitzustellen. Wie wird diese Maßnahme jenen Mitgliedstaaten zugutekommen, die — anders als Österreich oder Deutschland — kein System der dualen Berufsausbildung in Unternehmen besitzen, sondern in denen die Berufsausbildung in erster Linie in dafür spezialisierten Schulen erfolgt?
3. Darüber hinaus hat sich die Kommission zum Ziel gesetzt, im Zuge der Initiative „Dein erster EURES-Arbeitsplatz“ 5 000 junge Menschen in den Jahren 2012 und 2013 bei der Suche nach einem Arbeitsplatz in einem anderen Mitgliedstaat zu unterstützen. Wie sehen die von der Kommission gebotenen Hilfestellungen konkret aus?

**Antwort von Herrn Andor im Namen der Kommission**

(10. April 2012)

1. Sowohl das Programm Leonardo da Vinci als auch das Programm Erasmus bieten zusätzlich zur finanziellen Unterstützung einen Rahmen, um Mobilität zu organisieren und die Qualität von Praktika sicherzustellen. Beim Programm Leonardo da Vinci stehen den Berufsbildungsanbietern im Herkunftsland verschiedene Möglichkeiten zur Verfügung, um Unternehmen im Ausland zu finden. An vielen Schulen und Hochschulen besteht eine langjährige Zusammenarbeit mit Unternehmen im Ausland. Zwischengeschaltete Stellen wie Industrie- und Handelskammern, Handwerkskammern oder Büros für regionale Entwicklung nutzen ebenfalls ihre internationalen Kontakte, um Verbindungen zu Arbeitsstätten im Ausland herzustellen. Im Fall des Erasmus-Programms können die Unternehmen von den Studierenden ausfindig gemacht werden. In manchen Bildungseinrichtungen ist dies Bestandteil der Ausbildung. Die von den Studierenden getroffene Wahl muss von den Einrichtungen jedoch überprüft werden. Die Hochschulen können Praktikumsplätze auch selbst vorschlagen.
2. Die 1,3 Mio. EUR für technische Unterstützung im Rahmen des Europäischen Sozialfonds werden für die Einrichtung von Lehrstellenprogrammen eingesetzt. Damit wird das Ziel verfolgt, Mitgliedstaaten mit einem diesbezüglichen Bedarf Fachwissen zu vermitteln, indem zwischen Mitgliedstaaten, die über erfolgreiche Lehrstellenprogramme verfügen, und Mitgliedstaaten, die solche Programme entwickeln möchten, Erfahrungen ausgetauscht werden. Dieser Wissenstransfer soll unter anderem Aufschluss darüber geben, wie die Zusammenarbeit von Schulen und Unternehmen im Hinblick auf die Schaffung eines dualen Lernsystems gestaltet werden kann.
3. Die Initiative „Dein erster EURES-Arbeitsplatz“ wird von europäischen Arbeitsvermittlungsdiensten durchgeführt, die von der Kommission ausgewählt und koordiniert werden. Diese Arbeitsvermittlungen sollen sowohl für junge mobile Arbeitssuchende im Alter von 18 bis 30 Jahren als auch für Unternehmen (insbesondere KMU), die an der Einstellung von Arbeitskräften aus einem anderen Mitgliedstaat interessiert sind, folgende Dienste bieten: Beschaffung von Informationen, Abstimmung von Angebot und Nachfrage, Arbeitsplatzvermittlung und finanzielle Unterstützung (Pauschalsätze).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001767/12  
to the Commission  
Angelika Werthmann (NI)  
(14 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Youth Opportunities

On 20 December 2011 the Commission launched the 'Youth Opportunities' initiative to take specific steps to improve the situation of young people in the labour market and to reduce youth unemployment in Europe.

1. Among other things, the initiative plans to arrange at least 130 000 traineeships in 2012 as part of the Erasmus and Leonardo da Vinci Programmes. Does this measure mainly relate to the arrangement of grants within the framework of these programmes, or is the Commission also offering specific help with finding traineeships?
2. The initiative also plans to provide EUR 1.3 million from the European Social Fund for the creation of apprenticeship positions. How will this measure benefit Member States that, unlike Austria or Germany, do not have a dual system of vocational training in businesses, but primarily provide vocational training through specialist schools?
3. In addition, the Commission has also set the target of helping 5 000 young people find a job in another Member State in 2012 and 2013, as part of the 'Your First EURES Job' initiative. What is the precise nature of the assistance the Commission can provide?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission  
(10 April 2012)**

1. Both the Leonardo da Vinci and Erasmus programmes provide a framework to organise the mobility and to ensure the quality of the traineeship in addition to a financial support. For Leonardo da Vinci, the vocational education and training provider in the home country finds enterprises abroad by various means. Many schools and colleges have long-standing cooperation with enterprises abroad. Intermediary bodies, such as Chambers of Trade and Industry or Skilled Crafts, or regional development agencies, also use their international links to connect with workplaces abroad. For Erasmus, the enterprises may be found by the students. Some institutions consider this as part of the student training. However, the institutions have to check the students' choice. Placements might also be proposed by the higher institutions themselves.
2. The EUR 1.3million European Social Fund Technical Assistance support for the setting up of apprenticeship-type schemes aims to provide transfer of expertise to Member States in need through exchange of experience between Member States that have successful apprenticeship schemes and others that intend to develop such schemes. One of the objectives of this knowledge transfer will be to see how schools and businesses can work together to create a dual learning system.
3. 'Your first EURES job' will be implemented by European employment services selected and coordinated by the Commission. Those employment services are deemed to provide information, job matching, job placement and funding support (fixed rates) for both young mobile jobseekers aged 18-30 and businesses (SMEs in particular) interested in recruiting from another Member State.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001768/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**  
(14. Februar 2012)

*Betrifft:* Europäische Charta für die Qualität von Praktika

In seiner Entschließung vom 6. Juli 2010 zur „Förderung des Zugangs Jugendlicher zum Arbeitsmarkt, Stärkung des Status von Auszubildenden, Praktikanten und Lehrlingen“ hat das Europäische Parlament die Kommission unter anderem aufgefordert, eine „Europäische Charta für die Qualität von Praktika“ vorzuschlagen. Durch europaweite Mindeststandards für Praktika wie eine angemessene Vergütung, sozialen Schutz und eine zeitliche Begrenzung von Praktika soll die Ausbeutung junger Menschen vermieden und sichergestellt werden, dass Praktikanten keine regulären Arbeitskräfte ersetzen.

1. Hat die Kommission schon Initiativen ergriffen, um eine solche Qualitätscharta zu realisieren? Wie sieht der diesbezügliche Fortschritt aus?
2. Wie wird die Qualitätscharta inhaltlich ausgestaltet sein und wie wird die konkrete Umsetzung in den Mitgliedstaaten erfolgen? Wird die Charta für die Mitgliedstaaten bzw. für europäische Unternehmen rechtsverbindlich sein? Wird sich der Anwendungsbereich der Qualitätscharta nur auf Praktika in Unternehmen erstrecken oder wird die Charta auch für Praktika in staatlichen Einrichtungen und Behörden, internationalen Organisationen und Nichtregierungsorganisationen Gültigkeit besitzen?
3. Welche sonstigen Maßnahmen hat die Kommission ergriffen, um die Situation qualifizierter Hochschulabsolventen am Arbeitsmarkt zu verbessern?

**Antwort von Herrn Andor im Namen der Kommission**  
(4. April 2012)

1. Im Rahmen eines vom Parlament angestoßenen Pilotprojekts hat die Kommission eine Studie zur Erstellung einer umfassenden Übersicht über die Praktikantenausbildung in den Mitgliedstaaten in Auftrag gegeben. Diese Studie wird im Mai 2012 vorliegen und zum ersten Mal einen umfassenden Einblick in die diesbezüglichen nationalen Verfahren und rechtlichen Rahmenbedingungen sowie Aufschluss über Angebot, Inhalt und Qualität der Praktikantenausbildung geben.
2. Die Kommission beabsichtigt, im Rahmen des „Beschäftigungspakets“, das in den kommenden Wochen vorgestellt werden soll, eine Konsultation zu einem Qualitätsrahmen für Praktika durchzuführen. Gestützt auf die Ergebnisse dieser Konsultation wird die Kommission 2012, wie in der Initiative „Chancen für junge Menschen“ <sup>(1)</sup> angekündigt, den Qualitätsrahmen vorlegen.
3. In der Initiative „Chancen für junge Menschen“ wird eine Reihe von Maßnahmen vorgeschlagen, die den Übergang von der Universität zur Erwerbstätigkeit erleichtern sollen, z. B. eine verstärkte Förderung der Mobilität von Hochschülern zu Studienzwecken, intensivere Bemühungen um die Umsetzung der sogenannten Jugendgarantien und die Unterstützung junger Menschen beim Erwerb erster Berufserfahrungen.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> KOM(2011)933 vom 20.12.2011.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001768/12  
to the Commission**

**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**

(14 February 2012)

*Subject:* European Quality Charter on Internships

In its resolution of 6 July 2010 on 'promoting youth access to the labour market, strengthening trainee, internship and apprenticeship status', the European Parliament called on the Commission to propose, among other things, a 'European Quality Charter on Internships'. The aim is to prevent the exploitation of young people and to ensure that interns do not replace regular employees by setting Europe-wide minimum standards for internships, such as appropriate wage levels, social protection and restrictions on the duration of internships.

1. Has the Commission already implemented initiatives aimed at achieving such a quality charter? What progress has been made in this area?
2. How will the substance of the quality charter be framed and how will it be specifically implemented in the Member States? Will the charter be legally binding on Member States and on European businesses? Will the quality charter only apply to internships in private businesses, or will it also encompass internships in state institutions and authorities, international organisations and NGOs?
3. What other steps has the Commission taken to improve the situation of qualified university graduates in the labour market?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission**

(4 April 2012)

1. As part of a pilot project initiated by the Parliament, the Commission has commissioned a study on a 'comprehensive overview of traineeship arrangements in Member States'. This study will be available in May 2012 and provides a first full insight into relevant national policies and legislative framework, the supply, content and quality of traineeships.
2. The Commission aims to launch a consultation on a Quality Framework for Traineeships in the framework of the 'Employment package', which will be presented in the coming weeks. On the basis of the outcome of this consultation, the Commission will present in 2012 the Quality Framework as announced in the 'Youth Opportunities Initiative' <sup>(1)</sup>.
3. The 'Youth Opportunities Initiative' proposes a series of measures supporting the transition from university to work, e.g. reinforce support to learning mobility of higher education students, step up efforts to implement Youth Guarantees, and help young people get a first work experience.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2011) 933 of 20.12.2011.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001770/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Konstantinos Roupakis (PPE)**  
(14 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Βίαη ανατροπή στην Ελλάδα του θεσμού συλλογικής διαπραγμάτευσης που κατοχυρώνεται από το ευρωπαϊκό δίκαιο και τις διεθνείς συμβάσεις εργασίας

Το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο σε σχετικό ψήφισμά του από το 2008 (22.10.2008) είχε τονίσει μεταξύ άλλων ότι «... δεν πρέπει να τεθεί σε κίνδυνο η άσκηση θεμελιωδών δικαιωμάτων, όπως αναγνωρίζονται στα κράτη μέλη, στις συμβάσεις της ΔΟΕ και στο Χάρτη Θεμελιωδών Δικαιωμάτων της ΕΕ, συμπεριλαμβανομένου του δικαιώματος διαπραγμάτευσης, σύναψης και εφαρμογής συλλογικών συμβάσεων και του δικαιώματος των εργατικών κινητοποιήσεων...». Στην Ελλάδα, όμως, δρομολογείται κρατική παρέμβαση -μέσω νομοθετημάτων- τόσο στη διαδικασία των ελεύθερων συλλογικών διαπραγματεύσεων (θεσπίζεται μέγιστη διάρκεια των συλλογικών συμβάσεων ενώ παράλληλα αποφασίζεται ο χρόνος κατάλυσης αυτών που βρίσκονται ήδη σε ισχύ), όσο και στις επίσημες -ως αποτέλεσμα κοινωνικής συμφωνίας- αποφάσεις των κοινωνικών εταίρων, σε βάρος μάλιστα των εργαζομένων, με συνέπεια να απειλείται ο πυρήνας των βασικών κοινωνικών και οικονομικών δικαιωμάτων, τα οποία κατοχυρώνονται στην ΕΕ από τις συνθήκες της, το παράγωγο δίκαιο και τη νομολογία του Δικαστηρίου της ΕΕ.

Σε αυτό το πλαίσιο ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Στο κείμενο του σχετικού νομοσχεδίου (εγκρίθηκε στις 12.2.2012 από την ελληνική Βουλή) εννοείται ότι υπάρχουν ήδη ειλημμένες αποφάσεις αναφορικά με ζητήματα που καθορίζονται από τη συλλογική διαπραγμάτευση (όπως ο κατώτατος μισθός), και στην ουσία εκβιάζονται συγκεκριμένες αποφάσεις από τους κοινωνικούς εταίρους. Παράδειγμα αποτελεί η αναφορά συγκεκριμένων χωρών ως προτύπων για το μισθολογικό κόστος. Συνάδει η εν λόγω πρακτική με τις αρχές και την ουσία του κοινωνικού διαλόγου καθώς και με την αυτονομία των συλλογικών διαπραγματεύσεων;
2. Οι χώρες της ευρωζώνης που έχουν κατώτερο μισθό μικρότερο σε σχέση με την Ελλάδα διαθέτουν σύστημα ελάχιστου εγγυημένου εισοδήματος; Πώς επηρεάζει η μη ύπαρξή του την καταπολέμηση του φαινομένου των φτωχών εργαζομένων, όπου η Ελλάδα παρουσιάζει ήδη ιδιαίτερα υψηλά ποσοστά;
3. Η κατάσταση που διαμορφώνεται στην Ελλάδα θέτει υπό αμφισβήτηση το θεμελιώδες δικαίωμα στη διαπραγμάτευση, σύναψη και εφαρμογή συλλογικών συμβάσεων. Δεδομένου ότι υπάρχει ρητή δέσμευση της Επιτροπής για την προαγωγή και τη διαφύλαξη του κοινωνικού διαλόγου, ποιες δράσεις πρόκειται να υιοθετήσει προκειμένου να τιμήσει τη δέσμευσή της στην περίπτωση της Ελλάδας;

**Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(2 Απριλίου 2012)

1. Η Επιτροπή σέβεται απόλυτα την αυτόνομη διαπραγμάτευση των συλλογικών συμβάσεων εφόσον τοιούτοτρόπως προάγεται κατ'αρχήν η αναπροσαρμογή των αποδοχών βάσει τριμερούς συμφωνίας μεταξύ κυβέρνησης και κοινωνικών εταίρων. Ωστόσο, δεδομένου ότι έχει καταστεί λίαν επείγουσα η ταχεία προσαρμογή των μισθών, φαίνεται να δικαιολογείται κατ'εξάιρση η άμεση νομοθετική ρύθμιση θεμάτων που μέχρι σήμερα αποτελούσαν αντικείμενο συλλογικών διαπραγματεύσεων, όπως το επίπεδο του κατώτατου μισθού.
2. Στα κράτη μέλη που προβλέπουν ελάχιστο εγγυημένο εισόδημα, το επίπεδό του (ανά νοικοκυριό) είναι κατά κανόνα χαμηλότερο του κατώτατου μισθού, ώστε να μην αποθαρρύνεται η ανάληψη εργασίας. Το ζήτημα των φτωχών εργαζομένων στην Ελλάδα δεν πρέπει να υποτιμάται δεδομένου ότι το ποσοστό των φτωχών εργαζομένων στην Ελλάδα είναι το δεύτερο υψηλότερο στην ΕΕ (μετρούμενο με βάση τα στοιχεία του 2010). Η κατάσταση των ανέργων είναι επίσης ζωτικής σημασίας και απαιτείται να αναληφθεί δράση με σκοπό, μεταξύ άλλων, να αντιμετωπισθεί ο κίνδυνος ένας πολύ υψηλός κατώτατος μισθός να επηρεάζει τις ευκαιρίες απασχόλησης για τα άτομα χαμηλής επαγγελματικής ειδικότητας. Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει επίσης το Αξιοτίμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου στην απάντηση που έδωσε στην ερώτηση E-000889/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp>

3. Η Επιτροπή πιστεύει στη σημασία του κοινωνικού διαλόγου και των καλών εργασιακών σχέσεων, στο σεβασμό των δικαιωμάτων των εργαζομένων και στην αυτονομία των κοινωνικών εταίρων κατά τις διαπραγματεύσεις συλλογικών συμβάσεων. Ως εκ τούτου κατά την υλοποίηση του Προγράμματος Οικονομικής Προσαρμογής για την Ελλάδα, επιδίωξε πάντοτε το διάλογο με τους κοινωνικούς εταίρους. Επιπλέον, η ελληνική κυβέρνηση κλήθηκε να προωθήσει το διάλογο με τους κοινωνικούς εταίρους στο πλαίσιο του εν λόγω προγράμματος, δεδομένου ότι ο αποτελεσματικός κοινωνικός διάλογος αποτελεί βασική προϋπόθεση για την προσαρμογή της αγοράς εργασίας στην οικονομική ύφεση και για τη διαμόρφωση αποτελεσματικής στρατηγικής με στόχο την αποκατάσταση της ανταγωνιστικότητας. Το συγκεκριμένο πρόγραμμα ενθαρρύνει περισσότερο τη διαπραγμάτευση συλλογικών συμβάσεων σε επίπεδο επιχείρησης και αποθαρρύνει τη συχνή χρήση των διαιτητικών αποφάσεων που χαρακτήριζαν τον καθορισμό των αποδοχών στην Ελλάδα κατά το παρελθόν.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001770/12  
to the Commission**

**Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)**

(14 February 2012)

*Subject:* Forcible overturning of the institution of collective bargaining in Greece, protected by European law and international labour conventions

The European Parliament's resolution of 2008 (22 October 2008) emphasised *inter alia* that it '... does not affect the exercise of fundamental rights as recognised by the Member States, by the conventions of the International Labour Organisation and by the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, including the right to negotiate, conclude and enforce collective agreements and the right to take industrial action ...'. In Greece, however, legislation has been adopted authorising State intervention in the process of free collective bargaining (establishing a maximum duration for collective agreements as well as deciding when those which are currently in force will terminate) as well as regarding decisions officially negotiated by the social partners, thereby penalising workers and striking at the heart of their basic social and economic rights as enshrined in the EU treaties and secondary legislation, as well as the case law established by the Court of Justice.

In this context, will the Commission answer the following:

1. The text of the bill (approved by the Greek Parliament on 12 February 2012) means that decisions have already been taken regarding issues determined by collective bargaining (such as the minimum wage) and effectively imposed on the social partners. One example is the reference to particular countries as models for wage costs. Is this practice in keeping with the principles and essence of social dialogue and the autonomous collective bargaining?
2. The eurozone countries which have a lower minimum wage than Greece have systems which guarantee a minimum income. How does the non-existence of such a system affect efforts to combat the problem of the working poor, of which Greece already has particularly high levels?
3. The situation which is developing in Greece is undermining the fundamental right to negotiate, conclude and enforce collective agreements. What measures will be taken by the Commission to honour its explicit commitment to promote and safeguard social dialogue in the case of Greece?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission**

(2 April 2012)

1. The Commission fully respects autonomous collective bargaining, promoting in the first place wage adjustment via a Tripartite agreement between the government and social partners. Yet, in light of the urgent need of a rapid wage adjustment, direct government legislation on issues that so far have fallen in the remit of collective bargaining, namely the level of the minimum wage, appears justified on an exceptional basis.
2. In those Member States where there is a guaranteed minimum income, its level (for a one-person household) is as a rule set below the one of the minimum wage in order not to discourage work take up. The working poor issue in Greece should not be understated as in-work poverty in Greece is the second highest in the EU (measured on the basis of 2010 data). The situation of the jobless is also crucial and requires action, including with a view to tackle the risk that a too high minimum wage may affect job opportunities for the low skilled. The Commission would also refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Question E-000889/2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.
3. The Commission believes in the importance of social dialogue and good industrial relations, the respect of workers' rights and the autonomy of social partners in collective bargaining. During the implementation of the Economic Adjustment Programme for Greece, it has always aimed at a dialogue with the social partners. Moreover, the Greek Government was urged to promote dialogue with social partners within the framework of the Programme, since an effective social dialogue is a key condition for the adjustment of the labour market to the economic recession and for a workable strategy to restore competitiveness. The Programme encourages more bargaining at firm level and discourages the frequent use of arbitration decisions that characterised wage setting in Greece in the past.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp>

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001771/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**  
(14. Februar 2012)

*Betrifft:* Mindeststandards für die Rechte und den Schutz von Opfern von Straftaten sowie für die Opferhilfe

Kann die Kommission im Hinblick auf den Vorschlag für eine Richtlinie des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates über Mindeststandards für die Rechte und den Schutz von Opfern von Straftaten sowie für die Opferhilfe mitteilen,

1. welcher gesetzliche Rahmen von ihr zum Schutz von Opfern von Straftaten angeboten wird;
2. wie sie im Hinblick auf Artikel 6 des Vorschlags dazu beitragen kann, dass Opfer, die die Sprache des Strafverfahrens weder verstehen noch sprechen, den Prozess nachvollziehen und verfolgen können;
3. ob sie im Hinblick auf Artikel 7 Absatz 2 Buchstabe c des Vorschlags der Ansicht ist, dass im Rahmen des Rechts auf Zugang zu Opferhilfsdienste materielle Unterstützung vorgesehen sein sollte;
4. ob sie die Erstellung einer Statistikdatenbank einschließlich der Aufgliederung von Opfern nach Anzahl, Alter, Geschlecht und Nationalität favorisiert, und, falls ja, ob dies auf nationaler oder europäischer Ebene erfolgen sollte?

**Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission**  
(12. April 2012)

Der Vorschlag des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates über Mindeststandards für die Rechte und den Schutz von Opfern von Straftaten sowie für die Opferhilfe bezieht sich auf die Qualität der Behandlung, die Opfern nach einer Straftat und während des nachfolgenden Prozesses zuteil wird sowie auf ihr Recht auf Anwendung derselben Mindeststandards in allen EU-Mitgliedstaaten. Der Vorschlag gilt für alle Arten von Opfern und alle Arten von Straftaten.

Gemäß Artikel 6 des Vorschlags sollen Opfer, die bei der Teilnahme an Anhörungen oder Vernehmungen während Strafverfahren eine Verdolmetschung benötigen, diese kostenfrei in Anspruch nehmen können. Auch in allen anderen Fällen sollen die Bedürfnisse und die Teilnahme der Opfer an Strafverfahren ausschlaggebend sein. Dem Opfer, das die Sprache nicht versteht, muss eine kostenfreie Übersetzung der wesentlichen Dokumente zur Verfügung gestellt werden. Dies gilt auch für die Anzeige der Straftat und die Entscheidung zur Beendigung des Strafverfahrens.

In Artikel 7 der vorgeschlagenen Mindeststandards zur Opferhilfe ist keine materielle Unterstützung vorgesehen.

Eine systematischere und umfassendere Datensammlung in Bezug auf Opfer von Straftaten auf nationaler Ebene, die zu vergleichbaren Statistiken führen und auf europäischer Ebene verwendet werden könnten, wird von der Kommission befürwortet.

---



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001771/12  
to the Commission**

**Angelika Werthmann (NI)**

(14 February 2012)

*Subject:* Minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime

Concerning the proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime, can the Commission state:

1. what legal framework is offered by it to protect victims of crime;
2. concerning Article 6 of the proposal, how it can contribute to enabling victims who do not understand or speak the language of the criminal proceedings to comprehend and follow the process;
3. concerning Article 7(2)(c) of the proposal, whether it believes that material support should be included under the right to access victim support services;
4. whether it favours creating a database of statistics, including the breakdown of victims in terms of number, age, gender and nationality, and, if so, whether this would be at national or European level?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission**

(12 April 2012)

The proposed Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime addresses the quality of treatment that victims receive in the aftermath of crime and during the criminal proceedings that follow, and their right to receive the same minimum standard of treatment in all EU Member States. The proposal applies to all victims of all types of criminal offences.

According to Article 6 of the proposal, victims who need interpretation when participating in hearings and interviews during criminal proceedings should receive it free of charge. All other cases shall be based on the victims' needs and participation in the proceedings. Free of charge translation of essential documents should be provided to victims who do not understand the language, including the complaint and any decision ending criminal proceedings.

The proposed minimum standards in Article 7 on victim support do not include the provision of material support.

The Commission is favourable of a more systematic and comprehensive data collection on victims of crime at national level, which could result in comparable statistics and be used at European level.

---

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001773/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Niki Tzavela (EFD)**  
(14 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Η εφαρμογή της σύστασης 2010/191/ΕΕ της Επιτροπής

Σε απάντησή της στη γραπτή ερώτηση E-008699/2011, η Επιτροπή ενημερώνει ότι βρίσκεται σε διαδικασία αναζήτησης πρακτικών λύσεων έπειτα από καταγγελίες για πιθανές παραβιάσεις της αρχής σύμφωνα με την οποία τα τραπεζογραμμάτια και τα κέρματα σε ευρώ πρέπει να γίνονται αποδεκτά ως μέσο πληρωμής στις λιανικές συναλλαγές, όπως προβλέπεται στη σύσταση 2010/191/ΕΕ της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής.

Η Επιτροπή υποστηρίζει επίσης ότι έχει αναπτύξει στενή συνεργασία με εμπορικές ενώσεις καθώς και με ενώσεις καταναλωτών για την ενημέρωση των πολιτών σχετικά με το πεδίο εφαρμογής και τις ένομες συνέπειες του νόμιμου χρήματος των τραπεζογραμμάτων και των κερμάτων σε ευρώ.

Τέλος, η Επιτροπή ενημερώνει ότι συμβάλλει στη διάδοση των πληροφοριών σχετικά με το πεδίο εφαρμογής και τις ένομες συνέπειες του καθεστώτος νόμιμου χρήματος των τραπεζογραμμάτων και των κερμάτων σε ευρώ στα σχετικά ευρωπαϊκά και εθνικά φόρουμ.

1. Μπορεί η Επιτροπή να παράσχει συγκεκριμένα παραδείγματα πρακτικών λύσεων που έχουν αναζητηθεί και εφαρμοστεί στα κράτη μέλη όπου έχουν γίνει καταγγελίες για πιθανές παραβιάσεις του καθεστώτος νόμιμου χρήματος;
2. Μπορεί η Επιτροπή να παράσχει συγκεκριμένα παραδείγματα συνεργασίας με εμπορικές ενώσεις και με ενώσεις καταναλωτών μέσω των οποίων οι πολίτες ενημερώνονται για τη σύσταση 2010/191/ΕΕ της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής;
3. Μπορεί η Επιτροπή να παράσχει συγκεκριμένα παραδείγματα για τον τρόπο διάδοσης των πληροφοριών που αφορούν το πεδίο εφαρμογής και τις ένομες συνέπειες του καθεστώτος νόμιμου χρήματος των χαρτονομισμάτων και των κερμάτων σε ευρώ στα σχετικά ευρωπαϊκά και εθνικά φόρουμ;
4. Θα εξετάσει η Επιτροπή το ενδεχόμενο να προτείνει νομικά δεσμευτικές λύσεις σε περίπτωση που η σύσταση 2010/191/ΕΕ της ΕΕ δεν έχει εφαρμοστεί πλήρως έως τις 22 Μαρτίου 2013;

**Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(10 Απριλίου 2012)

1. Η Επιτροπή απέστειλε επιστολές στο Υπουργείο Οικονομικών και την Αρχή Καταναλωτών των Κάτω Χωρών σχετικά με πιθανές παραβιάσεις του καθεστώτος νόμιμου χρήματος στη χώρα τους και βρίσκεται σε τακτική επαφή με τις ενώσεις λιανοπωλητών και τις τραπεζικές ενώσεις της Ολλανδίας για την αντιμετώπισή τους. Επιπρόσθετα, ζητήθηκε η γνώμη της Επιτροπής από ορισμένα κράτη μέλη, τα οποία συντάσσουν νομοσχέδια, σχετικά με το πεδίο εφαρμογής και την ερμηνεία ορισμένων πτυχών του νόμιμου χρήματος του ευρώ.
2. Το 2010, στις Βρυξέλλες, η Επιτροπή ενημέρωσε τους αντιπροσώπους των εμπορικών ενώσεων και των ενώσεων καταναλωτών σχετικά με το πεδίο εφαρμογής και τις συνέπειες του καθεστώτος νόμιμου χρήματος των τραπεζογραμμάτων και των κερμάτων σε ευρώ όπως ορίζεται στη σύσταση. Το Νοέμβριο του 2011, η Επιτροπή ξεκίνησε μια εκστρατεία για τα κηλιδωμένα τραπεζογραμμάτια απευθυνόμενη σε εμπόρους λιανικής πώλησης, διανέμοντας φυλλάδια πληροφόρησης στα εμπορικά επιμελητήρια των κρατών μελών της ζώνης ευρώ.
3. Η σύσταση 2010/191/ΕΕ στηρίζεται στα συμπεράσματα της Euro Legal Tender Expert Group (ELTEG), μιας ομάδας εμπειρογνομόνων που αποτελείται από αντιπροσώπους των κεντρικών τραπεζών και των υπουργείων οικονομικών των κρατών μελών της ζώνης ευρώ, η οποία συνέταξε το 2009 την αναφορά για το νόμιμο χρήμα. Η Επιτροπή απέστειλε ενημερωτικές επιστολές στις κεντρικές τράπεζες και τα υπουργεία οικονομικών των χωρών της ζώνης ευρώ για την έγκριση της σύστασης.
4. Σύμφωνα με την αιτιολογική σκέψη 5 της σύστασης, η Επιτροπή θα προβεί σε ανασκόπηση της εφαρμογής της σύστασης τρία έτη μετά την έκδοσή της (π.χ. τον Μάρτιο του 2013). Βάσει των ανωτέρω, η Επιτροπή διενεργεί πραγματολογική εξέταση για να εκτιμήσει την ανάγκη να ληφθούν κανονιστικά μέτρα στο μέλλον.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001773/12  
to the Commission  
Niki Tzavela (EFD)  
(14 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Implementation of Commission Recommendation 2010/191/EU

In its answer to Written Question E-008699/2011, the Commission states that it is seeking practical solutions in response to complaints alleging potential breaches of the principle that euro banknotes and coins should be accepted as means of payment in retail transactions, as laid down in EC Recommendation 2010/191/EU.

The Commission also says that it is cooperating closely with trade and consumer associations to provide citizens with information on the scope and effects of legal tender of euro banknotes and coins.

Finally, the Commission states that it disseminates information on the scope and effects of legal tender of euro banknotes and coins in the relevant European and national forums.

1. Can the Commission provide concrete examples of practical solutions which have been sought and implemented in the Member States where potential breaches of legal tender have been reported?
2. Can it provide concrete examples of the cooperation with trade and consumer associations through which citizens have been provided with information on EC Recommendation 2010/191/EU?
3. Can it provide concrete examples of how information on the scope and effects of legal tender of euro banknotes and coins has been disseminated in the relevant European and national forums?
4. Will the Commission consider proposing legally binding solutions if EC Recommendation 2010/191/EU has not been fully implemented by 22 March 2013?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission  
(10 April 2012)**

1. The Commission addressed letters to the Ministry of Finance and to the Consumer Authority of the Netherlands on a number of potential breaches of legal tender in their country and is in regular contact with the Dutch retailer and banking associations to address it. The Commission has also been consulted by some Member States preparing draft laws on the scope and interpretation of some aspects of the legal tender of the euro.
  2. In 2010 the Commission informed the representatives of trade and consumers associations in Brussels about the scope and effects of legal tender of euro banknotes and coins as laid down in the recommendation. In November 2011, the Commission started a campaign addressed to retailers concerning stained banknotes by distributing information leaflets to the Chambers of Commerce of euro area Member States.
  3. Recommendation 2010/191/EU is based on the conclusions of ELTEG, an expert group made of representatives of the Central Banks and Ministries of Finance of euro area Member States, which prepared the report on legal tender in 2009. The Commission addressed information letters to the Central Banks and Finance Ministries of the euro area countries on the adoption of the recommendation.
  4. Pursuant to recital (5) of the recommendation, the Commission will review the implementation of the recommendation three years after its adoption (i.e. March 2013). Against this background, the Commission is in the process of fact-finding to assess whether regulatory measures are needed in the future.
-

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001774/12  
to the Commission**

**David Campbell Bannerman (ECR)**

(14 February 2012)

*Subject:* Iceland — information campaign on EU membership

Is the Commission planning an information campaign on EU membership in Iceland?

**Question for written answer E-001776/12  
to the Commission**

**David Campbell Bannerman (ECR)**

(14 February 2012)

*Subject:* Iceland — funding to support EU membership

How much funding has been directed, to date, to information programmes encouraging Icelanders to support membership of the EU?

**Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission**

(23 March 2012)

Communication on the various aspects of Icelandic EU accession is first and foremost the responsibility of the Icelandic authorities and other relevant actors in the country.

To complement these effects, an EU Info Centre has been operating in Reykjavik since 21 January 2012. The establishment and operation of the EU Info Centre are part of the project entitled 'EU Information and Communication Services in Iceland', which began in August 2011, for EUR 1,392,600 and will run for 24 months. The project is funded by the IPA Communication budget line (22.02.1002) and the services are provided by a private communications company under a contract with the Commission.

The overall objective of the project is to improve public knowledge and understanding of the European Union in Iceland. The specific objectives of the project are the following:

- to explain the role and nature of EU and its policies and the EU's relation with Iceland, along with the process of EU accession; to facilitate debate on the above and counteract possible misinformation and disinformation on the EU;
  - to offer an appropriate framework for the delivery and increase of timely, objective, clear and helpful information on the EU, under the direction of the Commission and, as appropriate, the EU Delegation in Reykjavik, to all segments of the Icelandic society;
  - to assist the Commission's Directorate-General Enlargement and the EU Delegation in the implementation of the Commission's communication and information activities, through web and social media based communication, event management, media relations and services of strategic advice as well as through the setting up and management of the EU Info Centre.
-

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001775/12  
to the Commission  
David Campbell Bannerman (ECR)  
(14 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Meeting with the Icelandic Government

Has the Commission met members of the Icelandic Government to push for EU citizens to vote in Icelandic local elections?

**Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission  
(10 April 2012)**

According to the Icelandic Constitution, foreign citizens with at least five years legal residency in Iceland before the day of election are eligible to vote in local elections. This period of residency is reduced to only three years for Danish, Finnish, Norwegian and Swedish nationals.

This distinction between Danish, Finnish and Swedish nationals on one hand and citizens from the remaining Member States on the other hand is not in line with the provisions of EC law. The Commission, therefore, has indeed raised the issue of voting of EU citizens in Icelandic local elections with representatives of the Icelandic Government, mainly at expert level meetings. This issue was first highlighted in the Commission's opinion on Iceland's application for EU membership, and has been followed up in the yearly Progress Reports under Chapter 23 (EU citizen's rights). It has also been discussed in the context of the accession negotiations and Iceland has indicated that it is prepared to have EU compatible legislation implemented by the time of accession.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001777/12  
to the Council**

**David Campbell Bannerman (ECR)**

(14 February 2012)

*Subject:* Syria — military intervention

Does the Council support military intervention in Syria?

**Reply**

(23 May 2012)

In response to the ongoing violence and systematic human rights violations by the Syrian regime inflicted to the civilian population, which the Council has repeatedly condemned in the strongest terms, the Council adopted restrictive measures in May 2011 and has since extended such measures on 14 subsequent occasions. It is committed to its current policy of imposing additional sanctions, targeting the regime and not the population, as long as the violence continues.

The EU will continue to push for strong UN action to increase international pressure on the Syrian regime and to call on all members of the Security Council, in particular China and Russia, to work together in an effort to stop violence, and to support the mission of the joint UN-LAS envoy to Syria and the implementation of the Arab League resolutions. Furthermore, at its meeting on 23 April 2012, the Council adopted conclusions in which it stated that the EU welcomes the unanimous adoption of the UNSC resolution 2042 on 14 April authorising the immediate deployment of an advance team of up to 30 unarmed military observers and of the UNSC resolution 2043 on 21 April establishing the full UN supervision mission in Syria (UNSMIS) with an initial deployment of up to 300 unarmed military observers as well as an appropriate civilian component, to monitor a cessation of armed violence and to monitor and support all aspects of the joint UN-League of Arab States Special Envoy Kofi Annan's six point proposal. The EU takes an active role in the Friends of the Syrian People Group, which met again in Istanbul on 1 April this year to strengthen international support for a political solution.

The EU also urges the Syrian opposition to show a clear commitment to the principle of non-violence. The opposition must unite now in a peaceful struggle for a new Syria that is democratic, pluralistic, stable and which guarantees human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities, and where all citizens enjoy equal rights.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001778/12  
to the Commission**

**David Campbell Bannerman (ECR)**

(14 February 2012)

*Subject:* Syria — military intervention

Does the Commission support military intervention in Syria?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**

(8 June 2012)

In response to the ongoing brutal crackdown by the Syrian regime on its population, which the EU has repeatedly condemned in the strongest terms, the EU adopted restrictive measures in May

2011 and has extended these 14 times since then. It is committed to continue its current policy of imposing additional sanctions, targeting the regime not the population, as long as the violence continues.

The EU will continue to push for strong UN action to increase international pressure on Bashar Al-Assad and his regime and calls on all members of the Security Council, particularly China and Russia, to support the mission of the joint UN-LAS envoy to Syria and the implementation of the Arab League resolutions. The EU welcomes the UN Security Council's Presidential Statement of 20 March 2012, backing his mission and six point plan. It takes an active role in the Friends of the Syrian People Group, which met again in Istanbul on 1 April 2012 to strengthen international support towards a political solution.

The EU also urges the opposition to show a clear commitment to the principle of non-violence in the awareness that the proliferation of weapons will complicate the path of the future Syrian state to a peaceful democracy. The opposition must unite now in a peaceful struggle for a new Syria that is democratic, pluralistic, and stable and guarantees human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001779/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)  
David Campbell Bannerman (ECR)**

(14 February 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Syria — HCFA (humanitarian ceasefire agreement) and the Syrian Government

Has the High Representative/Vice-President spoken with the Syrian Government over the crisis in Syria?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**

(31 May 2012)

In consistence with the EU's view that President Assad has lost all legitimacy and needs to step down immediately, High Representative/Vice-President Ashton has not been in direct contact with him, nor the Syrian Foreign Minister, since the adoption of restrictive measures by the EU in May 2011.

Meanwhile, the HR/VP and EEAS actively engage with all representative members of the Syrian opposition, which adhere to non-violence, inclusiveness and democratic values.

In view of a political solution to the crisis, the EU fully supports the Joint UN-Arab League Envoy to Syria, Mr Kofi Annan, and his six point plan. It welcomes the UN Security Council's Presidential Statement backing Mr Annan and calls on the Syrian regime to live up to its promises and comply with the six points immediately.

---



(Leagan Gaeilge)

**Ceist i gcomhair freagra scríofa E-001780/12**  
**chuig an gCoimisiún**  
**Liam Aylward (ALDE) agus Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE)**  
 (14 Feabhra 2012)

*Ábhar:* Maímh i leith cothaithe agus sláinte agus i leith na gairbhsí cothaithe

De réir an Údaráis Eorpaigh um Shábháilteacht Bia (EFSA) níl a dhóthain fianaise ann chun tacú leis na maímh i leith buntáistí na gairbhsí cothaithe. Sa Tuairim Eolaíochta a d'fhoilsigh an EFSA maidir leis an ngairbhseach cothaithe agus an córas díleáite dúradh go raibh tionchar fiseolaíoch na gairbhsí cothaithe ag brath ar shaintréithe ceimiceacha agus fisiciúla na gairbhsí áirithe agus ar an méid agus an modh tomhaltais. Ba é tuairim Phainéal an EFSA ná nach raibh a dhóthain fianaise ann chun na maímh i leith buntáistí na gairbhí cothaithe a dhearbhu, agus dúradh nach bhféadtaí comhghaolú idir cúis agus éifeacht a léiriú.

— An bhféadfadh an Coimisiún a sheasamh maidir le cinntí na Tuairime thuasluaite a shoiléiriú?

— An bhfuil taighde nó staidéar ar bith eile déanta ag an gCoimisiún ar na maímh i leith buntáistí sláinte na gairbhsí cothaithe, go háirithe ó thaobh cineálacha éagsúla na gairbhsí cothaithe agus an éifeacht fhiseolaíoch a bhíonn i gceist leo sin?

— An bhfuil sé i gceist ag an gCoimisiún agus ag an EFSA tuilleadh taighde a déanamh maidir leis an ngairbhseach cothaithe agus na maímh i leith a buntáistí sláinte?

**Freagra ón gCoimisinéir Dallí thar ceann an Choimisiúin**  
 (20 Márta 2012)

Le go bhféadfaí tabhairt faoi mheasúnú eolaíoch ar mhaímh shainiúla i leith sláinte atá seolta isteach ag Ballstáit faoi Airteagal 13 de Rialachán (CE) Uimh. 1924/2006 maidir le maímh i leith cothaithe agus sláinte a dhéantar maidir le bianna <sup>(1)</sup>, dhearbhaigh an tÚdarás Eorpach um Shábháilteacht Bia (EFSA) gur ghá an bia is ábhar don éifeacht atá maíte a shainiú (cothaitheach nó substaint sa bhia). Más rud é, ar bhonn na sonraí a seoladh isteach nach féidir an bia a shainiú dhóthain, ní bheidh sé ar chumas an EFSA measúnú a dhéanamh féachaint an bhfuil bunús eolaíoch leis an gcomhghaol idir an bia agus an éifeacht atá maíte, mar is gá faoin Rialachán.

I gcás roinnt éifeachtaí a maíodh maidir le 'snáithíní', bhain an EFSA de thatal as na sonraí a seoladh isteach nár leor an tsainiú a bhí déanta ar an gcineál snáithín le go bhféadfaí measúnú a dhéanamh ar an maíomh. Níorbh amhlaidh an scéal i ngach cás de mhaíomh maidir le snáithíní. I measc an 222 maíomh i leith sláinte san Iarscríbhinn atá i gceangal leis an dréacht-Rialachán ón gCoimisiún atá á scrúdú faoi láthair ag an bParlaimint agus ag an gComhairle, tá thart ar dheich gcineál snáithín inar leor an tsainiú a rinneadh orthu le measúnú fabhrach a dhéanamh.

Ba cheart a chur san áireamh chomh maith go bhfuil sé dearbhaithe ag an EFSA, maidir le maímh i leith sláinte, go mbaineann a chomhairle go sonrath leis na ceanglais i Rialachán (CE) Uimh. 1924/2006. Ní chuirfear an chomhairle sin in ionad na comhairle i dtaobh luacha cothúcháin agus tairbhe cothúcháin bia agus a chomhphárteanna, ar nós snáithíní. Tá sé seo i gcomhréir le Rialachán (CE) Uimh. 1924/2006, ina luaitear in aithris 4 nár cheart feidhm a bheith leis maidir le treoracha cothaitheacha.

<sup>(1)</sup> Rialachán (CE) Uimh. 1924/2006 ó Pharlaimint na hEorpa agus ón gComhairle an 20 Nollaig 2006 maidir le maímh i leith cothaithe agus sláinte a dhéantar maidir le bianna (IO L 404, 30.12.2006, lch. 9) (níor foilsíodh leagan Gaeilge). Féach: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:404:0009:0025:EN:PDF>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001780/12  
to the Commission  
Liam Aylward (ALDE) and Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE)  
(14 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Nutrition, health and dietary fibre claims

According to the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), sufficient evidence does not exist to support health claims related to the benefits of dietary fibre. The scientific opinion published by EFSA on dietary fibre and the digestive system stated that the physiological effects of dietary fibre depended on the physical-chemical properties of fibre components and on the level and method of consumption. The EFSA's Panel found that there was insufficient evidence to verify the health claims related to dietary fibre and stated that a cause and effect relationship could not be established.

— Could the Commission clarify its stance on the determinations of the abovementioned opinion?

— Has the Commission conducted any other research or study into claims related to the health benefits of dietary fibre, particularly in relation to the different kinds of dietary fibre and their associated physiological effects?

— Does the Commission and EFSA intend to conduct further research on dietary fibre and on claims related to health benefits?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission  
(20 March 2012)**

In order to be able to undertake a scientific assessment for specific health claims as submitted by Member States under Article 13 of Regulation (EC) 1924/2006 <sup>(1)</sup> on nutrition and health claims made on foods, the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) has confirmed that it is necessary to define what food (nutrient or substance in the food) is the subject of the claimed effect. Where, on the basis of the data submitted, the food is insufficiently characterised, EFSA has not been able to assess if the relationship between the food and the claimed effect is scientifically substantiated, as required under the regulation.

For a number of claimed effects on 'fibre', EFSA concluded that there was insufficient characterisation of the type of fibre for an assessment of the claim. This has not been the case for all claims on fibres. Among the 222 health claims in the annex to the draft Commission Regulation currently before the Parliament and the Council for scrutiny are around ten types of fibre where the characterisation was sufficient for a favourable assessment.

It should also be noted that EFSA has stated that in relation to health claims its advice is specific to the requirements of Regulation (EC) 1924/2006. It does not supersede or replace its advice on the dietary value and nutritional benefit of food and its components, like fibre. This is in line with Regulation (EC) 1924/2006, which states in its Recital 4 that it should not apply to dietary guidelines.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 December 2006 on nutrition and health claims made on foods, OJ L 404, 30.12.2006, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:404:0009:0025:EN:PDF>.

(Leagan Gaeilge)

**Ceist i gcomhair freagra scríofa E-001781/12**  
**chuig an gCoimisiún**  
**Liam Aylward (ALDE) agus Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE)**  
(14 Feabhra 2012)

*Ábhar:* Iarmhairt eacnamaíoch an rialacháin maidir le maímh i leith cothaithe agus sláinte

De réir measúnú tionchair eacnamaíoch a rinne an Chónaidhm Eorpach um Chumainn Déantóirí Táirgí Sláinte (EHPM) bheadh tionchar suntasach ó thaobh costais ghearrthéarmacha de ag an gcosc ar mhaímh i leith sláinte a chur ar lipéid, ábháir margaíochta, fógraí agus araile, go háirithe ó thaobh leibhéal ollbhrabúsachta bliantúla de. I gcás na gcomhlachtaí a scrúdaíodh, is thart ar 21 % de dhíolachán iomlán na 'dtáirgí eile' agus thart ar 14 % de na táirgí ar fad, vitimíní agus mianraí san áireamh, a bheadh i gceist leis na costais agus leis na cailteanais sin.

— An bhfuil sé i gceist ag an gCoimisiún a mheasúnú tionchair féin a dhéanamh ar an iarmhairt eacnamaíoch a bheadh ag an rialachán maidir le maímh i leith cothaithe agus sláinte ar bhrabúsacht na gcomhlachtaí sin a thairgíonn táirgí cothaithe agus sláinte?

— Cad atá le rá ag an gCoimisiún maidir leis na figiúirí um brabúsacht agus um chailteanais mar atá cur síos orthu i measúnú tionchar na hearnála féin?

**Freagra ón gCoimisinéir Dallí thar ceann an Choimisiúin**  
(28 Márta 2012)

Ar ghlacadh Rialacháin (CE) Uimh. 1924/2006 maidir le maímh i leith cothaithe agus sláinte a dhéantar maidir le bianna <sup>(1)</sup>, chinn na reachtóirí gur cheart an bunús eolaíoch a bheith ar an rud is tábhachtaí maidir le maímh i leith cothaithe agus sláinte a úsáid agus nach mór an bunús eolaíoch sin a bheith bunaithe ar fhianaise eolaíoch a nglactar go ginearálta léi.

Déantar maímh i leith na sláinte ar bhonn deonach agus tá freagracht ar an oibreoir gnó bia údar a thabhairt le húsáid maímh bunaithe ar fhianaise eolaíoch a nglactar go ginearálta léi. Ní féidir na maímh sin nach bhfuil bunaithe ar fhianaise eolaíoch a nglactar go ginearálta léi a údarú.

Measann an Coimisiún nach chun leasa an tionscail ina iomláine é go leanfadh na nósanna trachtála atá bunaithe ar an tomhaltóir a chur amú agus táirgí bia a ligean ar an margadh a bhfuil maímh i leith na sláinte á ndéanamh acu gan bunús a bheith leo.

<sup>(1)</sup> Rialachán (CE) Uimh. 1924/2006 ó Pharlaimint na hEorpa agus ón gComhairle an 20 Nollaig 2006 maidir le maímh i leith cothaithe agus sláinte a dhéantar maidir le bianna (IO L 404, 30.12.2006, lch. 9) (níor foilsíodh leagan Gaeilge). Féach: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:404:0009:0025:EN:PDF>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001781/12  
to the Commission  
Liam Aylward (ALDE) and Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE)  
(14 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Economic impact of the regulation on nutrition and health claims

According to an economic impact assessment conducted by the European Federation of Associations of Health Product Manufacturers (EHPM), the ban on health claims on labels, marketing materials, in advertisements etc. would have a significant impact on short-term costs, particularly as regards annual gross profitability levels. With regard to companies examined, these costs and losses would amount to 21 % of total 'other product' sales and around 14 % of all product sales, including vitamins and minerals.

— Does the Commission intend to conduct its own impact assessment on the economic consequences of the regulation on nutrition and health claims in relation to the profitability of those companies producing nutritional and health products?

— What does the Commission have to say in relation to those profitability and loss figures as described in the sector's own impact assessment?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission  
(28 March 2012)**

In adopting Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 <sup>(1)</sup> on nutrition and health claims made on foods, the legislators decided that scientific substantiation should be the main aspect to be taken into account for the use of nutrition and health claims and that this should be based on generally accepted scientific evidence.

Health claims are voluntary and it is the responsibility of the food business operator to justify the use of a claim with generally accepted scientific evidence. Claims which cannot be substantiated by generally accepted scientific evidence cannot be authorised.

The Commission considers that it is not in the interests of the industry as a whole to see commercial practices based on misleading the consumer continue and to let food products on the market with unsubstantiated health claims.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 December 2006 on nutrition and health claims made on foods, OJ L 404 30.12.2006, p. 9-25, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:404:0009:0025:EN:PDF>.

(Leagan Gaeilge)

**Ceist i gcomhair freagra scríofa E-001782/12**  
**chuig an gCoimisiún**  
**Liam Aylward (ALDE) agus Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE)**  
 (14 Feabhra 2012)

**Ábhar:** Bunús a thabhairt le maímh i leith buntáistí sláinte an aigéid Hyaluronic

D'fhoilsigh an tÚdaras Eorpach um Shábháilteacht Bia (EFSA) staidéar le déanaí maidir le maímh i leith buntáistí sláinte an aigéid Hyaluronic, maidir le dea-thionchar an aigéid Hyaluronic ar ailt an choirp go háirithe. De réir taighde an EFSA níl a dhóthain fianaise ann chun torthaí ó staidéir a rinneadh ar dhaoine a bhfuil oisté-airtríteas orthu a úsáid i gcás an phobail i gcoitinne, agus ní fhéadfaí a rá ach oiread go bhfuil torthaí staidéar a rinneadh ar oisté-airtríteas (m.sh ar ídiú an loingeáin altaigh agus ar laghdú ar chumas gluaiseachta na n-alt) oiriúnach i gcás fheidhmiú ailt shláintiúla an choirp. Mar sin, a deir an EFSA, níl fianaise ar bith ann chun gaol a léiriú nó a bhunú idir an t-aigéad Hyaluronic agus sláinte na n-alt.

— Cén fhreagairt atá ag an gCoimisiún ar an méid sin thuas?

— An bhfuil sé i gceist ag an gCoimisiún athbhreithniú a dhéanamh ar an taighde a rinneadh ar an ábhar seo, go háirithe ó thaobh na modheolaíochta a úsáideadh le buntáistí an aigéid Hyaluronic do shláinte alt an choirp a mhaíomh?

— An bhfuil sé i gceist ag an gCoimisiún tuilleadh taighde a dhéanamh ar dhaoine sláintiúla chun éifeacht an aigéid Hyaluronic ar ailt shláintiúla a scrúdú?

**Freagra ón Choimisinéir Dallí thar ceann an Choimisiúin**  
 (20 Márta 2012)

Nuair a glacadh Rialachán (CE) Uimh. 1924/2006 <sup>(1)</sup> maidir le maímh i leith cothú agus sláinte a dhéantar ar bhianna, chinn na reachtóirí gur cheart an bunús eolaíoch a bheith ar an ngné is tábhachtaí de mhaímh i leith cothú agus sláinte agus fianaise a bhfuil glacadh forleathan léi a bheith leis an mbunús sin. Is é an tÚdarás Eorpach um Shábháilteacht Bia (an EFSA) atá freagrach as measúnú a dhéanamh ar an bhfianaise eolaíoch.

Sa tuairim a thug sé ar cheithre aighneacht ó Bhallstáit maidir le haigéad híoralúrónach agus cothabháil shláinte na n-alt (Iris an EFSA 2009; 7(9):1266), dhearbhaigh an EFSA nár cruthaíodh go raibh ceangal cúis agus éifeacht ann. Is é an fáth a bhí leis sin gur ar othair arbh é an fáthmheas cliniciúil orthu go raibh oisté-airtrítis orthu a rinneadh na staidéir dhaonna uile a cuireadh ar fáil ar éifeachtaí an aigéid híoralúrónaigh ar shláinte na n-alt agus nár léir don EFSA go raibh aon fhianaise dhiongbháilte ann gurbh fhéidir conclúidí maidir leis an bpobal i gcoitinne a bhaint as staidéir eolaíocha a rinneadh ar dhaoine a raibh oisté-airtrítis orthu. Is de réir saintréithe gach cáis a dhéantar an cinéal seo cinnidh, agus dá mbeadh fianaise bhitheolaíoch ann a chruthódh go mbeadh an éifeacht chéanna ag an aigéad ar an spriocghrúpa agus a bhí aige ar an ngrúpa staidéir, ghlacfaí an maíomh sin.

Níl sé éigeantach maímh shláinte a dhéanamh agus is faoin oibreoir gnó atá sé féachaint chuige go bhfuil fianaise eolaíoch a bhfuil glacadh forleathan léi ag tacú le gach maíomh. Ní faoin gCoimisiún atá sé taighde a dhéanamh le treise a chur le maímh shláinte. Ní féidir cead a thabhairt maímh a úsáid nach bhfuil fianaise eolaíoch a bhfuil glacadh forleathan léi ag tacú leo.

<sup>(1)</sup> Rialachán (CE) Uimh. 1924/2006 ó Pharlaimint na hEorpa agus ón gComhairle an 20 Nollaig 2006 maidir le maímh i leith cothú agus sláinte a dhéantar ar bhianna (IO L 404, 30.12.2006, lch. 9). Féach: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:404:0009:0025:EN:PDF>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001782/12  
to the Commission  
Liam Aylward (ALDE) and Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE)  
(14 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Basis for claims regarding the health benefits of hyaluronic acid

The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) has recently published a study in relation to claims regarding the health benefits of Hyaluronic acid, particularly the positive effects of Hyaluronic acid on the joints in the body. According to EFSA's research, sufficient evidence has not been found to apply the results of studies performed on people who have osteoarthritis to the general public, nor could it be said that the results of studies on osteoarthritis (e.g. the erosion of articular cartilage and reduced mobility of joints) are relevant to the function of healthy joints. Therefore, EFSA states that there is no evidence to show or establish a relationship between hyaluronic acid and joint health.

— What is the Commission's response to the above?

— Does the Commission intend to review the research on this matter, particularly concerning the methodology used to substantiate the claims regarding the benefits of hyaluronic acid for healthy joints?

— Does the Commission intend to conduct more research on healthy individuals to examine the effects of hyaluronic acid on healthy joints?

**Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission  
(20 March 2012)**

In adopting Regulation (EC) 1924/2006 <sup>(1)</sup> on nutrition and health claims made on food, the legislators decided that scientific substantiation should be the main aspect to be taken into account for the use of nutrition and health claims and that this should be based on generally accepted scientific evidence. It is the responsibility of the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) to assess the scientific evidence.

In its opinion on four submissions from Member States for hyaluronic acid and maintenance of joint health (*EFSA Journal* 2009; 7(9):1266) EFSA concluded that a cause and effect relationship had not been established. This was because all the human studies presented on the effects of hyaluronic acid on joint health were conducted in patients with clinical diagnosis of osteoarthritis and EFSA saw no convincing evidence to extrapolate data from scientific studies on subjects suffering osteoarthritis to the general population. This is a case by case assessment, and where biologically justified, extrapolation of evidence from the study group to the target group is possible.

Health claims are voluntary and it is the responsibility of the food business operator to justify the use of a claim with generally accepted scientific evidence. It is not for the Commission to do research in support of health claims. Claims which cannot be substantiated by generally accepted scientific evidence cannot be authorised.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 December 2006 on nutrition and health claims made on foods, OJ L 404, 30.12.2006, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:404:0009:0025:EN:PDF>.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001783/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(14 febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: Rischi della cannabis alla guida

Uno studio canadese ha dimostrato che guidare dopo aver fumato cannabis raddoppia il rischio di avere incidenti stradali.

Per la prima volta la ricerca segnala un legame tra consumo di marijuana e incidenti stradali, isolando la droga leggera da qualsiasi altra sostanza alterante (esperimento non facile, poiché la marijuana è spesso associata ad alcol o altro). Il risultato è inequivocabile: mettersi al volante entro tre ore dopo aver fumato cannabis significa quasi raddoppiare le possibilità di avere un incidente. Se poi l'età è inferiore a 35 anni, le probabilità lievitano ulteriormente.

Alla luce dei fatti sopraesposti, si chiede alla Commissione di rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. È essa a conoscenza dello studio canadese che approfondisce gli effetti della cannabis alla guida?
2. Intende essa organizzare una campagna di sensibilizzazione per informare i cittadini europei dei rischi che si corrono mettendosi al volante sotto l'effetto della cannabis?

**Risposta data da Siim Kallas a nome della Commissione**

(30 marzo 2012)

È ormai ampiamente riconosciuto che oltre ai tre principali fattori scatenanti degli incidenti, ossia eccesso di velocità, guida in stato di ebbrezza e mancato uso delle cinture di sicurezza, sono oggi presenti nuove circostanze preoccupanti, come ad esempio la guida sotto l'influsso di sostanze stupefacenti. La direttiva 2011/82/UE <sup>(1)</sup> recentemente adottata tiene conto di tali aspetti. Di conseguenza, chi guida sotto l'influsso di sostanze stupefacenti sarà passibile di sanzioni all'interno dell'UE.

La Commissione non è al corrente, nello specifico, dello studio canadese relativo agli effetti della cannabis sulla guida menzionato dall'onorevole parlamentare. Tuttavia, il connubio guida-sostanze stupefacenti è stato oggetto di diversi studi. A tale proposito la Commissione segnala all'onorevole parlamentare il progetto UE DRUID <sup>(2)</sup>, lanciato nel quadro del Sesto programma quadro per la ricerca e lo sviluppo tecnologico. Il progetto DRUID, concluso nel settembre 2011, fornisce un'analisi approfondita dell'impatto di alcol, sostanze stupefacenti illegali e farmaci sulla capacità di guida. In particolare, esso individua il rischio relativo di infortunio grave o decesso associato a diverse sostanze illecite e fornisce orientamenti rivolti alle forze dell'ordine, impegnate quotidianamente a contrastare il problema della guida sotto l'effetto di sostanze stupefacenti.

I risultati del progetto sono consultabili online al seguente link: <http://www.druid-project.eu>.

La realizzazione di campagne di sensibilizzazione sui rischi della guida sotto l'effetto di stupefacenti rientra principalmente tra le competenze dei singoli Stati membri, visto che dipende dalle strategie e dagli approcci adottati nei confronti delle sostanze stupefacenti illegali, che possono variare considerevolmente. Ad ogni modo, va segnalato che le conclusioni del progetto DRUID comprendono orientamenti relativi alla comunicazione sui rischi e l'uso di sostanze psicoattive, rivolti in particolare a un pubblico giovane.

<sup>(1)</sup> Direttiva 2011/82/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 25 ottobre 2011, intesa ad agevolare lo scambio transfrontaliero di informazioni sulle infrazioni in materia di sicurezza stradale (GU 288 del 5.11.2011, pagg. 1-15).

<sup>(2)</sup> Driving under the Influence of Drugs, Alcohol and Medicines (guida sotto l'influsso di sostanze stupefacenti, alcol e farmaci).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001783/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(14 February 2012)

*Subject:* Risks of cannabis-impaired driving

A Canadian study has shown that driving after smoking cannabis doubles the risk of road accidents.

For the first time, research has shown a link between marijuana consumption and road accidents. The soft drug had to be isolated from all other mind-altering substances — not an easy task, given that marijuana is often used in conjunction with alcohol or other drugs. The findings are irrefutable: taking the wheel within three hours of smoking cannabis almost doubles one's chance of having an accident. The probability is even higher for people under the age of 35.

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

1. Is it aware of the Canadian study on the effects of cannabis on driving?
2. Does it intend to organise a public awareness campaign to inform EU citizens of the risks of taking the wheel while under the influence of cannabis?

**Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission**

(30 March 2012)

It is now widely recognised that beyond the three traditional 'killers' — speeding, drink-driving and the non-use of safety belts — new phenomena such as driving under the influence of drugs are becoming an increasing cause of concern. This concern has been taken into account in the framework of the recently adopted Directive 2011/82/EU <sup>(1)</sup>. Henceforth, drivers under the influence of drugs will be exposed to sanctions wherever they drive within the EU.

The Commission is not aware of the specific Canadian study on the effects of cannabis on driving mentioned by the Honourable Member. However, a number of studies have been carried out on the problem of drug-driving. In this respect, the Commission would like to draw the attention of the Honourable Member to the EU project DRUID <sup>(2)</sup>, launched under the Sixth Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development. The DRUID project, concluded in September 2011, provides for an in-depth analysis of the impact on fitness to drive of alcohol, illicit drugs and medicines. It notably includes an identification of the relative risk of serious injury or fatality for different illicit substances as well as guidelines for everyday drug-driving police enforcement.

The results of this project are available at the following address: <http://www.druid-project.eu>

The organisation of public awareness campaigns on the risks of drug-driving is rather a matter for the Member States as it depends on the national policies and attitudes towards the use of illicit drugs, which may be quite different between Member States. It could however be mentioned that the deliverables of the DRUID project include guidelines on risk communication on the use of psychoactive substances, more particularly addressed to young drivers.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Directive 2011/82/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2011 facilitating the cross-border exchange of information on road safety related traffic offences, OJ L 288, 5.11.2011, p. 1-15.

<sup>(2)</sup> Driving under the Influence of Drugs, Alcohol and Medicines.



(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001784/12  
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(14 febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Cooperante italiano rapito dai talebani

La polizia pakistana ha sempre parlato di riscatto, di rapimento per denaro. Recentemente, un comandante militare talebano avrebbe rivendicato il sequestro dei due cooperanti stranieri, aggrediti il 19 gennaio da tre uomini armati che hanno assaltato la loro residenza a Multan, nella provincia del Punjab. Erano appena tornati da Kot Addu, dove distribuivano gli aiuti di un'organizzazione non governativa tedesca agli abitanti colpiti dalle alluvioni del 2010.

La rivendicazione è stata tuttavia smentita da un portavoce di Tehrik-i-Taliban, i talebani pakistani.

Il comandante talebano ha spiegato che i due ragazzi sarebbero trattenuti nelle aree al confine con il Pakistan, dove le migliaia di combattenti di Tehrik-i-Taliban impongono una legge islamica molto severa tra le montagne sotto il loro controllo. I gruppi integralisti colpiscono gli stranieri, anche se lavorano per le organizzazioni umanitarie. Le tribù che spadroneggiano nelle zone al confine con l'Afghanistan sono quelle dei Waziri e dei Mehsud, spalleggiati dagli «ospiti» afgani, i mujaheddin legati al clan Haqqani.

Alla luce dei fatti sopraesposti, si chiede all'Alto Rappresentante di rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. È a conoscenza dei sequestri di persona operati dai talebani pakistani?
2. Può la Delegazione dell'UE in Pakistan fare chiarezza e tentare di monitorare le ricerche dei due cooperanti rapiti?

**Risposta data dall'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione**

(10 maggio 2012)

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente è al corrente del sequestro dei due cooperanti, uno italiano e l'altro tedesco.

Sebbene le condizioni generali di sicurezza siano lievemente migliorate in Pakistan rispetto al 2010, con una flessione del 12 % degli atti di violenza, la situazione rimane difficile e il Pakistan è tuttora uno dei paesi più instabili al mondo.

Il recente incremento dei sequestri di cooperanti stranieri che operano in Pakistan costituisce una fonte di grave preoccupazione per l'UE e i per i suoi partner internazionali.

L'Unione europea segue da vicino l'evolversi degli eventi riguardanti la sicurezza dei suoi cittadini. Data la delicatezza della situazione che vede coinvolte vite umane, è osservata la massima discrezione. Per questo motivo l'Unione europea non commenta i rapimenti e auspica il rilascio rapido e sicuro delle persone sequestrate.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001784/12**  
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**  
**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**  
(14 February 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Italian aid-worker kidnapped by the Taliban

The Pakistani police have always maintained that the two foreign aid workers had been kidnapped for ransom. A Taliban military commander recently claimed responsibility for the kidnapping of these aid-workers, who were set upon on 19 January by three armed men who attacked their residence in Multan, in the Punjab province. They had just returned from Kot Addu, where they were distributing aid for a German non-governmental organisation to inhabitants affected by the 2010 floods.

The claim has, however, been disputed by a spokesperson for Tehrik-i-Taliban, the Pakistani Taliban.

The Taliban commander explained that the two men were being held near the Pakistan border, where thousands of Tehrik-i-Taliban fighters impose very strict Islamic law in the mountain areas under their control. Fundamentalist groups target foreigners, even if they work for humanitarian organisations. The Waziri and Mehsud tribes control the areas on the border with Afghanistan, backed by Afghan 'guests' — Mujahedins linked to the Haqqani clan.

In light of these facts, I would ask the High Representative to answer the following questions:

1. Is she aware of the kidnappings carried out by the Pakistani Taliban?
2. Can the EU Delegation in Pakistan clarify the situation and try to monitor the search for the two kidnapped aid-workers?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**  
(10 May 2012)

The High Representative/Vice-President is aware of the kidnappings of an Italian and a German aid worker.

Although the overall security situation had been slowly improving in Pakistan by comparison with 2010 — the number of violent attacks has reduced by 12 %, but the environment remains challenging. Pakistan is still among the most volatile countries in the world.

The recent increase in kidnappings of international staff aid workers in Pakistan is a major source of concern for the EU and international partners.

The EU follows closely security developments concerning EU nationals. In view of the sensitivity of the issue in the case of affected individuals, the utmost discretion is observed. For this reason the EU refrains from commenting on the abductions and hopes for the safe and swift release of those who have been abducted.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001785/12  
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(14 febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Attentati contro diplomatici israeliani

Vi è stato un doppio attentato contro obiettivi diplomatici israeliani, in India e in Georgia. Il primo episodio è avvenuto a Nuova Delhi, dove due persone in moto si sono avvicinate a un'automobile con a bordo personale dell'ambasciata di Israele. Gli assalitori hanno poi fatto detonare un ordigno, forse incendiario, che ha provocato il ferimento della moglie di un funzionario. Quasi in contemporanea scattava l'allarme a Tbilisi, in Georgia. Un diplomatico israeliano si è accorto della presenza di un ordigno sotto la sua automobile e ha avvisato la polizia.

Per quanto riguarda i responsabili del duplice attacco, fonti di Gerusalemme non escludono che possa trattarsi di una vendetta del movimento filo-iraniano Hezbollah nell'anniversario dell'uccisione del capo dell'apparato clandestino. In alternativa, non si può escludere che il duplice episodio sia una risposta iraniana all'uccisione degli scienziati. Colpisce la tecnica usata in India: gli assalitori erano in moto e hanno applicato un ordigno magnetico nella parte posteriore dell'automobile. Si tratta dello stesso modus operandi impiegato a Teheran per eliminare alcuni personaggi legati al programma nucleare.

1. Alla luce dei fatti sopraesposti, può l'Alto Rappresentante far sapere se è a conoscenza degli attentati subiti dai diplomatici israeliani, presumibilmente ad opera del nucleo filo-iraniano Hezbollah?
2. Può indicare se la delegazione dell'UE in Israele può fornire maggiori informazioni sul caso per fare chiarezza sugli attentati, in modo da tutelare i diplomatici israeliani?

**Risposta data dall'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione**

(24 maggio 2012)

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente (AR/VP) è a conoscenza dei fatti segnalati dall'onorevole parlamentare. Immediatamente dopo questi incidenti, l'AR/VP, attraverso il suo portavoce, ha rilasciato una dichiarazione per esprimere la più ferma condanna degli attentati contro il personale delle ambasciate israeliane in India e in Georgia e per manifestare la sua sincera solidarietà nei confronti dei feriti. L'AR/VP ha condannato gli attentati, così come tutti gli atti di terrorismo che non possono essere giustificati in alcun caso.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001785/12**  
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**  
**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**  
(14 February 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Attacks against Israeli diplomats

A double attack has taken place against Israeli diplomatic targets, one in India and the other in Georgia. The first incident occurred in New Delhi, when two people on a motorbike approached a car with staff from the Israeli embassy inside. The assailants then detonated a device, possibly a firebomb, injuring the wife of an official. Almost simultaneously, an alarm was triggered in Tbilisi, Georgia. An Israeli diplomat noticed a device under his car and alerted the police.

As regards the perpetrators of the double attack, sources in Jerusalem have not excluded the possibility that it could be a revenge attack by the pro-Iranian Hezbollah movement on the anniversary of the murder of the head of the clandestine group. Alternatively, it cannot be ruled out that the double attack could be an Iranian response to the murder of scientists. The technique used in the India attack is particularly striking: the assailants were on a motorbike and attached a magnetic bomb to the rear of the car. This is the same *modus operandi* that was used in Tehran to kill certain people linked to the nuclear programme.

1. In light of the above, can the High Representative state whether she is aware of the attacks on the Israeli diplomats, presumably the work of the pro-Iranian Hezbollah group?
2. Can she indicate whether the EU delegation in Israel is able to provide more information on the case in order to clarify the details of the attacks, in order to protect Israeli diplomats?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**  
(24 May 2012)

The High Representative/Vice-President is aware of the events referred to by the Honourable Member. Immediately after the incidents, the HR/VP's spokesperson issued a statement, in which it was made clear that the HR/VP condemned in the strongest terms the attacks targeting personnel of the Israeli embassies in India and Georgia and that she expressed her sincere sympathy with those who had been wounded. The HR/VP condemned the attacks as she condemned all acts of terrorism, which cannot be justified under any circumstances.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001786/12  
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(14 febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Suicidio di una monaca tibetana

In Cina, una giovane monaca di 18 anni si è data fuoco per protestare contro la repressione e per chiedere al governo di Pechino libertà per il Tibet. Il suicidio della giovane donna non è un gesto isolato.

Nelle ultime settimane sono dodici i monaci tibetani che si sono immolati con il fuoco. I casi di suicidio, infatti, sono aumentati notevolmente da quando un video shock, girato clandestinamente e messo in rete da una ONG, ha dato amplificazione al fenomeno delle autoimmolazioni con il fuoco di monaci e monache buddisti tibetani che protestano contro la repressione cinese del Tibet

Alla luce dei fatti sopraesposti, si prega l'Alto Rappresentante di rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. È a conoscenza dell'ennesimo caso di suicidio di una giovane monaca tibetana dissidente contro il governo cinese?
2. Quali azioni intende intraprendere per evitare che altri casi del genere si possano ripetere in Tibet e per garantire la libertà di espressione in Cina?

**Risposta data dall'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione**

(22 maggio 2012)

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente attribuisce grande importanza alla situazione in Tibet e segue attentamente gli sviluppi nelle aree abitate dai Tibetani, specialmente nella provincia di Sichuan, dove si registra un numero crescente di autoimmolazioni e dove negli ultimi mesi sono avvenuti gravi scontri tra la polizia e la popolazione locale. L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente è stata informata della morte di una giovane monaca diciottenne, dopo essersi data fuoco il 17 febbraio 2012.

Il 9 dicembre 2011 la delegazione dell'UE in Cina ha intrapreso un'iniziativa diplomatica nei confronti del ministero degli Affari esteri esprimendo forte preoccupazione per i recenti episodi di autoimmolazione, che palesano la sensazione di molti Tibetani che i loro diritti non siano rispettati. L'Unione europea ha sollecitato le autorità cinesi ad affrontare le cause alla radice degli atti di autoimmolazione, in particolare la sensazione da parte della popolazione tibetana di non partecipare appieno alla politica di sviluppo della regione.

L'Unione ha espresso preoccupazione per la situazione in Tibet anche durante la visita a Bruxelles del 12 dicembre 2011 di Zhu Weiqun, viceministro esecutivo del Dipartimento del Fronte Unito di lavoro.

Anche nel corso del vertice UE-Cina del 14 febbraio 2012 a Pechino, l'UE si è detta profondamente preoccupata per la situazione dei diritti umani in Tibet. Pur aderendo alla politica «Una sola Cina», l'UE continuerà a esortare il pieno rispetto dei diritti umani, compresa la libertà culturale, di espressione, di credo, di riunione e di associazione in queste zone ma anche altrove in Cina.

L'UE ha inoltre ripetutamente sollecitato le autorità cinesi a riprendere il dialogo con gli inviati del Dalai Lama e ha chiesto, finora invano, di poter visitare le regioni a popolazione tibetana.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001786/12**  
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**  
**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**  
(14 February 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — Suicide of a Tibetan nun

A young 18-year-old nun set herself alight in China in protest against repression and to ask the Beijing Government for freedom for Tibet. The young woman's suicide is not an isolated gesture.

In recent weeks, 12 Tibetan monks have sacrificed themselves by fire. Suicide cases have, in fact, increased considerably since the release of a shocking video, filmed illegally and uploaded to the Internet by an NGO, which has amplified the phenomenon of self-immolation of Tibetan Buddhist nuns and monks who are protesting against Chinese repression in Tibet.

In light of these facts:

1. Is the High Representative aware of this case, yet another suicide of a young Tibetan nun protesting against the Chinese Government?
2. What action will she take to prevent other cases like this happening in Tibet and guarantee freedom of expression in China?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**  
(22 May 2012)

The High Representative/Vice-President attaches great importance to the situation in Tibet. She follows closely the developments in Tibetan-populated areas, especially in Sichuan province, where an increasing number of self-immolations have occurred and where serious clashes between the police and the local population took place over the last few months. She has received information about the death of a young 18-year-old nun after she set herself on fire on 17 February 2012.

On 9 December 2011, the EU Delegation to China made a demarche to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs expressing its profound concern at the recent series of self-immolations which demonstrate the feeling among many Tibetans that their rights are not being respected. The EU urged the Chinese authorities to address the root causes of the self-immolations, and in particular the perceived lack of genuine participation by the Tibetan population in the development policy of the region.

The EU also expressed its concerns regarding the situation in Tibet during the visit of Zhu Weiqun, Executive Vice-Minister of the United Front Work Department to Brussels, on 12 December 2011.

EU's deep concerns as to the human rights situation in Tibet were raised as well at the EU-China summit which took place on 14 February 2012 in Beijing. While adhering to the 'One-China policy', the EU will continue to call for full respect for human rights, including the freedom of expression, religion, culture, association and assembly in these areas as in other parts of China.

Moreover, the EU repeatedly urges the Chinese authorities to resume their dialogue with the Envoys of the Dalai Lama. It has also asked to visit the regions inhabited by Tibetans but this request has been refused until now.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001787/12  
alla Commissione**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(14 febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: Microaghi di seta

Capita di ritrovarsi sulla pelle un piccolo arrossamento per una puntura d'insetto di cui non ci si è accorti. Evidentemente l'insetto era uno di quelli la cui puntura ha un valore inferiore a zero in base allo «Schmidt Sting Pain Index» (in sigla SSPI), l'indice del dolore ideato da un ematologo che quantifica le punture di 78 diverse specie di insetti. Adesso tutti i medici potranno usufruire della leggerezza degli insetti SSPI/zero e della sicurezza degli agopuntori: i ricercatori della «Tufts University» del Massachusetts hanno messo a punto un nuovo tipo di microaghi bioattivi di 500 micron per 10 (meno di un decimo di un capello) costruiti con un materiale derivato dalla seta, la fibroina, risultata estremamente biocompatibile e biodegradabile. La nuova «puntura» si presenta come una sorta di benda da applicare nel punto da trattare e a prima vista gli aghi non si vedono nemmeno, tanto sono piccoli.

Lo studio indica come sia possibile far sì che sia lo stesso ago a fungere da «transporter» per il farmaco, non più raccolto in una siringa e iniettato sotto la pressione di uno stantuffo, ma stipato fra le stesse molecole che costituiscono la struttura dell'ago. L'ago viene «armato» a temperatura ambiente, cosa utilissima per farmaci termolabili come ad esempio enzimi, antibiotici o vaccini, che necessitavano di sofisticate procedure sottozero. Poi, a provocare la graduale diffusione dei farmaci ci pensa l'ambiente umido del corpo in cui l'ago è penetrato. Viene così eliminato il dolore della spinta impartita al liquido dallo stantuffo, ma il vero punto di forza del nuovo ago è la sua piccolezza, che gli evita di raggiungere in profondità i nervi sottocutanei, proprio come fanno gli insetti SSPI/zero. La tecnica ha consentito di ottenere una riduzione 10 volte superiore della densità delle colonie batteriche utilizzando quantità di antibiotici 4 o 5 volte inferiori semplicemente manipolando la struttura molecolare dell'ago.

Ciò premesso, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. È a conoscenza della sperimentazione dei microaghi di seta? Ritiene che tale scoperta innovativa possa usufruire di Fondi europei e se sì quali?
2. Pensa che l'iniziativa dell'Università del Massachusetts possa essere replicata in paesi europei nell'ambito di futuri progetti pilota?

**Risposta data da Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione**

(28 marzo 2012)

La Commissione non finanzia alcuna attività di ricerca e di innovazione relativa a microaghi di seta nell'ambito dell'attuale settimo programma quadro per la ricerca e lo sviluppo tecnologico (7° PQ, 2007-2013). Tuttavia, tale programma seleziona proposte da finanziare sulla base di una valutazione reciproca indipendente e di conseguenza le attività connesse ai microaghi di seta potrebbero potenzialmente essere finanziate nell'ambito delle varie sezioni del programma quadro, quali il programma «Idee» <sup>(1)</sup> o, come parte di un progetto in collaborazione interdisciplinare, nell'ambito del programma «Cooperazione» in relazione ai temi specifici «Salute» <sup>(2)</sup> e «Nanoscienze, nanotecnologie, materiali e nuove tecnologie di produzione» <sup>(3)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://erc.europa.eu>.

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/health/home\\_en.html](http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/health/home_en.html)

<sup>(3)</sup> [http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/cooperation/nanotechnology\\_en.html](http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/cooperation/nanotechnology_en.html)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001787/12  
to the Commission**

**Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)**

(14 February 2012)

*Subject:* Silk microneedles

One sometimes finds small red marks on one's skin, caused by unnoticed insect bites. Those bites must have been made by an insect with a sting value lower than zero on the Schmidt Sting Pain Index (SSPI), a pain scale created by a haematologist which measures the bites of 78 different species of insect. Doctors can now show the same lightness of touch as SSPI-zero insects and the same sureness of touch as acupuncturists, following the development by researchers at Tufts University in Massachusetts of a new type of bioactive microneedle measuring 500 microns by 10 microns (less than one-tenth of a hair's width) and made of fibroin, a material derived from silk, which is highly biocompatible and biodegradable. This new type of injection takes the form of a 'patch' which is applied to the area to be treated. The needles are so small that they are not even visible at first glance.

The research indicates that the needle itself can carry the drug, which will no longer need to be held in a syringe and injected under pressure, but will instead be forced between the molecules that make up the needle. The needle is loaded at room temperature, which is especially useful for thermolabile medicines such as enzymes, antibiotics and vaccines, which previously required the use of complicated sub-zero procedures. The moist environment of the body into which the needle is inserted then causes the drug to spread gradually. The pain caused by the plunger forcing the liquid into the body is therefore eliminated, but the real advantage of the new needle lies in its small size, which means that, like SSPI-zero insects, it does not reach down to the subcutaneous nerves. The technique allows a ten-fold reduction in bacterial colony density to be achieved while using four or five times less antibiotics, simply by manipulating the molecular structure of the needle.

Given the above, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Is it aware of the silk microneedle tests that are under way? Does it believe that this innovative discovery could qualify for EU funding and, if so, on what basis?
2. Does it think that initiatives similar to the University of Massachusetts study could be carried out in EU Member States under future pilot projects?

**Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission**

(28 March 2012)

The Commission does not fund any research and innovation activities involving silk micro-needles under the current 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013). FP7 nevertheless selects research proposals to be funded on the basis of independent peer review. Work related to silk micro-needles might therefore potentially be supported under a variety of sections of the framework programme, including the 'Ideas' programme <sup>(1)</sup> or, as part of an interdisciplinary collaborative project, under the 'Cooperation' programme's specific themes 'Health' <sup>(2)</sup> and 'Nanosciences, nanotechnologies, materials and new production technologies' <sup>(3)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://erc.europa.eu>.

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/health/home\\_en.html](http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/health/home_en.html)

<sup>(3)</sup> [http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/cooperation/nanotechnology\\_en.html](http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/cooperation/nanotechnology_en.html)



(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001788/12**

**alla Commissione**

**Mara Bizzotto (EFD)**

(14 febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: Chiesa incendiata dalla comunità musulmana dell'ex Repubblica Iugoslava di Macedonia

L'Alto Commissario dell'OSCE per le minoranze nazionali, Knut Vollebaek, ha lanciato un allarme in seguito agli incidenti che hanno interessato la regione sud-occidentale dell'ex Repubblica Iugoslava di Macedonia (ERIM), verso la fine di gennaio. Tali incidenti sono scoppiati in occasione del carnevale nel villaggio di Vevcani. Le tradizioni locali prevedono che i cittadini approfittino del carnevale per esprimere critiche in relazione a temi di attualità, tra cui anche la religione. Tuttavia, la numerosa comunità musulmana della regione ha reagito con violenza ai festeggiamenti a causa delle critiche all'Islam espresse dai partecipanti al carnevale. La comunità musulmana ha quindi causato disordini per diversi giorni, scagliandosi infine contro una chiesa alla quale ha appiccato il fuoco. Rappresentanti ufficiali della comunità musulmana hanno anche dichiarato che stanno valutando di avviare azioni legali contro i partecipanti al carnevale.

L'Alto Commissario dell'OSCE ha commentato l'accaduto affermando che la capacità delle diverse comunità etniche che compongono l'ERIM di convivere e tollerarsi reciprocamente sta diminuendo, e che il pericolo di una separazione di natura etnica sta aumentando. I timori dell'Alto Commissario Vollebaek sembrano confermati dal fatto che le iniziative dell'OSCE per promuovere l'integrazione etnica nell'ERIM sono state sostanzialmente ignorate dalle autorità e dalle istituzioni interessate.

È la Commissione a conoscenza dei fatti sopra descritti? Ritiene che le azioni di questa comunità musulmana costituiscano un vero e proprio tentativo di censura? Ritiene che l'avvio di azioni legali in tale contesto sia incompatibile con i principi dell'UE sulla libertà di espressione? È dell'opinione che l'incendio di una chiesa rappresenti un episodio particolarmente grave, che dimostra come il fondamentalismo islamico continui a rappresentare una minaccia per la stabilità sociale e politica nella regione dei Balcani? Inoltre, alla luce del fatto che l'ERIM è uno Stato candidato ad accedere all'UE, condivide la Commissione l'opinione secondo cui episodi di violenza come quelli sopra descritti sottolineano la necessità di riconsiderare la candidatura dell'ERIM almeno finché una maggiore stabilità sociale, culturale e politica non sarà stata raggiunta?

**Risposta data da Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione**

(23 marzo 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza della serie di incidenti avvenuti a Struga e in altre località alla fine di gennaio 2012. Le indagini della polizia su tali incidenti non sono ancora concluse.

La Commissione rispetta il diritto dei cittadini a intraprendere azioni legali se si considerano vittime di crimini di odio. Spetta agli organi giurisdizionali giudicare se sia stato commesso un reato quale l'incitamento all'odio.

La Commissione controlla costantemente che i paesi candidati soddisfino a pieno i criteri di Copenaghen, compresi il rispetto dei diritti umani e dello Stato di diritto. La relazione della Commissione del 2011 sullo stato di avanzamento afferma che «è stato sviluppato un quadro istituzionale per la tutela delle minoranze e per il sostegno del dialogo interetnico», sottolineando altresì che «un dialogo costante tra tutte le comunità è necessario per promuovere la fiducia».

La prossima relazione sullo stato di avanzamento con le conclusioni della Commissione verrà pubblicata a ottobre 2012.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001788/12  
to the Commission  
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)  
(14 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Church torched by the Muslim community in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

The High Commissioner for National Minorities of the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), Knut Vollebaek, has sounded a warning in the wake of the incidents that took place in the south-west region of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM) towards the end of January 2012. These incidents occurred during the carnival in the village of Vevcani. In accordance with local traditions, citizens use the carnival as an opportunity to express criticism in relation to topical issues, such as religion. However, the large Muslim community in the region reacted violently to the celebrations due to the carnival participants' criticism of Islam. Its members caused unrest for several days, finally lashing out against a church and setting it on fire. Official representatives of the Muslim community have also stated that they are considering taking legal action against the carnival participants.

The OSCE High Commissioner commented on the incident, stating that the ability of the different ethnic communities that make up FYROM to live together and tolerate each other is decreasing, and that the danger of an ethnic separation is increasing. The fears of High Commissioner Vollebaek seem to be confirmed by the fact that the efforts of the OSCE to promote ethnic integration in FYROM have been largely ignored by the authorities and institutions concerned.

Is the Commission aware of the facts described above? Does it consider that these actions of the Muslim community effectively constitute an attempt at censorship? Does it believe the initiation of legal action in this regard to be incompatible with the EU's principles concerning freedom of expression? Is it of the opinion that setting a church on fire is a particularly serious incident, which demonstrates how Islamic fundamentalism continues to represent a threat to social and political stability in the Balkan region? Moreover, in the light of the fact that FYROM is a candidate for accession to the EU, does the Commission share the opinion that violent episodes such as those described above highlight the need to reconsider FYROM's candidacy, at least until greater social, cultural and political stability has been achieved?

**Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission  
(23 March 2012)**

The Commission is fully aware of the series of incidents in Struga and in some other locations in late January 2012. The police investigation of the incidents has not been concluded yet.

The Commission respects the rights of citizens to take legal action if they consider themselves victims of hate crimes. It is up to the courts to judge whether an offence, such as hate speech, has been committed.

The Commission constantly monitors the candidate countries' continuing fulfilment of the Copenhagen criteria, including respect for human rights and rule of law. The Commission's Progress Report of 2011 stated that 'an institutional framework has been developed to protect the rights of minorities and to support inter-ethnic dialogue', while also noting that 'continued dialogue amongst all the communities is necessary in order to foster trust'.

The next Progress Report outlining the Commission's findings will be published in October 2012.

---

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001789/12  
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**

**Mara Bizzotto (EFD)**

(14 febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Inizio di una nuova jihad in Siria

L'attuale capo di al-Qaeda, Ayman al-Zawahri, ha recentemente rivolto un appello a tutto il mondo musulmano dichiarando che al-Qaeda è intenzionata a sostenere l'opposizione siriana contro il regime del Presidente al-Assad. Le parole di al-Zawahri sono state confermate dai servizi segreti iracheni, i quali hanno informato il ministero dell'Interno del fatto che un numero crescente di combattenti jihadisti si sta trasferendo in Siria al fine di unirsi agli oppositori del regime. Il viceministro ha paragonato questo fenomeno a quanto già accaduto negli anni passati, quando jihadisti di tutto il mondo musulmano si sono recati in Iraq per mettersi al servizio di al-Qaeda.

È l'Alto Rappresentante in grado di confermare queste informazioni? Condivide la preoccupazione espressa dal viceministro iracheno riguardo al fatto che le proteste in Siria rischiano di essere manipolate da cellule estremiste legate ad al-Qaeda, intenzionate a trasformare il conflitto sociale siriano in una nuova «jihad», secondo l'esempio di quanto accaduto in passato in Afghanistan e in Iraq?

È dell'opinione che tale possibilità sia particolarmente probabile, dal momento che le cellule di al-Qaeda possono approfittare del migliore coordinamento e delle maggiori risorse finanziarie dell'organizzazione terroristica al fine di imporre la propria leadership sull'intero movimento di opposizione, e prendere quindi le redini della rivolta stessa? Se sì, ritiene che l'apertura di un nuovo fronte jihadista in un paese geograficamente e politicamente molto vicino all'UE — la Siria partecipa alla Politica europea di vicinato — costituisca un fatto particolarmente preoccupante? Intende adottare misure per evitare che l'UE subisca ripercussioni, soprattutto in materia di sicurezza, e possibilmente per evitare che la Siria precipiti in un caos simile a quello in cui è sprofondato l'Iraq?

**Risposta data dall'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione**

(25 maggio 2012)

Nella dichiarazione del 19 marzo, l'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Ashton ha condannato con durezza tutti gli atti di terrorismo in Siria, sottolineando che non ci sono giustificazioni alle uccisioni indiscriminate e alle menomazioni di civili innocenti, in alcun caso.

Nell'ottica di porre fine alle violenze in Siria ed evitare un aggravarsi del conflitto che potrebbe avere conseguenze anche al di fuori del paese, l'UE appoggia pienamente l'inviato speciale dell'ONU e della Lega araba, Kofi Annan, e il suo piano in sei punti per la soluzione della crisi. L'Unione accoglie con favore il sostegno espresso dal Consiglio di sicurezza dell'ONU nelle risoluzioni 2042 e 2043 nei confronti di Kofi Annan e del suo piano, ed esorta il regime siriano a tener fede alle proprie promesse e ad attuare quanto prima i sei punti del piano.

L'UE sollecita regolarmente i Siriani a seguire un percorso non violento verso la costruzione di una Siria pacifica e democratica, ricordando che la proliferazione delle armi può essere un ostacolo al raggiungimento di tale obiettivo.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001789/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

**Mara Bizzotto (EFD)**

(14 February 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — The start of a new jihad in Syria

The current head of Al-Qaida, Ayman al-Zawahri, recently made an appeal to the entire Muslim world stating that Al-Qaida intends to support Syrian opposition to President al-Assad's regime. This has been confirmed by the Iraqi intelligence services, which informed the Interior Ministry that growing numbers of jihadist fighters are moving to Syria to join opponents of the regime. The deputy minister has compared this to what happened in the past when jihadists from across the Muslim world went to Iraq to put themselves at the service of Al-Qaida.

Is the High Representative able to confirm this? Does she share the concern expressed by the Iraqi deputy minister that the protests in Syria risk being manipulated by extremist cells linked to Al-Qaida, which intend to turn the social conflict in Syria into a new 'jihad', mirroring what happened in the past in Afghanistan and Iraq?

Is she of the opinion that this is highly likely, given that Al-Qaida cells can take advantage of the terrorist organisation's better coordination and greater financial resources in order to impose its leadership on the entire opposition movement, and take the reins of the revolt? If so, does she consider the setting up of a new jihad front in a country which is geographically and politically very close to the EU (Syria participates in the European Neighbourhood Policy) to be particularly worrying? Does she intend to take measures to ensure that the EU avoids repercussions, particularly on security, and if possible, to prevent the situation in Syria from descending into chaos, similar to that seen in Iraq?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission**

(25 May 2012)

In her statement of 19 March High Representative/Vice-President Ashton unreservedly condemned all acts of terrorism in Syria. She made clear that there is no justification for the indiscriminate killing and maiming of innocent civilians, under any circumstances.

In view of ending the violence in Syria and preventing a worsening of the conflict that could have consequences that go beyond Syria, the EU fully supports the UN-Arab League Envoy, Mr Kofi Annan, and his six point plan for the settlement of the crisis. It welcomes the UN Security Council's backing of Mr Annan and his plan, as expressed in Security Council Resolutions 2042 and 2043, and urges the Syrian regime to finally live up to its promises and fully comply with the six points without delay.

The EU consistently calls on Syrians to pursue a non-violent path towards a peaceful and democratic Syria, recalling that the proliferation of weapons may impede the attainment of this objective.

---

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-001790/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Chrysoula Paliadelis (S&D)**  
(14 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Δηλώσεις επιτρόπων

Στις 7 Φεβρουαρίου 2012 η αντιπρόεδρος της Επιτροπής, αρμόδια για την ψηφιακή ατζέντα, Νέλι Κρους, σε συνέντευξη της σε ολλανδική εφημερίδα, δήλωσε ότι «μια έξοδος της Ελλάδας από το ευρώ δεν θα έβλαπτε την υπόλοιπη ευρωζώνη».

Αντίθετα, ο εκπρόσωπος Τύπου της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής, Ολιβιέ Μπαγί, υπογράμμισε ότι η Επιτροπή επιθυμεί την παραμονή της Ελλάδας στην ευρωζώνη, σημειώνοντας, ωστόσο, ότι η δήλωση της κ. Κρους δεν έρχεται σε αντίθεση με αυτήν τη θέση της Επιτροπής και τονίζοντας, παράλληλα, ότι τόσο ο πρόεδρος της Επιτροπής, Ζοζέ Μανουέλ Μπαρόζο, όσο και ο αντιπρόεδρος Όλι Ρεν, θεωρούν πως οι επίτροποι έχουν δικαίωμα να εκφράζονται για την κατάσταση της ελληνικής οικονομίας.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Πώς η άποψη της κ. Κρους δεν έρχεται σε αντίθεση με την άποψη της Επιτροπής, εφόσον η πάγια γραμμή της Επιτροπής είναι ότι η έξοδος της Ελλάδας από το ευρώ θα έβλαπτε την ευρωζώνη;
2. Μπορούν οι επίτροποι, ανεξαρτήτως του αντικειμένου τους, να εκφέρουν την προσωπική τους άποψη για τόσο κρίσιμα θέματα χωρίς να δεσμεύονται από την επίσημη θέση της Επιτροπής;
3. Η πολυφωνική στάση της Επιτροπής για το οικονομικό μέλλον του ευρώ και οι επιπτώσεις αυτής της πολυφωνίας στη διαμόρφωση της κοινής γνώμης και των διεθνών αγορών συμβάλλουν στη θετική εξέλιξη των κρίσιμων ζητημάτων με τα οποία βρίσκεται αντιμέτωπη η ευρωζώνη και η ευρωπαϊκή συνοχή;

**Απάντηση του κ. Barroso εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(12 Μαρτίου 2012)

Παρόλο που η πολιτική της Επιτροπής είναι να μην σχολιάζει άρθρα που δημοσιεύονται στον Τύπο, και με τη δέουσα προσοχή που απαιτεί ο ευαίσθητος χαρακτήρας του θέματος αυτού, η Επιτροπή απαντά στην ερώτηση.

1. Η Επιτροπή επιθυμεί η Ελλάδα να παραμείνει μέλος της ευρωζώνης και η κα Κροες δεν ζήτησε την έξοδο της Ελλάδας από το ευρώ. Μια βιώσιμη λύση για την Ελλάδα αποτελεί παράγοντα καθοριστικής σημασίας για την επίλυση της παρούσας κρίσης. Η Επιτροπή έχει τη βεβαιότητα ότι το ευρώ θα επιβιώσει παρά τους κλυδωνισμούς που υφίσταται και θα κατορθώσει να εξέλθει από την κρίση ισχυρότερο. Συνεπώς, η Επιτροπή δεν θεωρεί ότι η γνώμη της κας Κροες έρχεται σε αντίθεση με τη γνώμη της Επιτροπής.
2. Με την επιφύλαξη του δικαιώματος των Επιτρόπων να εκφράζουν τις προσωπικές τους απόψεις, σύμφωνα με την αρχή της συλλογικής ευθύνης, οι Επίτροποι δεν διατυπώνουν σχόλια που θα μπορούσαν να θέσουν υπό αμφισβήτηση απόφαση που έχει ληφθεί από την Επιτροπή.
3. Η θέση της Επιτροπής είναι σαφής. Η θετική έκβαση των κρίσιμων θεμάτων με τα οποία βρίσκεται αντιμέτωπη η ευρωζώνη και η ευρωπαϊκή συνοχή απαιτεί ισχυρή δέσμευση όχι μόνο από την Επιτροπή, αλλά και από το Συμβούλιο και το Κοινοβούλιο και από τα κράτη μέλη.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-001790/12  
to the Commission  
Chrysoula Paliadeli (S&D)  
(14 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Commissioners' statements

On 7 February 2012, Neelie Kroes, Commission Vice-President and Digital Agenda Commissioner, in an interview with a Dutch newspaper, stated that Greece's exit from the Euro would not harm the rest of the Eurozone.

On the other hand, the Commission Spokesperson, Olivier Bailly, pointed out that the Commission wanted Greece to remain in the Eurozone, but noted that Ms. Kroes' statement does not contradict the Commission's position and stressed, at the same time, that both Commission President José Manuel Barroso and Vice-President Olli Rehn believe that Commissioners have the right to express an opinion on the state of the Greek economy.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. How does Ms. Kroes' opinion not contradict the Commission's opinion since its established position is that Greece's exit from the Euro would harm the Eurozone?
2. Are Commissioners, regardless of their area of competence, entitled to express their personal opinions on such critical issues without being bound by the Commission's official position?
3. Will the Commission's pluralistic position on the economic future of the Euro and the impact of this pluralism on public opinion and international markets contribute to a positive outcome to the critical issues confronting the Eurozone and European cohesion?

**Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission  
(12 March 2012)**

Although it is Commission policy not to comment on articles appearing in the press, with due consideration to the sensitivity on this issue, the Commission is happy to answer.

1. The Commission wants Greece to remain a member of the euro area and Mrs Kroes has not asked for Greece to leave the euro area. A sustainable solution in Greece is an essential element to resolve the current crisis. The Commission is confident that the euro will survive the storm and come out of the crisis stronger. The Commission therefore does not consider that Mrs Kroes' opinion contradicts the Commission's opinion.
  2. Without prejudice to the right of Commissioners to express their personal opinions, in accordance with the principle of collective responsibility, Commissioners shall not make any comment which would call into question a decision taken by the Commission.
  3. The position of the Commission is clear. A positive outcome to the critical issues confronting the Eurozone and European cohesion implies a strong engagement not only from the Commission, but also from the Council and the Parliament and from the Member States.
-

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001791/12**  
**an den Rat**  
**Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)**  
(14. Februar 2012)

*Betrifft:* ACTA — Transparenz und Providerhaftung

Die Verhandlungen um das ACTA sind abgeschlossen, der Vertragstext ist öffentlich zugänglich. Allerdings sind noch nicht die Verhandlungsdokumente der einzelnen Verhandlungsrunden öffentlich einzusehen.

1. Kann der Rat ausschließen, dass diese Dokumente der Öffentlichkeit womöglich nicht zugänglich gemacht werden? Falls ja, wann werden sie veröffentlicht? Falls nein, warum nicht?
2. Hält der Rat es für angemessen, dass diese Dokumente bisher nicht veröffentlicht wurden? Falls ja, warum?
3. Was hat der Rat bisher unternommen, damit diese Dokumente veröffentlicht werden?

In der Debatte um Artikel 27 des ACTA-Übereinkommens wird immer wieder auf eine drohende Providerhaftung hingewiesen.

4. Kann der Rat ausschließen, dass durch das ACTA Provider für den von ihnen transportierten Inhalt haftbar gemacht werden können, sollten diese gegen Urheberrecht verstoßen?

**Antwort**  
(30. April 2012)

Die Verhandlungen über das Übereinkommen zur Bekämpfung von Produkt- und Markenpiraterie (ACTA) wurden im Juni 2008 aufgenommen und im November 2010 abgeschlossen. Wie der Herr Abgeordnete ausführt, ist der endgültige Text des Übereinkommens öffentlich zugänglich.

Nach Informationen des Rates hat die Europäische Kommission dem Europäischen Parlament im Laufe der Verhandlungen über das Übereinkommen, für deren Führung sie verantwortlich und an denen — bei Angelegenheiten unter der Zuständigkeit der Mitgliedstaaten — der Ratsvorsitz beteiligt war, sieben Entwürfe des konsolidierten Textes des Übereinkommens, drei detaillierte schriftliche Berichte über die Verhandlungsrunden sowie vierzehn Vermerke und interne Arbeitsdokumente zukommen lassen. Darüber hinaus haben die Europäische Kommission und der Vorsitz des Rates der Europäischen Union das Parlament mehrfach umfassend im Plenum sowie im Rahmen von Ausschusssitzungen und anderen informellen Nachbesprechungen informiert. Weitere Einzelheiten kann der Herr Abgeordnete dem Vermerk zur Transparenz der ACTA-Verhandlungen entnehmen, den die Europäische Kommission am 13. Februar 2012 veröffentlicht hat <sup>(1)</sup>.

Ferner hat der Rat gemäß der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1049/2001 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 30. Mai 2001 über den Zugang der Öffentlichkeit zu Dokumenten des Europäischen Parlaments, des Rates und der Kommission <sup>(2)</sup> zahlreiche Anträge auf Zugang zu Dokumenten im Zusammenhang mit den ACTA-Verhandlungen erhalten. Nach vorläufigen Informationen der zuständigen Dienststellen des Rates wurden auf diese Anträge hin zweiundzwanzig Dokumente uneingeschränkt und weitere zweiundzwanzig teilweise für die Öffentlichkeit zugänglich gemacht; in zehn Fällen wurde der Antrag nach Artikel 4 der genannten Verordnung, in dem bestimmte Ausnahmen vorgesehen sind, abgelehnt.

Was die vierte Frage des Herrn Abgeordneten betrifft, so ist der Rat nach wie vor der Auffassung, dass für einen Beitritt der EU zum ACTA keine Änderung des gegenwärtigen Besitzstands der Union erforderlich ist. Dies bedeutet unter anderem, dass das ACTA nicht zu einer Änderung des gegenwärtigen Besitzstands der Union über die Haftung der Anbieter von Vermittlungsdiensten führen wird.

Dem Herrn Abgeordneten dürfte zweifellos bekannt sein, dass die Kommission am 22. Februar 2012 beschlossen hat, das Übereinkommen dem Europäischen Gerichtshof zu übermitteln, damit dieser prüft, ob es mit den Grundrechten und Grundfreiheiten der EU wie dem Recht auf freie Meinungsäußerung und Informationsfreiheit oder dem Datenschutz und dem Recht auf Eigentum in Bezug auf geistiges Eigentum unvereinbar ist.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2012/february/tradoc\\_149103.pdf](http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2012/february/tradoc_149103.pdf)

<sup>(2)</sup> ABl. L 145 vom 31.5.2001, S. 43-48.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001791/12  
to the Council**

**Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)**

(14 February 2012)

*Subject:* ACTA — transparency and provider liability

The negotiations in relation to the ACTA Agreement have now been concluded, and the text of the agreement is available to the public. However, the negotiating documents from the individual negotiation rounds are not yet available for public inspection.

1. Can the Council rule out the possibility that these documents may not be made available to the public? If so, when will they be published? If not, why not?
2. Does the Council consider the fact that these documents have not yet been published appropriate? If so, why?
3. What steps has the Council taken so far to ensure that these documents are published?

There have been frequent references to the threat of provider liability in the debate relating to Article 27 of the ACTA Agreement.

4. Can the Council rule out the possibility that the ACTA Agreement will render providers liable for the content they transmit, if it infringes copyright?

**Reply**

(30 April 2012)

The negotiations on the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA) started in June 2008 and were finalised in November 2010. As the Honourable Member indicates, the final text of the ACTA agreement is available to the public.

It is the Council's understanding that, during the ACTA negotiations the European Commission, which was responsible for conducting the negotiations, with the participation of the Presidency of the Council for matters under Member States' competence, shared with the European Parliament seven draft consolidated texts of the agreement, three detailed written reports on negotiation rounds and fourteen notes and internal working papers. Furthermore, the European Commission and the Presidency of the Council of the European Union have kept the Parliament fully informed on several occasions in plenary, committee meetings and other informal debriefing sessions. For further details, the Honourable Member is referred to the note on Transparency of ACTA negotiations issued by the European Commission on 13 February 2012 <sup>(1)</sup>.

Furthermore, pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 May 2001 regarding public access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents <sup>(2)</sup>, the Council has received numerous requests for access to documents related to the ACTA negotiations. According to preliminary information received from the relevant Council services, in response to those requests, twenty-two documents have been fully released to the public, partial access has been granted to another twenty-two documents, whilst the request was refused in ten cases pursuant to the exceptions set out in Article 4 of the abovementioned Regulation.

Regarding the Honourable Member's fourth question, the Council is still of the view that accession by the EU to ACTA will not require any changes to the current *acquis communautaire*. This means, *inter alia*, that ACTA will not result in any changes of the current *acquis communautaire* on the liability of intermediary service providers.

The Honourable Member is doubtless aware of the fact that the Commission decided, on 22 February 2012, to refer the ACTA agreement to the European Court of Justice, for the latter to assess whether ACTA is incompatible with the EU's fundamental rights and freedoms, such as freedom of expression and information or data protection and the right to property as regards intellectual property.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2012/february/tradoc\\_149103.pdf](http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2012/february/tradoc_149103.pdf)

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 145, 31.5.2001, pp. 43-48.



(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001792/12  
an die Kommission  
Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)  
(14. Februar 2012)**

*Betrifft:* ACTA — Transparenz und Providerhaftung

Dem ACTA-Ausschuss werden nach Artikel 36 des ACTA-Übereinkommens verschiedene Aufgaben übertragen, die dazu führen könnten, dass dem Ausschuss sämtliche Verhandlungsdokumente vorliegen müssen, um Artikel 31 bis 33 des Wiener Übereinkommens über das Recht der Verträge angemessen zu achten.

1. Werden dem Ausschuss sämtliche Verhandlungsdokumente zur Verfügung gestellt? Falls ja, ab wann? Falls nein, warum nicht?
2. Kann die Kommission ausschließen, dass diese Dokumente womöglich gar nicht der Öffentlichkeit zugänglich gemacht werden? Falls ja, wann werden sie dann veröffentlicht? Falls nein, warum nicht?
3. Hält die Kommission es für angemessen, dass diese Dokumente bisher nicht veröffentlicht wurden? Falls ja, warum?
4. Was hat die Kommission bisher unternommen, damit diese Dokumente veröffentlicht werden?

In der Debatte um Artikel 27 des ACTA-Übereinkommens wird immer wieder auf eine drohende Providerhaftung hingewiesen.

5. Kann die Kommission ausschließen, dass durch das ACTA Provider für den von ihnen transportierten Inhalt haftbar gemacht werden können, sollten diese gegen Urheberrecht verstoßen?
6. Wird durch ACTA eine Providerhaftung untersagt?

**Antwort von Karel De Gucht im Namen der Kommission  
(10. April 2012)**

Der Wortlaut des ACTA-Übereinkommens ist endgültig und in seiner Gesamtheit der Öffentlichkeit zugänglich. Es gibt keine geheimen Anhänge, Protokolle oder Erläuterungen zur Auslegung.

Das Wiener Übereinkommen über das Recht der Verträge aus dem Jahr 1969 enthält keine Verpflichtung zur Veröffentlichung von Vorbereitungsarbeiten. Diese Auffassung teilt auch der Juristische Dienst des Parlaments in seiner an den Ausschuss für internationalen Handel (INTA) gerichteten Stellungnahme.

Was die öffentliche Verbreitung von das ACTA betreffenden Dokumenten anbelangt, so weist die Kommission darauf hin, dass zahlreiche Dokumente entweder von der Kommission auf ihrer Website <sup>(1)</sup> veröffentlicht oder infolge von Anträgen auf Zugang zu Dokumenten nach der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1049/2001 über den Zugang der Öffentlichkeit zu Dokumenten des Europäischen Parlaments, des Rates und der Kommission <sup>(2)</sup> verbreitet wurden. Es gibt jedoch bestimmte Dokumente oder Teile davon, zu denen der Zugang verweigert wurde, weil sie unter eine der in Artikel 4 der Verordnung 1049/2001 vorgesehenen Ausnahmeregelungen fallen, da ihre Verbreitung unter anderem den Schutz der internationalen Beziehungen oder den Entscheidungsprozess der Organe beeinträchtigen würde. Diese Dokumente oder Teile davon sollten, solange diese Ausnahmeregelungen gelten, nicht verbreitet werden.

Mit der Richtlinie über den elektronischen Geschäftsverkehr (E-Commerce-Richtlinie 2000/31/EG) wurde vor 12 Jahren die Grundlage für die in der EU geltende Haftungsregelung für Internet-Diensteanbieter geschaffen. Darin wird eindeutig festgelegt, was Internet-Diensteanbieter machen müssen, damit sie nicht für möglicherweise von ihren Nutzern übermittelte oder gespeicherte illegale Inhalte haften müssen. Durch Artikel 27 ACTA wird diese Regelung in keiner Weise geändert, sie bleibt in vollem Umfang anwendbar. In vielen Drittländern gibt es diesen wichtigen Mechanismus allerdings nicht, und genau deshalb ist es so wichtig, dass er im ACTA-Übereinkommen vorgesehen ist.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/trade/tackling-unfair-trade/acta/>.

<sup>(2)</sup> ABl. L 145 vom 31.5.2001.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001792/12  
to the Commission**

**Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)**

(14 February 2012)

*Subject:* ACTA — transparency and provider liability

According to Article 36 of the ACTA Agreement, the ACTA Committee is to be assigned a number of responsibilities that could require all negotiating documents to be made available to the Committee in order to comply with Articles 31 to 33 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

1. Are all negotiating documents to be made available to the Committee? If so, from when? If not, why not?
2. Can the Commission rule out the possibility that these documents may not be made available to the public? If so, when will they be published? If not, why not?
3. Does the Commission consider the fact that these documents have not yet been published appropriate? If so, why?
4. What steps has the Commission taken so far to ensure that these documents are published?

There have been frequent references to the threat of provider liability in the debate relating to Article 27 of the ACTA Agreement.

5. Can the Commission rule out the possibility that the ACTA Agreement will render providers liable for the content they carry if this infringes copyright?
6. Does the ACTA Agreement prohibit provider liability?

**Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission**

(10 April 2012)

The text of ACTA is final and publicly available in its entirety. There are no secret annexes, protocols or interpretation notes.

The Vienna Convention on the Law of the Treaties of 1969 does not contain any obligation to publish preparatory works. This understanding is shared by the Legal Service of the Parliament in its Opinion to the INTA Committee.

Regarding the disclosure of ACTA related documents to the public, the Commission notes that numerous documents have either been published by the Commission in its website<sup>(1)</sup> or disclosed following requests for access to documents pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 regarding public access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents<sup>(2)</sup>. However, there are certain documents or parts thereof to which access has been refused because they are covered by one of the exceptions foreseen in Article 4 of Regulation 1049/2001, as their disclosure would undermine, *inter alia*, the protection of international relations or the institutions' decision making process. For these, no disclosure should be made as long as these exceptions remain applicable.

The E-commerce directive (Directive 2000/31/EC) established the basis for the Internet service provider (ISP) liability regime in the EU 12 years ago. It defines clearly what ISPs need to do to be exempted from responsibility for illegal content that their users may transmit or store. Article 27 ACTA does not add or subtract to that regime, which will remain fully applicable. However, this important mechanism does not exist in many third countries and this is why it is so important that it is foreseen by ACTA.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/trade/tackling-unfair-trade/acta/>.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 145, 31.5.2001.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001793/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Werner Langen (PPE)**  
(14. Februar 2012)

*Betrifft:* Konsequenzen der Europäischen Kommission bei Versäumnissen in der Umsetzung der „Abwasser-Richtlinie“ (91/271/EWG)

Die 6. Untersuchung der Europäischen Kommission über die Umsetzung der Richtlinie 91/271/EWG des Rates über die Behandlung von kommunalem Abwasser (SEK(2011)1561) hat beträchtliche Unterschiede zwischen verschiedenen Mitgliedstaaten aufgezeigt.

Vor allem entlang der Mosel scheint es erhebliche Unterschiede zu geben, die die Mitgliedstaaten Deutschland (Rheinland-Pfalz, Saarland), Frankreich (Lothringen) und Luxemburg betreffen. Insbesondere Artikel 4 der Richtlinie, in dem die schrittweise Einführung einer verpflichtenden Zweitbehandlung von kommunalem Abwasser geregelt ist, scheint von den betreffenden Mitgliedstaaten nur begrenzt umgesetzt worden zu sein. Die Untersuchung der Kommission besagt in Punkt 3 (Compliance Overview), dass die Erfüllung nur in Deutschland vollständig (mehr als 96 %) erfolgt ist. In Frankreich (64 %) und Luxemburg (56 %) ist die Umsetzung nur teilweise erfolgt.

1. Worin liegen nach Ansicht der Kommission die Gründe für die Unterschiede?
2. Bis wann soll ein möglichst hohes und einheitliches Niveau erreicht werden?
3. Welche Maßnahmen wird die Kommission bezüglich der Versäumnisse bei der Umsetzung vorschlagen bzw. durchsetzen?

**Antwort von Herrn Potočník im Namen der Kommission**  
(17. April 2012)

Der Kommission ist bekannt, dass es Unterschiede bei der Umsetzung der „Abwasserrichtlinie“<sup>(1)</sup> gibt. Diese Situation erfordert in groben Zügen die relative Bedeutung, die die betreffenden Mitgliedstaaten Investitionen in die Abwasserbehandlung beimessen. Auf diese Frage wird auch in der zurzeit laufenden Überprüfung („Fitness Check“) des Wasserrechts eingegangen. Die Kommission plant, die Ergebnisse auf einer Konferenz im Mai 2012 vorzulegen. Viele Mitgliedstaaten haben in den letzten Jahren jedoch Schritte für eine bessere Umsetzung unternommen, so dass sich die tatsächliche Situation positiver darstellt als aus dem Bericht auf der Grundlage der Daten von 2007-2008 hervorgeht.

Alle Fristen für Deutschland, Luxemburg und Frankreich sind am 31.12.2005 abgelaufen. Die Kommission hat rechtliche Schritte eingeleitet, um die weitere Einhaltung der Vorschriften sicherzustellen. Frankreich und Luxemburg wurden mehrmals vor dem Europäischen Gerichtshof verklagt. Die Kommission hat zum Beispiel Frankreich verklagt (Rechtssache 2004/2032), um eine zügige Umsetzung der Richtlinie sicherzustellen. Im November 2011 hat die Kommission beschlossen, Luxemburg vor dem Gerichtshof zu verklagen, da es das Urteil des Europäischen Gerichtshofs in der Rechtssache C-425/05 nicht umgesetzt hat.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Richtlinie 91/271/EWG, ABl. L 135 vom 30.5.1991.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001793/12  
to the Commission**

**Werner Langen (PPE)**

(14 February 2012)

*Subject:* Action by the Commission in response to shortcomings in the implementation of the 'Waste Water Directive' (91/271/EEC)

The sixth review by the Commission of the implementation of Council Directive 91/271/EEC on the treatment of urban waste water (SEC(2011)1561) brought to light considerable differences between certain Member States.

Along the Moselle in particular there seem to be significant differences between the approaches employed by the Member States concerned, Germany (Rhineland-Palatinate, Saarland), France (Lorraine) and Luxembourg. More specifically, Article 4 of the directive, which sets out provisions governing the gradual introduction of mandatory secondary treatment for urban waste water, seems only to have been implemented to a limited degree by the Member States in question. Section 3 of the Commission's review (Compliance Overview) indicates that only Germany is fully compliant (over 96 %). Compliance is only partial in France (64 %) and Luxembourg (56 %).

1. In the Commission's view, what are the reasons for the differences?
2. What is the target date for achieving the highest possible level of uniform compliance?
3. What measures will the Commission propose or impose in relation to shortcomings in the implementation of the directive?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission**

(17 April 2012)

The Commission is aware of the differences of compliance in the implementation of the Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive (UWWTD) <sup>(1)</sup>. In broad terms, this situation requires the relative importance accorded by the Member States concerned to investments in waste water treatment. This issue is further addressed in the review ('Fitness Check') of water legislation which is currently underway and the Commission intends to present its results at a conference in May 2012. This said, in recent years many Member States have taken steps to achieve a better level of implementation which makes the actual situation more positive than the one presented in the report based on 2007-2008 data.

All deadlines expired on 31.12.2005 for Germany, Luxembourg and France. To ensure further compliance, the Commission has taken legal action. France and Luxembourg have been taken a number of times to the European Court of Justice. As examples, the Commission initiated legal action against France (case No 2004/2032) to ensure that the directive is swiftly implemented. In November 2011, the Commission again decided to take Luxembourg before the Court for the lack of execution of the ruling of the European Court of Justice in Case C-425/05.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Directive 91/271/EEC, OJ L 135, 30.5.1991.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001795/12  
al Consiglio**

**Salvatore Caronna (S&D), David-Maria Sassoli (S&D), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Guido Milana (S&D), Roberto Gualtieri (S&D), Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D), Vittorio Prodi (S&D), Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Vincenzo Iovine (ALDE), Giommara Uggias (ALDE), Debora Serracchiani (S&D), Silvia Costa (S&D), Rita Borsellino (S&D), Andrea Cozzolino (S&D), Mario Pirillo (S&D), Rosario Crocetta (S&D), Lorenzo Fontana (EFD), Claudio Morganti (EFD), Oreste Rossi (EFD), Gianni Vattimo (ALDE), Francesca Balzani (S&D), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Pino Arlacchi (S&D), Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D), Paolo De Castro (S&D), Gianni Pittella (S&D), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Leonardo Domenici (S&D), Lara Comi (PPE), Elisabetta Gardini (PPE), Luigi Berlinguer (S&D) e Francesco De Angelis (S&D)**

(14 febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: Rogatorie rilevanti per il processo sulla strage di Ustica

— A fronte dei fatti occorsi il 27 giugno 1980, quando un DC 9 della compagnia Itavia, in volo da Bologna a Palermo, è stato abbattuto in circostanze non pienamente accertate, causando la morte degli 81 passeggeri;

— considerato che le indagini svolte in questi anni dalla magistratura italiana hanno accertato la presenza di aerei e navi militari di Stati membri e di paesi terzi nell'area al momento dei fatti e che la cooperazione delle rispettive autorità giudiziarie è stata e resta un elemento essenziale per l'accertamento delle responsabilità di questa gravissima strage;

— visto che la cooperazione suddetta è stata in questi anni carente e caratterizzata da reticenze e omissis e che i familiari delle 81 vittime aspettano ancora che sia resa loro pienamente giustizia a 31 anni dai fatti;

— visto che ancora nel 2010 le autorità giudiziarie italiane che indagavano sulla strage di Ustica hanno rivolto richieste di rogatoria alle autorità di tre Stati membri (Francia, Germania e Belgio) e di due paesi terzi (Stati Uniti e Libia) che sono inevase e alcune delle quali non hanno neppure ricevuto risposta formale;

— visto l'articolo 4, paragrafo 3 TUE che vincola gli Stati membri al principio di cooperazione leale tra loro, ancor più alla luce dell'entrata in vigore del Trattato di Lisbona e riguarda anche la cooperazione giudiziaria penale sia tra gli Stati membri sia tra l'Unione e paesi terzi;

— vista la convenzione di cooperazione giudiziaria in materia penale del 2000, che completa una convenzione del Consiglio d'Europa in materia, che tutti gli Stati membri sono tenuti a rispettare;

— visto l'accordo di mutua assistenza giudiziaria tra UE e Stati Uniti, in vigore dal 2009;

Può al Consiglio far sapere:

1. se intende verificare che la decisione degli Stati membri in questione di non dare risposta o assistenza alle autorità giudiziarie italiane sia compatibile con il dovuto rispetto dell'articolo 4, paragrafo 3 TUE e delle convenzioni citate;
2. se ritiene che, in base al principio di cooperazione leale, alle autorità italiane sia dovuta piena collaborazione e comunque una risposta motivata, sia essa positiva o negativa;
3. se ritiene che l'accordo di mutua assistenza tra UE e USA in materia giudiziaria penale comporti un dovere per le parti di collaborare e, in particolare, delle autorità americane di dare risposta motivata alle rogatorie italiane, sia essa negativa o positiva?

**Risposta***(2 aprile 2012)*

Il Consiglio non formula commenti sui procedimenti giudiziari in corso negli Stati membri o sull'attuazione dell'acquis dell'UE da parte degli Stati membri.

In generale, il principio di leale cooperazione sancito dall'articolo 4, paragrafo 3 del trattato sull'Unione europea non impedisce alle autorità degli Stati membri di avvalersi dei motivi di rifiuto previsti negli strumenti giuridici relativi alla cooperazione giudiziaria.

L'accordo UE-USA, del 25 giugno 2003, sulla mutua assistenza giudiziaria in materia penale <sup>(1)</sup> non stabilisce alcun termine per rispondere alle richieste di mutua assistenza giudiziaria.

---

---

(1) GUL 181 del 19.7.2003, pag. 34.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001795/12  
to the Council**

**Salvatore Caronna (S&D), David-Maria Sassoli (S&D), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Guido Milana (S&D), Roberto Gualtieri (S&D), Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D), Vittorio Prodi (S&D), Andrea Zannoni (ALDE), Vincenzo Iovine (ALDE), Giommara Uggias (ALDE), Debora Serracchiani (S&D), Silvia Costa (S&D), Rita Borsellino (S&D), Andrea Cozzolino (S&D), Mario Pirillo (S&D), Rosario Crocetta (S&D), Lorenzo Fontana (EFD), Claudio Morganti (EFD), Oreste Rossi (EFD), Gianni Vattimo (ALDE), Francesca Balzani (S&D), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Pino Arlacchi (S&D), Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D), Paolo De Castro (S&D), Gianni Pittella (S&D), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Leonardo Domenici (S&D), Lara Comi (PPE), Elisabetta Gardini (PPE), Luigi Berlinguer (S&D) and Francesco De Angelis (S&D)**

(14 February 2012)

*Subject:* Important letters rogatory for the 'Ustica massacre' trial

— In view of the events that occurred on 27 June 1980, when an Itavia DC 9 flying from Bologna to Palermo was brought down in circumstances which have not been fully established, causing the death of the 81 passengers on board;

— considering that the investigations conducted over the years by the Italian judicial authorities established the presence of military aircraft and vessels from both Member States and third countries in the area at the time of the crash and that the cooperation of the respective judicial authorities was, and remains, vital for determining responsibility for this very serious massacre;

— given that over the years this cooperation has been lacking and characterised by reticence and omissions, and that the families of the 81 victims are still waiting for justice 31 years after the event;

— given that even in 2010, the Italian judicial authorities that had been investigating the Ustica crash sent letters rogatory to the authorities of three Member States (France, Germany and Belgium) and two third countries (United States and Libya), which have not been dealt with, and some of which have not even received a formal reply;

— having regard to Article 4(3) of the Treaty on European Union (TEU), which obliges the Member States to adhere to the principle of sincere cooperation, (even more so in light of the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon), and also concerns judicial cooperation in criminal matters, both between the Member States and between the Union and third countries;

— having regard to the Convention of Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters of 2000, which supplements a similar convention of the Council of Europe, which all Member States are required to respect;

— having regard to the agreement on mutual legal assistance between the EU and the United States, in force since 2009;

can the Council state:

1. whether it intends to check that the decision of the Member States concerned not to reply to or assist the Italian judicial authorities is compatible with the requirement to comply with Article 4(3) of the Treaty on European Union and with the abovementioned agreements;
2. whether it does not agree that, based on the principle of sincere cooperation, the Italian authorities should be entitled to full cooperation, and in any case to a reasoned reply, whether it be positive or negative;
3. whether it does not believe that the agreement on mutual legal assistance between the EU and the USA in criminal matters includes the duty of the parties to cooperate and, in particular, the duty of the US authorities to provide a reasoned reply to the Italian letters rogatory, whether it be negative or positive?

**Reply***(2 April 2012)*

The Council does not comment on ongoing judicial proceedings in Member States or on implementation of the EU *acquis* by Member States.

In general the principle of sincere cooperation enshrined in Article 4(3) of the Treaty on European Union does not preclude Member State authorities from availing themselves of grounds of refusal laid down in legal instruments on judicial cooperation.

The EU-US Agreement of 25 June 2003 on mutual legal assistance in criminal matters <sup>(1)</sup> does not lay down any time periods for replying to requests for mutual legal assistance.

---

---

(<sup>1</sup>) OJ L 181, 19.7.2003, p. 34.



(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001796/12  
alla Commissione**

**Salvatore Caronna (S&D), David-Maria Sassoli (S&D), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Guido Milana (S&D), Roberto Gualtieri (S&D), Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D), Vittorio Prodi (S&D), Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Vincenzo Iovine (ALDE), Giommara Uggias (ALDE), Debora Serracchiani (S&D), Silvia Costa (S&D), Rita Borsellino (S&D), Andrea Cozzolino (S&D), Mario Pirillo (S&D), Rosario Crocetta (S&D), Lorenzo Fontana (EFD), Claudio Morganti (EFD), Oreste Rossi (EFD), Gianni Vattimo (ALDE), Francesca Balzani (S&D), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Pino Arlacchi (S&D), Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D), Paolo De Castro (S&D), Gianni Pittella (S&D), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Leonardo Domenici (S&D), Lara Comi (PPE), Elisabetta Gardini (PPE), Luigi Berlinguer (S&D) e Francesco De Angelis (S&D)**

(14 febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: Rogatorie rilevanti per il processo sulla strage di Ustica

— A fronte dei fatti occorsi il 27 giugno 1980, quando un DC 9 della compagnia Itavia, in volo da Bologna a Palermo, è stato abbattuto in circostanze non pienamente accertate, causando la morte degli 81 passeggeri;

— considerato che le indagini svolte in questi anni dalla magistratura italiana hanno accertato la presenza di aerei e navi militari di Stati membri e di paesi terzi nell'area al momento dei fatti e che la cooperazione delle rispettive autorità giudiziarie è stata e resta un elemento essenziale per l'accertamento delle responsabilità di questa gravissima strage;

— visto che la cooperazione suddetta è stata in questi anni carente e caratterizzata da reticenze e omissis e che i familiari delle 81 vittime aspettano ancora che sia resa loro pienamente giustizia a 31 anni dai fatti;

— visto che ancora nel 2010 le autorità giudiziarie italiane che indagavano sulla strage di Ustica hanno rivolto richieste di rogatoria alle autorità di tre Stati membri (Francia, Germania e Belgio) e di due paesi terzi (Stati Uniti e Libia) che sono inevase e alcune delle quali non hanno neppure ricevuto risposta formale;

— visto l'articolo 4, paragrafo 3 TUE che vincola gli Stati membri al principio di cooperazione leale tra loro, ancor più alla luce dell'entrata in vigore del Trattato di Lisbona e riguarda anche la cooperazione giudiziaria penale sia tra gli Stati membri sia tra l'Unione e paesi terzi;

— vista la convenzione di cooperazione giudiziaria in materia penale del 2000, che completa una convenzione del Consiglio d'Europa in materia, che tutti gli Stati membri sono tenuti a rispettare;

— visto l'accordo di mutua assistenza giudiziaria tra UE e Stati Uniti, in vigore dal 2009;

Può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se intende verificare che la decisione degli Stati membri in questione di non dare risposta o assistenza alle autorità giudiziarie italiane sia compatibile con il dovuto rispetto dell'articolo 4, paragrafo 3 TUE e delle convenzioni citate;
2. se ritiene che, in base al principio di cooperazione leale, alle autorità italiane sia dovuta piena collaborazione e comunque una risposta motivata, sia essa positiva o negativa;
3. se ritiene che l'accordo di mutua assistenza tra UE e USA in materia giudiziaria penale comporti un dovere per le parti di collaborare e, in particolare, delle autorità americane di dare risposta motivata alle rogatorie italiane, sia essa negativa o positiva?

**Risposta data da Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione***(30 marzo 2012)*

La Commissione è consapevole del caso di Ustica e del fatto che dopo oltre trent'anni le vittime di tale tragedia attendono ancora giustizia. Nel 2011 la Commissione ha presentato un pacchetto generale di misure destinate a rafforzare la tutela delle vittime di reato.

La Commissione si rammarica che l'Italia ed altri due Stati membri non abbiano ratificato la convenzione del 29 maggio 2000 sull'assistenza giudiziaria in materia penale tra gli Stati membri dell'Unione europea, attualmente in vigore e vincolante per 24 Stati membri dell'Unione.

La Commissione monitora l'attuazione dell'accordo sulla mutua assistenza giudiziaria tra l'Unione europea e gli Stati Uniti d'America, entrato in vigore il 1° febbraio 2010, che si aggiunge agli accordi bilaterali esistenti tra l'UE e gli USA; il suo intento è di assistere ed agevolare l'applicazione di disposizioni specifiche dell'accordo stesso.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001796/12  
to the Commission**

**Salvatore Caronna (S&D), David-Maria Sassoli (S&D), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Guido Milana (S&D), Roberto Gualtieri (S&D), Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D), Vittorio Prodi (S&D), Andrea Zannoni (ALDE), Vincenzo Iovine (ALDE), Giommara Uggias (ALDE), Debora Serracchiani (S&D), Silvia Costa (S&D), Rita Borsellino (S&D), Andrea Cozzolino (S&D), Mario Pirillo (S&D), Rosario Crocetta (S&D), Lorenzo Fontana (EFD), Claudio Morganti (EFD), Oreste Rossi (EFD), Gianni Vattimo (ALDE), Francesca Balzani (S&D), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Pino Arlacchi (S&D), Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D), Paolo De Castro (S&D), Gianni Pittella (S&D), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Leonardo Domenici (S&D), Lara Comi (PPE), Elisabetta Gardini (PPE), Luigi Berlinguer (S&D) and Francesco De Angelis (S&D)**

(14 February 2012)

*Subject:* Important letters rogatory for the 'Ustica massacre' trial

— In view of the events that occurred on 27 June 1980, when an Itavia DC 9 flying from Bologna to Palermo was brought down in circumstances which have not been fully established, causing the death of the 81 passengers on board;

— considering that the investigations conducted over the years by the Italian judicial authorities established the presence of military aircraft and vessels from both Member States and third countries in the area at the time of the crash and that the cooperation of the respective judicial authorities was, and remains, vital for determining responsibility for this very serious massacre;

— given that over the years this cooperation has been lacking and characterised by reticence and omissions, and that the families of the 81 victims are still waiting for justice 31 years after the event;

— given that even in 2010, the Italian judicial authorities that had been investigating the Ustica crash sent letters rogatory to the authorities of three Member States (France, Germany and Belgium) and two third countries (United States and Libya), which have not been dealt with, and some of which have not even received a formal reply;

— having regard to Article 4(3) of the Treaty on European Union (TEU), which obliges the Member States to adhere to the principle of sincere cooperation, (even more so in light of the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon), and also concerns judicial cooperation in criminal matters, both between the Member States and between the Union and third countries;

— having regard to the Convention of Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters of 2000, which supplements a similar convention of the Council of Europe, which all Member States are required to respect;

— having regard to the agreement on mutual legal assistance between the EU and the United States, in force since 2009;

can the Commission state:

1. whether it intends to check that the decision of the Member States concerned not to reply to or assist the Italian judicial authorities is compatible with the requirement to comply with Article 4(3) of the Treaty on European Union and with the abovementioned agreements;
2. whether it does not agree that, based on the principle of sincere cooperation, the Italian authorities should be entitled to full cooperation, and in any case to a reasoned reply, whether it be positive or negative;
3. whether it does not believe that the agreement on mutual legal assistance between the EU and the USA in criminal matters includes the duty of the parties to cooperate and, in particular, the duty of the US authorities to provide a reasoned reply to the Italian letters rogatory, whether it be negative or positive?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission***(30 March 2012)*

The Commission is aware of the Ustica case and that, after more than 30 years, the victims of such a tragedy are still awaiting justice. In 2011, the Commission presented a comprehensive package of measures aimed at enhancing protection for victims of crime.

The Commission regrets that Italy and two other Member States did not ratify the Convention of 29 May 2000 on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters between the Member States of the European Union, which is in force and currently binding on 24 EU Member States.

The Commission monitors the implementation of the Agreement on Mutual Legal Assistance between the European Union and the United States of America, which entered into force on 1st February 2010. It adds to the existing bilateral agreements between the EU and US, and aims to provide assistance and ease in applying specific provisions of the Agreement.

---

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

**Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-001797/12**  
**προς την Επιτροπή**  
**Georgios Papastamkos (PPE)**  
(14 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

**Θέμα:** Αναπτυξιακό σχέδιο εξόδου της Ελλάδος από την κρίση

Παρά την διαφαινόμενη ελάφρυνση του ελληνικού δημοσίου χρέους, εξακολουθούν να τίθενται ερωτηματικά ως προς την περαιτέρω βιωσιμότητά του. Οι δραστικές περικοπές για εκατομμύρια πολίτες επ' εσχάτων, μέσω ενός ακόμη προγράμματος σκληρής λιτότητας, εμφανίζονται να μην αρκούν, αλλά βυθίζουν τη χώρα στην ανασφάλεια, στην ανεργία, στην στέρηση αναπτυξιακών κεφαλαίων, αφού η ακολουθούμενη πολιτική στραγγίζει την αγορά και απομακρύνει τους πολίτες από την κατανάλωση. Η ελληνική κοινωνία και οικονομία ευρίσκεται στο επίκεντρο του φαύλου κύκλου λιτότητας-ύφεσης. Κρίσιμα μεγέθη της ελληνικής οικονομίας έχουν επιδεινωθεί δραματικά, παρά τις πρωτοφανείς θυσίες της ελληνικής κοινωνίας. Ως εκ τούτου, η εντροπία του οικονομικού και κατ' επέκταση του πολιτικού συστήματος είναι προ των πυλών.

Στην Ελλάδα ζητείται κατεπειγόντως ανάπτυξη και έξοδος από τον *circulus vitiosus* λιτότητας-ύφεσης. Δύναται η Επιτροπή να με ενημερώσει εάν προτίθεται, πέραν της επιταγής της δημοσιονομικής εξυγίανσης, να επεξεργασθεί ένα ολοκληρωμένο σχέδιο δημιουργικής αναπτυξιακής φυγής προς τα εμπρός για την Ελλάδα, με στοχευμένες αναπτυξιακές παρεμβάσεις με προφανή και μετρήσιμη αναπτυξιακή αξία;

**Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής**  
(22 Μαρτίου 2012)

Απώτερος στόχος του προγράμματος οικονομικής προσαρμογής για την Ελλάδα είναι η αποκατάσταση βιώσιμης ανάπτυξης και απασχόλησης μεσοπρόθεσμα. Με την έννοια αυτή, οι στόχοι του πρώτου και δεύτερου ελληνικού προγράμματος (αποκατάσταση της δημοσιονομικής βιωσιμότητας, διασφάλιση της οικονομικής σταθερότητας και αλλαγή της δομής της ελληνικής οικονομίας μέσω διαρθρωτικών μεταρρυθμίσεων) λειτουργούν για την επίτευξη του απώτερου αυτού στόχου. Η Επιτροπή συμφωνεί με το αξιότιμο μέλος ότι η βιωσιμότητα του δημόσιου χρέους θα διασφαλιστεί μόνο με βιώσιμη και εύρωστη ανάπτυξη.

Το πρόγραμμα προσαρμογής περιλαμβάνει διάφορες διαρθρωτικές πολιτικές για την ενίσχυση της ανάπτυξης με στόχο τον εκσυγχρονισμό του δημόσιου τομέα, την αύξηση της αποτελεσματικότητας και της ευελιξίας των αγορών προϊόντων και εργασίας και τη δημιουργία ενός περισσότερο ανοιχτού και προσβάσιμου επιχειρηματικού περιβάλλοντος για εγχώριους και ξένους επενδυτές. Η καλύτερη απορρόφηση των διαρθρωτικών ταμείων για έργα υποδομής και για τη χρηματοδότηση μικρών και μεσαίων επιχειρήσεων, στην οποία συμβάλλει η Ειδική ομάδα της Επιτροπής για την τεχνική βοήθεια προς την Ελλάδα, θα προωθήσει την οικονομική δραστηριότητα ήδη στο εγγύς μέλλον.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-001797/12  
to the Commission  
Georgios Papastamkos (PPE)  
(14 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Growth plan to help Greece overcome the crisis

Despite the apparent reduction in Greece's public debt, doubts persist over its sustainability. It appears that the drastic cuts forced on millions of citizens recently through yet another harsh austerity plan are not sufficient and instead are plunging the country into insecurity and unemployment, as well as creating a shortage of capital for growth, as the policy chosen is sucking markets dry and preventing citizens from consuming. Greek society and the Greek economy are stuck in a vicious circle of austerity and recession. Crucial sectors of the Greek economy have deteriorated dramatically, despite the unprecedented sacrifices made by Greek society. The collapse of the economy and thus of the political system is on the horizon.

Greece urgently needs to achieve growth and escape this vicious circle of austerity and recession. Can the Commission state whether, leaving aside the dictates of fiscal consolidation, it intends to draw up an integrated and creative plan for Greece to overcome the crisis through growth by means of targeted measures which manifestly and measurably stimulate growth?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission  
(22 March 2012)**

The ultimate objective of economic adjustment programme for Greece is of restoring sustainable growth and job in a medium-term perspective. In that sense the objectives of the first and second Greek programme (restore fiscal sustainability, ensure financial stability and change the structure of the Greek economy through structural reforms) are instrumental for that ultimate goal. The Commission agrees with the Honourable Member that the sustainability of public debt will only be ensured with sustained strong growth.

The adjustment programme does include several growth-enhancing structural policies which aim at modernising the public sector, rendering product and labour markets more efficient and flexible, and creating a more open and accessible business environment for domestic and foreign investors. A better absorption of structural funds for infrastructure projects and financing small and medium-sized enterprises, to which the Commission's taskforce on technical assistance to Greece is contributing, will also contribute to economic activity already in the near term.

---

(České znění)

**Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-001800/12**

**Komisi**

**Jiří Havel (S&D)**

(14. února 2012)

**Předmět:** Přerušení plateb u tří operačních programů ČR (Doprava, Životní prostředí a Regionální OP Severozápad)

Začal 6. (předposlední) rok v rámci současného rozpočtového období (2007-2013). V souvislosti se strukturálními fondy EU projednává EP zprávu Evropského účetního dvora za rok 2010, ze které vyplývá, že ČR patří mezi členské země s nejvyšší chybivostí u předkládaných projektů (spolu se Španělskem a Itálií). Tuto situaci odráží i skutečnost, že Komise (GR Regio) přerušila už v loňském roce platby u 3 operačních programů ČR (Doprava, Životní prostředí a Regionální OP Severozápad).

- Jak Komise hodnotí kroky, které ČR dělá k obnovení plateb v rámci uvedených OP?
- Jaký je reálný stav čerpání ČR ze strukturálních fondů EU u jednotlivých programů?
- Jaké největší problémy má ČR podle Komise při čerpání ze strukturálních fondů EU?
- Jaké kroky musí ČR podle Komise udělat, aby způsobilá čerpání ze strukturálních fondů v přerušovaných OP?
- Do jaké míry je podle Komise reálné riziko, že ČR peníze ze strukturálních fondů nevyčerpá, resp. že o ně v uvedených OP přijde?
- Jsou ohrožené ještě další OP?

**Odpověď Johannese Hahna jménem Komise**

(21. března 2012)

Komise v roce 2011 nepozastavila platby žádnému z českých programů. Zpracovávání dvou žádostí o platby pro program Podnikání a inovace bylo v roce 2011 na základě ustanovení článku 91 nařízení Rady č. 1083/2006<sup>(1)</sup> přerušeno. Toto přerušení bylo v roce 2011 odvoláno a došlo k obnovení plateb.

Ke třem uvedeným programům, jichž se týká položená otázka, zaslala Komise varovné dopisy, ve kterých členský stát informuje, že v případě předložení žádostí by došlo k přerušení plateb. V uvedených dopisech byla rovněž podrobně uvedena opatření, která musí české úřady provést, aby byla varování odvolána.

1., 4. Komise již akceptovala řadu preventivních a nápravných opatření navržených českými úřady, avšak na některých opatřeních je ještě třeba pracovat. České úřady u všech tří programů provádějí následný audit. Odvolání varování a obnovení plateb bude záležet na výsledcích těchto auditů.

2. Měsíční monitorovací zprávu<sup>(2)</sup> Ministerstvo pro místní rozvoj zveřejňuje na adrese:  
[www.strukturalni-fondy.cz/getdoc/9d9a23d0-4d1e-42b3-8414-291de7e247ae/MMZ](http://www.strukturalni-fondy.cz/getdoc/9d9a23d0-4d1e-42b3-8414-291de7e247ae/MMZ)

3. Hlavní nedostatky se týkají fungování řídicích a kontrolních systémů, uplatňování pravidel pro zadávání veřejných zakázek a celkové administrativní kapacity pro realizaci činností ve vztahu k Evropskému strukturálnímu fondu. Další problémy se týkají výběru projektů a politického zasahování do procesu technické realizace projektů.

5., 6. V současné době je z uvedených tří programů pro rok 2012 ohroženo čerpání jen u programu Životní prostředí. Informace o dalších programech jsou uvedeny ve výše zmiňované monitorovací zprávě. Komise monitoruje finanční pokrok a udržuje kontakt s českými úřady s cílem podpory plného čerpání z fondů.

<sup>(1)</sup> Úř. věst. L 210, 31.7.2006.

<sup>(2)</sup> Zahrnuta je analýza stavu pravidla N+3/N+2.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001800/12**  
**to the Commission**  
**Jiří Havel (S&D)**  
(14 February 2012)

*Subject:* Suspension of payments for three Operational Programmes in the Czech Republic (Transport, Environment and Regional OP Northwest)

The sixth and penultimate year of the current budgetary period (2007-13) has commenced. In the context of the EU Structural Funds, Parliament is debating the 2010 report of the European Court of Auditors, which shows that the Czech Republic is one of the Member States with the highest error rates for projects submitted (along with Spain and Italy). This is also borne out by the fact that, in 2011, the Commission (DG Regio) suspended payments for three Operational Programmes (Transport, Environment and Regional OP Northwest).

— How does the Commission evaluate the steps taken by the Czech Republic to restore the payments under the aforementioned Operational Programmes?

— What is the real status of the Czech Republic's absorption of EU Structural Funds for each programme?

— In the Commission's view, what are the biggest problems that the Czech Republic has when absorbing EU Structural Funds?

— What steps should the Czech Republic take, in the Commission's view, in order to make the absorption of structural funds possible under the suspended OPs?

— To what extent does the Commission believe there is a real risk that the Czech Republic will not absorb funds from the aforementioned OPs, or will lose them?

— Are any other Operational Programmes at risk?

**Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission**  
(21 March 2012)

The Commission did not suspend payments to any Czech programmes in 2011. The processing of two claims for the Enterprise and Innovations programme were interrupted in 2011, under the terms of Article 91 of Council Regulation No 1083/2006<sup>(1)</sup>. These interruptions were lifted and payments resumed later in 2011.

For the three programmes mentioned in the question, the Commission sent warning letters informing the Member State that if claims were submitted, they would be interrupted. These letters also detailed actions that the Czech authorities had to carry out in order to lift the warnings.

1, 4. A number of preventive and corrective actions proposed by the Czech authorities have already been accepted by the Commission but some actions still have to be finalised. *Ex-post* audits are being carried out by the Czech authorities for all three programmes. The lifting of the warnings and resuming payments will depend on the results of these audits.

2. The Ministry of Regional Development publishes a monthly monitoring report<sup>(2)</sup>: [www.strukturalni-fondy.cz/getdoc/9d9a23d0-4d1e-42b3-8414-291de7e247ae/MMZ](http://www.strukturalni-fondy.cz/getdoc/9d9a23d0-4d1e-42b3-8414-291de7e247ae/MMZ)

3. The main deficiencies relate to the functioning of the management and control systems, the application of public procurement rules and the overall administrative capacity for Structural Fund implementation. Other problems relate to project selection and to political involvement in the technical implementation process.

5, 6. Currently, of the three programmes, only the Environment programme appears at risk of a possible decommitment of funds in 2012. Information about other programmes can be found in the report mentioned above. The Commission is monitoring financial progress and is in contact with the Czech authorities in order to facilitate the full absorption of funds.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 210, 31.7.2006.

<sup>(2)</sup> Including an analysis of the N+2/3 rule state of play.



(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001801/12**

**an den Rat**

**Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)**

(14. Februar 2012)

*Betrifft:* EDPS-Kontrollbericht

Am 13. Februar 2012 präsentierte der Europäische Datenschutzbeauftragte (EDPS) einen Kontrollbericht, der die Umsetzung und Einhaltung der Leitlinien zur Videoüberwachung (Video-Surveillance Guidelines) vom 17. März 2010 in den Organen der Europäischen Union und ihren Einrichtungen darstellt.

1. Hat der Rat die Vorgaben, welche in den Leitlinien zur Videoüberwachung vom 17. März 2010 festgeschrieben sind, bereits vollständig umgesetzt? Wenn nicht, warum nicht?
2. Warum überschreitet der Rat die in den Leitlinien vorgesehene Speicherdauer der Aufnahmen von sieben Tagen?
3. Welche Gründe führt der Rat an, die eine Speicherung der Daten für eine Dauer von einem Monat nötig machen?
4. Stellt der Rat die notwendigen Informationen bezüglich seiner Überwachungsstrategie öffentlich zur Verfügung? Wenn ja, wo kann man diese einsehen? Wenn nein, warum werden die entsprechenden Informationen nicht bereitgestellt?
5. Führt der Rat eine Folgenabschätzung in Bezug auf eine mögliche Verletzung der Privatsphäre durch? Wenn ja, wo ist diese veröffentlicht, und inwieweit fließt diese in die Überwachungsstrategie ein? Wenn nein, wieso nicht?

Um Verwaltungslasten zu reduzieren, wurden diese Fragen in einer Anfrage zusammengefasst und die einzelnen Fragen mit einer laufenden Nummer versehen. Der Fragesteller ersucht höflich, die einzelnen Fragen unter Anführung der jeweiligen Nummerierung zu beantworten.

**Antwort**

(12. April 2012)

Die Politik des Generalsekretariats des Rates für den Einsatz von Videosystemen zielt darauf ab, die Sicherheit von Mitgliedern des Rates, Bediensteten, Delegierten und anderen Besuchern sowie seiner Gebäude, Vermögenswerte und Informationen zu gewährleisten. Diese Politik entspricht den Leitlinien des Europäischen Datenschutzbeauftragten (EDSB) vom 17. März 2010. Die Anbringung neuer Piktogramme, mit denen — deutlicher angelehnt an die Leitlinien des EDSB — auf die Verwendung von Video-Überwachungsanlagen auf dem Gelände und in den Räumlichkeiten des Rates hingewiesen wird, steht seitens des Ratssekretariats kurz vor dem Abschluss.

Die Verlängerung der in den Leitlinien des EDSB vorgesehenen Speicherfrist von sieben Tagen wurde beschlossen, weil die Erfahrung gezeigt hat, dass diese nicht ausreicht, um folgende Situationen zu berücksichtigen:

- a) die Verzögerung, die zwischen der Meldung eines Vergehens oder einer Straftat und der richterlichen Weisung an die Ermittler, verfügbare Video-Aufzeichnungen anzufordern, entstehen könnte;
- b) bereits eingetretene Vorfälle, bei denen ein Sachschaden (etwa ein Fahrraddiebstahl) erst nach Rückkehr des Besitzers von einer Auslandsmission festgestellt werden kann;
- c) schwere Sicherheitsvorfälle, die in der Regel eine eingehendere und ausführlichere Analyse der Daten erfordern.

In diesem Zusammenhang ist anzumerken, dass in Belgien (dem Gastland) wie in anderen Mitgliedstaaten eine Speicherfrist von dreißig Tagen vorgesehen ist.

Das Videoüberwachungskonzept ist auf der Website des Rates veröffentlicht. Zwecks Information der Öffentlichkeit wurden Faltblätter gedruckt, die in Kürze verteilt werden können. Darüber hinaus wurden ein Verfahren und ein Instrument für die Aufzeichnung und Beantwortung von diesbezüglichen Anfragen entwickelt.

Das Generalsekretariat des Rates beabsichtigt, eine Folgenabschätzung im Hinblick auf vermeintliche Verletzungen der Privatsphäre im Zusammenhang mit seinem Videoüberwachungs-konzept durchzuführen. Sobald diese abgeschlossen ist, können die Ergebnisse vom Datenschutz-beauftragten des Generalsekretariats des Rates (bzw. vom EDSB) und vom Internen Auditdienst eingesehen werden.

---

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001801/12  
to the Council**

**Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)**

(14 February 2012)

*Subject:* European Data Protection Supervisor's inspection report

On 13 February 2012, the European Data Protection Supervisor (EDPS) presented an inspection report outlining the implementation of and compliance with the Video-Surveillance Guidelines of 17 March 2010 in institutions of the European Union and their offices.

1. Has the Council fully implemented the stipulations set down in the Video-Surveillance Guidelines of 17 March 2010? If not, why not?
2. Why does the Council exceed the seven-day retention period for recordings set down in the guidelines?
3. What reasons does the Council offer for why it is necessary to retain data for a period of one month?
4. Does the Council allow public access to the necessary information in relation to its surveillance strategy? If so, where can this be found? If not, why is the relevant information not made available?
5. Is the Council conducting an impact assessment in relation to a possible invasion of privacy? If so, where is this published and to what extent is it incorporated in the surveillance strategy? If not, why not?

In order to reduce administrative effort, these queries have been framed within one question and have been numbered successively. The author of the question politely requests that the individual queries should be answered with reference to their number.

**Reply**

(12 April 2012)

The Council Secretariat applies a policy on the use of video systems aimed at ensuring the security and safety of Council members, staff, delegates and other visitors, as well as of its buildings, assets and information. This policy complies with the guidelines issued on 17 March 2010 by the European Data Protection Supervisor (EDPS). The Council Secretariat is currently finalising the installation of new pictograms indicating Closed-Circuit Television (CCTV) use on Council premises, more in line with EDPS guidelines.

It was decided to exceed the seven-day retention period for recordings set down in the EDPS guidelines because experience has shown that this does not provide enough time to take into account:

- a) the delay that may exist between the reporting of a misdemeanour or crime and a magistrate's decision to instruct investigators to request available CCTV data;
- b) incidents that have occurred where damage to property can only be established by the owner upon return from missions abroad (e.g. bicycle thefts);
- c) serious security incidents which normally require a more in-depth and extensive analysis of data.

In this context, it should be observed that Belgium (the host State) applies a thirty-day retention rule, as do other Member States.

The video protection policy is published on the Council's Internet site. Information 'flyers' have been produced and will shortly be made available to help respond to any inquiries from the public. In addition, a procedure and tool for recording and responding to such inquiries has been developed.

The Council Secretariat is planning to conduct an impact assessment study related to any perceived invasion of privacy in the context of its video protection policy. Once concluded, the results will be available for consultation by the Council Secretariat's Data Protection Officer (or the EDPS, as appropriate) and the Internal Audit Service.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001802/12**  
**an die Kommission**  
**Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)**  
(14. Februar 2012)

Betrifft: EDPS-Kontrollbericht

Am 13. Februar 2012 präsentierte der Europäische Datenschutzbeauftragte (EDPS) einen Kontrollbericht, der die Umsetzung und Einhaltung der Leitlinien zur Videoüberwachung (Video-Surveillance Guidelines) vom 17. März 2010 in den Organen der Europäischen Union und ihren Einrichtungen darstellt.

1. Hat die Kommission die Vorgaben, welche in den Leitlinien zur Videoüberwachung vom 17. März 2010 festgeschrieben sind, bereits vollständig umgesetzt? Wenn nicht, warum nicht?
2. Warum überschreitet die Kommission die in den Leitlinien vorgesehene Speicherdauer der Aufnahmen von sieben Tagen?
3. Welche Gründe führt die Kommission an, die eine Speicherung der Daten für eine Dauer von einem Monat nötig machen?
4. Stellt die Kommission die notwendigen Informationen bezüglich ihrer Überwachungsstrategie öffentlich zur Verfügung? Wenn ja, wo kann man diese einsehen? Wenn nein, warum werden die entsprechenden Informationen nicht bereitgestellt?
5. Führt die Kommission eine Folgenabschätzung in Bezug auf eine mögliche Verletzung der Privatsphäre durch? Wenn ja, wo ist diese veröffentlicht, und inwieweit fließt diese in die Überwachungsstrategie ein? Wenn nein, wieso nicht?

Um Verwaltungslasten zu reduzieren, wurden diese Fragen in einer Anfrage zusammengefasst und die einzelnen Fragen mit einer laufenden Nummer versehen. Der Fragesteller ersucht höflich, die einzelnen Fragen unter Anführung der jeweiligen Nummerierung zu beantworten.

**Antwort von Herrn Šeřčovič im Namen der Kommission**  
(30. April 2012)

1. Die Kommission hatte bereits vor der Veröffentlichung der Leitlinien des EDSB für Videoüberwachung im März 2010 die erforderlichen Schritte unternommen, um die Einhaltung der Datenschutzbestimmungen zu gewährleisten. So wurde dem EDSB 2007 z. B. der Einsatz von Videoüberwachungstechnik ordnungsgemäß mitgeteilt. Zudem konzentriert sich die Kommission auf die Feinabstimmung ihrer Videoüberwachungsstrategie und führt eine Folgenabschätzung bezüglich ihrer Videoüberwachungs-ausrüstung durch.

2. Die Erfahrung hat gezeigt, dass die Kommission bei einer Speicherdauer von sieben Tagen in der Praxis nicht imstande wäre, die in den Rechtsvorschriften und Bestimmungen der Europäischen Union oder der Mitgliedstaaten festgelegten gesetzlichen und administrativen Anforderungen, insbesondere in Bezug auf strafrechtliche Ermittlungen oder Verwaltungsuntersuchungen bei sicherheitsrelevanten Zwischenfällen, zu erfüllen.

Die Kommission wendet bezüglich des Zugangs zu Videoüberwachungsaufnahmen strenge Verfahren an. Dieser Zugang ist nur einer begrenzten Zahl von ordnungsgemäß bevollmächtigten und beauftragten Bediensteten und ausschließlich in dem für die Durchführung von strafrechtlichen Ermittlungen oder Verwaltungsuntersuchungen erforderlichen Maße gestattet.

3. Eine Speicherdauer von einem Monat stellt einen akzeptablen Kompromiss zwischen den Bedenken bezüglich des Schutzes personenbezogener Daten und den Erfordernissen für eine zeitnahe und effektive Durchführung von Ermittlungen bei sicherheitsrelevanten Zwischenfällen dar.

4. Die Kommission informiert die Öffentlichkeit auf verschiedene Arten, unter anderem durch (mehrsprachige und mit Piktogrammen versehene) Informationstafeln und Plakate an den Eingängen ihrer Gebäude oder durch entsprechende Informationen auf ihren Intranet- und Internetseiten<sup>(1)</sup>.

5. Gemäß den Empfehlungen des EDSB vom letzten Jahr führt die Kommission derzeit eine Folgenabschätzung bezüglich der Verwendung von Videoüberwachungs-ausrüstung durch.

(1) Siehe z. B.: [http://ec.europa.eu/contact/docs/cctv\\_ds\\_de.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/contact/docs/cctv_ds_de.pdf)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001802/12  
to the Commission**

**Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)**

(14 February 2012)

*Subject:* European Data Protection Supervisor's inspection report

On 13 February 2012, the European Data Protection Supervisor (EDPS) presented an inspection report outlining the implementation of and compliance with the Video-Surveillance Guidelines of 17 March 2010 in institutions of the European Union and their offices.

1. Has the Commission fully implemented the stipulations set down in the Video-Surveillance Guidelines of 17 March 2010? If not, why not?
2. Why does the Commission exceed the seven-day retention period for recordings set down in the guidelines?
3. What reasons does the Commission offer for why it is necessary to retain data for a period of one month?
4. Does the Commission allow public access to the necessary information in relation to its surveillance strategy? If so, where can this be found? If not, why is the relevant information not made available?
5. Is the Commission conducting an impact assessment in relation to a possible invasion of privacy? If so, where is this published and to what extent is it incorporated in the surveillance strategy? If not, why not?

In order to reduce administrative effort, these queries have been framed within one question and have been numbered successively. The author of the question politely requests that the individual queries should be answered with reference to their number.

**Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission**

(30 April 2012)

1. The Commission had already taken the necessary steps to ensure compliance with data protection rules before the EDPS Video-Surveillance Guidelines were issued in March 2010. For instance, the use of video-surveillance techniques was duly notified to the EDPS in 2007. Furthermore, the Commission is focusing on finetuning its video-surveillance policy and conducting an impact assessment regarding its video-surveillance equipment.

2. Experience has shown that a seven-day retention period would make it operationally impossible for the Commission to fulfil the legal and administrative requirements, laid down in European Union or Member States laws and regulations, in particular as concerns judiciary or administrative enquiries into safety and security incidents.

The Commission follows strict procedures for access to video-surveillance recordings, which is only allowed for a limited number of duly authorised and mandated staff and exclusively to the extent needed for conducting judiciary or administrative inquiries.

3. A retention period of one month strikes the right balance between personal data protection concerns and the needs related to conducting inquiries into security incidents in a timely and effective manner.

4. The Commission informs the public through a combination of measures, including information boards or posters (in several languages and using pictograms) at the entrance of its premises and information posted on its intranet and Internet sites <sup>(1)</sup>.

5. Further to last year's recommendations of the EDPS, the Commission is in the process of conducting an impact assessment concerning the use of video-surveillance equipment.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Cf. for instance [http://ec.europa.eu/contact/docs/cctv\\_ds\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/contact/docs/cctv_ds_en.pdf)

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001803/12**

**an die Kommission**

**Hermann Winkler (PPE)**

(14. Februar 2012)

*Betrifft:* Potenzielle Revision der Richtlinie 2008/50/EG über Luftqualität und saubere Luft für Europa — mangelnde Effizienz von Maßnahmen wie den Umweltzonen bei der Umsetzung

Bei der Umsetzung der oben genannten Richtlinie ergeben sich seit Jahren in vielen Mitgliedstaaten offensichtlich zahlreiche Schwierigkeiten. Allein im Jahr 2010 gab es 22 Vertragsverletzungsverfahren wegen der Verletzung der PM<sub>10</sub>-Werte.

In meiner Heimat Deutschland wurden im Zuge dieser Richtlinie sogenannte „Umweltzonen“ in den Städten eingerichtet. In diese dürfen nur noch Autos mit bestimmten Abgaswerten fahren, was vor allem für Gewerbetreibende weitreichende Auswirkungen hatte. Nach einigen Monaten bzw. stellenweise auch einigen Jahren der Erprobung muss ich feststellen, dass diese Zonen keineswegs zur Verbesserung der Luftqualität führten. So veröffentlichte das Bundesumweltamt erst jüngst Ergebnisse, nach denen sich die Luftqualität in Deutschland 2011 nicht verbessert hat. In vielen Städten können die Grenzwerte trotz intensiver Bemühungen nicht eingehalten werden. So haben bundesweit 42 % aller Messstationen an mehr als 35 Tagen zu hohe Emissionswerte angezeigt. In einigen Städten, wie z. B. Leipzig oder Düsseldorf, sind seit der Einführung der Umweltzone sogar erhöhte Werte gemessen worden.

Mir ist durchaus bewusst, dass Umweltzonen keine direkte Vorgabe der EU sind, denn spezielle Instrumente werden in der Richtlinie nicht vorgegeben. Jedoch ergibt sich aus den vielen Vertragsverletzungsverfahren, die die Kommission in den letzten Jahren angestrengt hat, dass dieses Problem durchaus kein deutschlandspezifisches ist. Im „28. Jahresbericht über die Kontrolle der Anwendung des EU-Rechts“ für 2010 schreibt die Kommission, dass sie mit weiteren Anträgen zur Fristverlängerung der Mitgliedstaaten in Bezug auf die Einhaltung der Richtlinie sowie weiteren Vertragsverletzungsverfahren rechnet, wie dies im Jahre 2011 ja dann auch geschehen ist. Vor diesem Hintergrund sehe ich das Ziel und die Inhalte dieser Richtlinie als gescheitert an.

Welche Schlussfolgerungen zieht die Kommission aus dem oben geschilderten Sachverhalt? Wann und in welcher Form ist mit Änderungen der Richtlinie zu rechnen?

**Antwort von Herrn Potočnik im Namen der Kommission**

(28. März 2012)

Die Kommission räumt ein, dass einige Mitgliedstaaten nach wie vor Schwierigkeiten haben, die in der Richtlinie festgelegten Grenzwerte einzuhalten. Die Gesundheit der Bevölkerung ist jedoch ernst zu nehmen, und die derzeitige gesundheitliche Lage zeigt, dass weitere Maßnahmen notwendig sind. Die verbleibenden Probleme betreffen häufig ganz spezifische Gebiete und nicht so sehr landesweite Überschreitungsfälle. Die Kommission hat zur Unterstützung der Mitgliedstaaten eine Reihe von Maßnahmen getroffen (wie Leitlinien, Workshops), und sie hat sich bereits verpflichtet, die Zusammenarbeit mit den Mitgliedstaaten zu verstärken und die EU-Vorschriften über Verschmutzungsquellen gegebenenfalls zu ändern (siehe Arbeitspapier der Kommissionsdienststellen — Umsetzung der EU-Politik auf dem Gebiet der Luftqualität und Vorbereitung einer umfassenden Überprüfung <sup>(1)</sup>).

Die Kommission hat eine umfassende Überprüfung der EU-Politik auf dem Gebiet der Luftqualität eingeleitet, die 2013 abgeschlossen werden soll. Die Überarbeitung konzentriert sich unter anderem auf die Aktualisierung der wissenschaftlichen Grundlage für die gesundheitlichen und ökologischen Auswirkungen und wird gegebenenfalls neue Vorschläge und die Überarbeitung bestehender Vorschläge zur Folge haben. Weitere Informationen finden sich auf der diesem Thema gewidmeten Website und in der öffentlich zugänglichen CIRCA-Bibliothek: [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/air/review\\_air\\_policy.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/air/review_air_policy.htm).

<sup>(1)</sup> SEK(2011)342.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001803/12  
to the Commission**

**Hermann Winkler (PPE)**

(14 February 2012)

*Subject:* Potential revision of Directive 2008/50/EC on ambient air quality and cleaner air for Europe/lack of efficiency in the implementation of measures such as low emission zones

Many Member States have obviously experienced numerous difficulties in compliance with the aforementioned Directive for several years. In 2010 alone there were 22 infringement procedures because PM<sub>10</sub> values were not adhered to.

In my own country, Germany, so-called 'low emission zones' have been established in urban areas as a result of this directive. These zones may only be used by cars with particular exhaust emission values, something that has had far-reaching effects for businesses in particular. After trials lasting several months and, in some cases, years, I find that these zones have not led to any improvement in air quality. The German Environmental Protection Agency recently published results that show that air quality in Germany did not improve in 2011. Many cities find it impossible to comply with the limit values, despite intensive efforts. Thus, 42 % of all measuring stations throughout Germany indicated excessive emission values on more than 35 days. In some cities, such as Leipzig or Düsseldorf, the values measured have actually gone up since the introduction of the low emission zones.

I am well aware that low emission zones are not a direct requirement of the EU because these special instruments are not prescribed in the directive. Nonetheless, the numerous infringement procedures pursued by the Commission in recent years show that this problem is not specific to Germany. In the '28th Annual report on monitoring the application of EC law' for 2010, the Commission writes that it expects more applications from Member States for extensions to the deadline for compliance with the directive and more infringement procedures, as proved to be the case in 2011. In this context, I regard the objective and substance of this directive as a failure.

What conclusions does the Commission draw from the matter outlined above? When can we expect changes to the directive and what form will these take?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission**

(28 March 2012)

The Commission acknowledges that a number of Member States are still facing difficulties in meeting the limit values laid down in the directive. However, public health is a serious concern and the current health evidence continues to point to the need to go further. The remaining problems are often related to very specific zones rather than country-wide exceedance situations. To help Member States, the Commission has provided a number of support activities (e.g. guidelines, workshops) and has already committed itself to re-enforce cooperation with Member States and, where necessary, to amend EU legislation on pollution sources (see the Commission Staff Working Paper on the implementation of EU Air Quality Policy and preparing for its comprehensive review <sup>(1)</sup>).

The Commission has launched a comprehensive review of the EU air quality policies to be completed in 2013. The review will focus, *inter alia*, on updating the scientific basis on health and environment impacts, and will come forward with new proposals and revisions to existing proposals as required. More information can be found on the dedicated website and related CIRCA library publicly available at:  
[http://ec.europa.eu/environment/air/review\\_air\\_policy.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/air/review_air_policy.htm)

---

<sup>(1)</sup> SEC(2011) 342.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001804/12**  
**to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**  
**William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)**  
 (14 February 2012)

*Subject:* VP/HR — EU delegations

What is the total staff budget for all EU delegations worldwide?

Does the High Representative plan to increase the staff budget in the future?

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

1. The European External Action Service (EEAS) budget for the delegations in 2012 is EUR 298.8 million, of which salaries:

EEAS officials	EUR 97.9 million
Local Agents	EUR 43.5 million
Contract Agents	EUR 15.6 million
Junior Experts/Detached National Experts	EUR 4.3 million
Temporary/Agency Staff	EUR 1.0 million
Total	EUR 162.3 million

The remainder of the budget is devoted to the administrative costs for this staff including infrastructure costs: share of rent of delegations, housing, security costs, informatics, missions, training and other administrative costs.

The figures do not include the staff in delegations financed by the Commission where the total for delegations is EUR 184.3 million which includes salaries as follows:

Commission officials	EUR 103.2 million
Local Agents	EUR 6.1 million
Contract Agents	EUR 0.5 million
Junior Experts/Detached National Experts	EUR 3.5 million
Temporary/Agency Staff	EUR 0.1 million
Total	EUR 113.4 million

The remainder of the Commission Heading V budget is devoted to the administrative costs for this staff including share of rent of delegations, housing, security costs, informatics, missions, training and all other administrative costs.

The Commission employs local and contract agents which are financed under the administrative credits of operational programmes and by the European Development Fund (EDF), the local costs of which are managed on behalf of the Commission by the EEAS. In 2012, the Commission will pay EUR 184.0 million to the EEAS to finance all local costs of this staff (including salaries, infrastructure costs share of rent of delegations, housing, security costs, missions and training). This does not include the salaries of the Commission contract agents financed by these programmes which are paid directly by the Commission at Headquarters (EUR 84.0 million).

2. The staff resources of the institutions are set by the Budget Authority in the context of the annual budget procedure.



*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-001805/12  
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)  
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)  
(14 February 2012)**

*Subject:* VP/HR — EU delegations

How many people does the EU employ at its delegations worldwide?

Does the High Representative plan to increase the number of staff in the future?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission  
(10 May 2012)**

There are 5 806 persons currently employed in the EU Delegations worldwide, of which 3 746 are Commission staff and 2 060 are European External Action Service (EEAS) staff.

The staff resources of the institutions are set by the budget authority in the annual budget procedure. The 2012 EEAS budget foresees 20 additional establishment plan posts (AD) for the Delegations, as well as the possibility to redeploy up to 20 more posts from headquarters to the Delegations, all in the last quarter of the year. On the Commission side, some redeployments between delegations are envisaged to better match local presence with the actual workload in each delegation.

\_\_\_\_\_

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001806/12  
à la Commission**

**Franck Proust (PPE) et Alain Cadec (PPE)**

(14 février 2012)

*Objet:* Régimes d'aide aux entreprises et fonds structurels

Des progrès considérables sont au programme de la prochaine politique régionale européenne. L'Union compte faire une priorité du développement des territoires par la croissance économique et l'appui à l'innovation et aux PME.

Afin d'éviter toute distorsion de concurrence, la Commission a mis en place depuis longtemps un encadrement des subventions publiques allouées aux entreprises et autres activités privées.

La législation, autant européenne que française, de la plupart de ces régimes d'aides d'État, exemptés ou notifiés, doit arriver à échéance en 2013 ou 2014.

De nombreux acteurs de terrain que nous rencontrons se posent une question très pratique. Ils ont compris les grands objectifs de la prochaine politique de cohésion et commencent déjà à réfléchir aux projets. Mais ils n'ont pas en leur possession le cadre légal d'attribution des fonds. Cela devient très problématique.

1. La Commission prévoit-elle d'ouvrir bientôt le débat sur la révision de ces règlements? Dans l'affirmative, quel en serait le calendrier?
2. Le cas échéant, la Commission peut-elle énoncer avec exhaustivité les régimes qui vont être révisés?
3. La Commission peut-elle préciser si les régimes d'aides publiques vont évoluer en profondeur? Le cas échéant, quelle en sera l'incidence sur l'attribution des fonds européens?

**Réponse donnée par M. Almunia au nom de la Commission**

(30 mars 2012)

1. La Commission entend procéder au réexamen de plusieurs instruments d'aide d'État qui arrivent à expiration en 2013. Ce faisant, elle agira en toute transparence, notamment en consultant les parties intéressées. En ce qui concerne les lignes directrices pour les aides d'État à finalité régionale, ce réexamen est déjà en cours. Un questionnaire public a été publié <sup>(1)</sup> et une consultation publique est prévue ultérieurement concernant le projet de nouvelles lignes directrices. L'adoption des cartes des aides à finalité régionale étant une condition préalable à l'application des règles énoncées dans ces nouvelles lignes directrices, la Commission adoptera celles-ci de façon à permettre la notification et l'approbation desdites cartes en temps voulu.

Les lignes directrices relatives au transport maritime font déjà l'objet d'une consultation <sup>(2)</sup>. Une consultation publique portant sur un questionnaire relatif à la révision des règles en matière d'aides d'État applicables à la recherche, au développement et à l'innovation (RDI) <sup>(3)</sup> a également été organisée.

2. Les instruments d'aide d'État de l'UE proprement dits ne déterminent pas les régimes d'aides, mais définissent des règles de portée générale applicables à ceux-ci. Ces règles étant réexaminées, tous les régimes entrant dans leur champ d'application seront eux aussi affectés.

3. Ces réexamens ne sont pas encore suffisamment avancés pour que l'on puisse déterminer si des modifications substantielles seront apportées aux règles générales applicables aux régimes. Il n'est donc pas encore possible non plus de se prononcer quant à leur incidence sur la répartition des ressources de l'UE. Au cours du processus de réexamen, la Commission consultera les parties intéressées en toute transparence.

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/competition/consultations/2012\\_regional\\_stateaid/index\\_en.html](http://ec.europa.eu/competition/consultations/2012_regional_stateaid/index_en.html)

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/competition/consultations/2012\\_maritime\\_transport/index\\_en.html](http://ec.europa.eu/competition/consultations/2012_maritime_transport/index_en.html)

<sup>(3)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/competition/consultations/2012\\_stateaid\\_rdi/index\\_en.html](http://ec.europa.eu/competition/consultations/2012_stateaid_rdi/index_en.html)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001806/12  
to the Commission**

**Franck Proust (PPE) and Alain Cadec (PPE)**

(14 February 2012)

*Subject:* Aid schemes for businesses and Structural Funds

Substantial progress is on agenda for the EU's Regional Policy in the forthcoming period. The EU intends to make development of the regions a priority through economic growth and support for innovation and SMEs.

In order to avoid any distortion of competition, the Commission has long had in place a framework for public subsidies allocated to businesses and other private activities.

Both European and the French legislation governing the majority of these State-aid schemes, whether exempted or notified, is due to expire in 2013 or 2014.

Many stakeholders of our acquaintance raise a very practical issue. They have understood the main objectives of the forthcoming cohesion policy and have already started thinking about projects. However they do not have the legal framework for the allocation of funds. This is becoming very problematic.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Does it plan to open up the debate on the revision of these regulations in the near future? If so, what is the proposed timeline?
2. Can it, where appropriate, comprehensively list the schemes which will be revised?
3. Can it specify whether the public aid schemes will change substantively? If so, what will be the impact on the allocation of EU funds?

**Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission**

(30 March 2012)

1. The Commission intends to carry out revisions for a number of state aid instruments due to expire in 2013 in full transparency, including through consultation of stakeholders. For the Regional Aid Guidelines ('RAG'), the review is already ongoing and a public questionnaire has been published <sup>(1)</sup>, while a public consultation on the draft new RAG is planned later. Since the adoption of regional aid maps is a precondition for the application of the new RAG rules, the Commission will adopt the new RAG to allow for notification and approval of maps in due time.

A consultation on the maritime guidelines is also ongoing <sup>(2)</sup>. Likewise, there has been a public consultation on a questionnaire on the review of the state aid rules for research, development and innovation (R & D&I) <sup>(3)</sup>.

2. EU state aid instruments do not themselves determine the aid schemes but rather lay down general rules applicable to schemes. To the extent these general rules are reviewed, all schemes falling under them would be equally affected.

3. The review exercises are not sufficiently mature yet to determine whether substantive changes to general rules applicable to schemes will be carried out, therefore the impact on the allocation of EU funds cannot yet be determined either. During the review process the Commission will consult stakeholders in a transparent way.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/competition/consultations/2012\\_regional\\_stateaid/index\\_en.html](http://ec.europa.eu/competition/consultations/2012_regional_stateaid/index_en.html)

<sup>(2)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/competition/consultations/2012\\_maritime\\_transport/index\\_en.html](http://ec.europa.eu/competition/consultations/2012_maritime_transport/index_en.html)

<sup>(3)</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/competition/consultations/2012\\_stateaid\\_rdi/index\\_en.html](http://ec.europa.eu/competition/consultations/2012_stateaid_rdi/index_en.html)

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001807/12  
alla Commissione  
Matteo Salvini (EFD)  
(14 febbraio 2012)**

Oggetto: Informazioni in merito al cambio della valuta nazionale — euro

Con l'art. 26 del D.L. 201/2011, del 6.12.2011, convertito il 22.12.2011 nella legge n. 214, l'attuale governo italiano ha soppresso il diritto, garantito dalla legge, di poter cambiare le lire in euro. È stata infatti abrogata la legge n. 96 del 7 aprile 1997 che garantiva la possibilità di poter cambiare le lire in euro fino al 29 febbraio 2012.

Inoltre, il decreto in questione è entrato in vigore immediatamente e non dopo 15 giorni dalla pubblicazione sulla Gazzetta Ufficiale, come invece avviene nell'iter legislativo ordinario. Così facendo molti italiani hanno perso la possibilità di cambiare le lire che avevano conservato rimettendoci parecchio denaro.

Può la Commissione far sapere che cosa dispone la legge negli altri Stati membri in merito al cambio tra valuta nazionale e euro?

**Risposta data da Olli Rehn a nome della Commissione  
(10 aprile 2012)**

In Germania, Spagna, Irlanda e Austria le banconote e le monete nazionali possono essere cambiate in euro per un tempo indeterminato.

In Belgio non è prevista alcuna scadenza per cambiare le banconote nazionali. Per le monete belghe, il termine per il cambio è scaduto alla fine del 2004. In Grecia il termine per il cambio di banconote è scaduto il 1° marzo 2012 mentre per le monete il termine è scaduto il 1° marzo 2004.

In Francia i termini per cambiare le banconote e le monete sono scaduti rispettivamente il 17 febbraio 2012 e il 17 febbraio 2005. In Lussemburgo il cambio delle banconote è a tempo indeterminato mentre le monete non possono più essere cambiate dalla fine del 2004. Nei Paesi Bassi le banconote possono essere cambiate fino al 1° gennaio 2032 e le monete si potevano cambiare fino al 1° gennaio 2007. In Portogallo sarà possibile cambiare le banconote fino al 30 dicembre 2022 mentre il termine per il cambio delle monete è scaduto il 30 dicembre 2002. In Finlandia sia le banconote che le monete potevano essere cambiate fino al 29 febbraio 2012.

In Slovenia le monete in tolar potranno essere cambiate fino al 31 dicembre 2016 mentre le banconote in tolar possono essere cambiate a tempo indeterminato. Le banconote maltesi della quinta serie possono tuttora essere cambiate, fino al 31 gennaio 2018, alla Banca centrale di Malta senza alcun costo aggiuntivo. Le monete maltesi si potevano cambiare fino al 1° febbraio 2010.

La Banca centrale di Cipro cambierà fino alla fine del 2017 le banconote in sterline cipriote senza il pagamento di commissioni. Le sterline cipriote in monete non possono più essere cambiate dalla fine del 2009. Per le banconote slovacche non è prevista alcuna scadenza mentre per le monete slovacche il termine scade il 31 dicembre 2013. Tuttavia, per le monete commemorative slovacche non è prevista alcuna scadenza.

Il cambio e la vendita delle monete in corone estoni destinate alla circolazione sono cessati.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001807/12  
to the Commission  
Matteo Salvini (EFD)  
(14 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Information relating to the exchange of national currency for the euro

In Article 26 of Legislative Decree 201/2011 of 6 December 2011, transposed into Law No 214 on 22 December 2011, the current Italian Government abolished the right, guaranteed by law, to change lira into euro, by repealing Law No 96 of 7 April 1997, which provided the opportunity to change lira into euro until 29 February 2012.

Moreover, the decree in question came into force immediately, and not 15 days after publication in the Official Gazette, as is the case under the ordinary legislative procedure. As a result, many Italians have missed their chance to change the lira they had kept, thereby losing a great deal of money.

Can the Commission state what legal provisions have been made in other Member States with regard to exchanging national currency for the euro?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission  
(10 April 2012)**

In Germany, Spain, Ireland and Austria national banknotes and coins can be exchanged for euro indefinitely.

In Belgium, there is no limit of time for exchanging Belgian banknotes. For Belgian coins, the exchanging period expired end-2004. Greece allows the exchange of banknotes until 1 March 2012 while for coins the deadline expired on 1 March 2004.

In France, the deadlines for exchanging banknotes and coins expired on 17 February 2012 and 17 February 2005, respectively. In Luxembourg the period for exchanging banknotes is unlimited while coins cannot be exchanged anymore since end-2004. In the Netherlands banknotes can be exchanged until 1 January 2032 and coins were exchangeable until 1 January 2007. In Portugal the period for exchanging banknotes runs until 30 December 2022 while the last date for the exchanging of coins was 30 December 2002. In Finland both banknotes and coins can be exchanged until 29 February 2012.

Slovene tolar coins can be exchanged until 31 December 2016 while tolar banknotes can be exchanged in perpetuity. Maltese banknotes of the 5th Series can still be exchanged at the Central Bank of Malta, without any additional cost, until 31 January 2018. Maltese coins remained exchangeable until 1 February 2010.

The Central Bank of Cyprus will, until the end of 2017 and without any charges, exchange Cyprus pound banknotes. The Cyprus pound coins ceased to be exchangeable as from the end of 2009. No time limit applies for Slovak banknotes while for Slovak coins the period runs until 31 December 2013. However, for commemorative Slovak coins no time limit applies.

Exchange and sale of Estonian kroon circulation coins has been discontinued.

---

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001808/12  
aan de Commissie  
Barry Madlener (NI)  
(14 februari 2012)**

*Betref:* Spanje sjoemelt met financieringstekort

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht <sup>(1)</sup> „EU to punish Spain for deficits, inaction“?
2. Kan de Commissie bevestigen dat Spanje inderdaad gesjoemeld heeft met begrotingscijfers en bezuinigingsmaatregelen heeft uitgesteld tot na de regionale verkiezingen?
3. Wat vindt de Commissie van deze gang van zaken van de Spaanse regering en wat gaat de Commissie hiertegen ondernemen?

**Antwoord van de heer Rehn namens de Commissie  
(25 april 2012)**

De Europese Commissie is op de hoogte van het bericht waar het geachte Parlementslid naar verwijst, maar kan de inhoud ervan niet bevestigen.

Op 27 februari 2012 heeft de Spaanse regering de eerste resultaten van de uitvoering van de begroting voor 2011 bekendgemaakt en aangegeven dat het overheidstekort voor 2011 naar verwachting uiteindelijk zal uitkomen op ongeveer 8,5 % van het BBP. Om deze ontsporing gedeeltelijk te compenseren, heeft de regering op 30 december 2011 een reeks maatregelen genomen waardoor het tekort met meer dan 15 miljard EUR zal worden teruggebracht. De uiteindelijke tekortcijfers voor 2011 zullen bekend zijn zodra Spanje eind maart de BTP-kennisgeving heeft ingediend en de gegevens vervolgens door Eurostat zijn gevalideerd.

De aanzienlijke overschrijding bij de uitvoering van de begroting voor 2011 vergt een grotere consolidatie-inspanning in 2012. De Eurogroep heeft tijdens de bijeenkomst op 12 maart 2012 de toezegging verwelkomd van de Spaanse regering om de termijn van 2013 te halen voor de correctie van het buitensporige tekort. Tevens steunt de Eurogroep het voornemen van de Spaanse overheid om de begroting voor 2012 zo snel mogelijk aan te nemen. Deze voorziet in een aanzienlijke consolidatie-inspanning en welomschreven maatregelen die waarborgen dat deze correctie op alle overheidsniveaus op een geloofwaardige en duurzame manier wordt toegepast. Volgens de Eurogroep zou de tijdige correctie van het buitensporige tekort worden gewaarborgd door een extra vroegtijdige inspanning ter grootte van 0,5 % van het BBP, bovenop de maatregelen die al door de Spaanse overheid zijn aangekondigd, en door een snelle goedkeuring en strikte toepassing van de in de wet inzake begrotingsstabiliteit vastgelegde nieuwe mechanismen met betrekking tot het toezicht en de controle op de naleving van de begroting op de verschillende overheidsniveaus. De Spaanse regering heeft zich bereid verklaard hiermee rekening te houden in het verdere begrotingsproces.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/02/14/us-eu-spain-deficit-idUSTRE81D0LG20120214>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001808/12  
to the Commission  
Barry Madlener (NI)  
(14 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Spain falsifies its deficit figures

1. Is the Commission familiar with the report <sup>(1)</sup> 'EU to punish Spain for deficits, inaction'?
2. Can the Commission confirm that Spain has indeed falsified budget figures and delayed austerity measures until after the regional elections?
3. What view does the Commission take of the Spanish Government's actions and what is it going to do about this?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission  
(25 April 2012)**

The European Commission is aware of the report mentioned by the Honourable Member, but cannot confirm the information contained therein.

On 27 February 2012, the Spanish Government announced first results for the 2011 budget execution, indicating that it expects the 2011 general government deficit to have reached around 8.5 % of GDP. In order to partially compensate for this slippage, the government adopted on 30 December 2011 a set of deficit-reducing measures amounting to over EUR 15 billion. The final deficit figures for 2011 will be known after the submission of the EDP notification by Spain at the end of March and the validation of the data by Eurostat.

The sizable overrun in the budget execution of 2011 requires a larger consolidation effort in 2012. During its meeting on 12 March 2012, the Eurogroup welcomed the commitment of the Spanish Government to meet the 2013 deadline for the correction of the excessive deficit. It also supported the Spanish authorities' resolve to adopt the 2012 budget as soon as possible, containing a substantial consolidation effort, which is backed-up with well-specified measures ensuring that this correction is credible and sustainable at all levels of government. The Eurogroup assesses that the timely correction of the excessive deficit should be ensured by an additional frontloaded effort of the order of 0.5 % of GDP, beyond what has already been announced by the Spanish authorities so far, and by an early adoption and strict implementation of the new mechanisms in the Budget Stability Law on the monitoring and control of budget compliance at different levels of government. The Spanish Government expressed its readiness to consider this in the further budgetary process.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/02/14/us-eu-spain-deficit-idUSTRE81D0LG20120214>.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001809/12  
do Komisji**

**Tadeusz Cymański (EFD) oraz Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)**

(14 lutego 2012 r.)

*Przedmiot:* Jednolita sieć transportowa (TEN-T)

Komisja Europejska opublikowała w grudniu 2011 r. wniosek w sprawie rozporządzenia zawierającego ramowe założenia tworzenia w Europie jednolitej sieci transportowej (TEN-T). Rozwiązanie to ma na celu integrację różnych typów infrastruktury transportowej w jedną sieć. W ramach instrumentu „Łącząc Europę” KE przewidziała blisko 32 mld euro na rozwój infrastruktury transportowej w latach 2014-2020.

Jednocześnie na podstawie art. 50 wniosku w sprawie rozporządzenia Komisja przygotowała wstępną listę dziesięciu projektów korytarzy transeuropejskich, które będą traktowane priorytetowo podczas dystrybucji środków z ww. instrumentu. Na pierwszym miejscu listy znalazł się kluczowy dla połączenia Morza Bałtyckiego z basenem Morza Śródziemnego i Kanałem Sueskim projekt korytarza Bałtyk-Adriatyk.

W obecnej sytuacji kryzysu gospodarczego prawdopodobna wydaje się sytuacja, w której dany kraj członkowski na pewien czas wstrzyma realizację inwestycji infrastrukturalnych na wielką skalę. W tej sytuacji właściwe władze krajowe czy samorządowe tego państwa nie złożą wniosków o dofinansowanie projektów związanych z budową korytarzy transeuropejskich. Mogą jednak, po zmianie sytuacji ekonomicznej, być gotowe do realizacji zwiększonej liczby projektów, o ile pula środków ww. instrumentu nie zostanie wcześniej wyczerpana.

— Zwracam się więc do Komisji z pytaniem, jak Komisja planuje zapewnić sprawiedliwy dostęp do środków instrumentu „Łącząc Europę” dla wszystkich krajów członkowskich?

— Czy Komisja planuje zabezpieczenie proporcjonalnej puli środków instrumentu finansowego dla poszczególnych krajów członkowskich na okres całej wieloletniej perspektywy finansowej 2014-2020?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wiceprzewodniczącego Siima Kallasa w imieniu Komisji**

(28 marca 2012 r.)

W rozporządzeniu dotyczącym instrumentu „Łącząc Europę” <sup>(1)</sup>, którego projekt Komisja Europejska przedstawiła wraz ze zmienionymi wytycznymi dla transeuropejskiej sieci transportowej (TEN-T) <sup>(2)</sup> dnia 19 października 2011 r., wskazano pewne priorytetowe cele finansowania europejskiej infrastruktury transportowej, w tym listę dziesięciu projektów korytarzy sieci bazowej TEN-T.

Wybór wniosków w ramach tego instrumentu w drodze zaproszeń do składania ofert nie oznacza przydziału środków na zasadzie „kto pierwszy, ten lepszy”. Oznacza to raczej, że spełnione muszą być pewne kryteria – dojrzałości, jakości, wartości dodanej dla UE. Wartość dodana obejmuje element rozmieszczenia geograficznego – wspieranie projektów tylko w niektórych państwach członkowskich nie leży w interesie Komisji, nawet jeśli średnio poziom dojrzałości lub jakości projektów w niektórych z tych państw członkowskich jest wyższy. Celem Komisji jest budowa sieci transeuropejskiej we wszystkich państwach członkowskich, w tym we wszystkich państwach objętych Funduszem Spójności.

Ponadto, aby zagwarantować, że państwa członkowskie objęte Funduszem Spójności będą mogły czerpać pełne korzyści z realizacji celów instrumentu „Łącząc Europę”, zarezerwowano kwotę 10 mld EUR na specjalne traktowanie tych państw w zakresie stawek współfinansowania, koncentrując się równocześnie na projektach o dużej wartości dodanej dla UE i stosując procedurę zaproszenia do składania wniosków, która okazała się skuteczna w ramach obecnej TEN-T.

Ogłaszane będą specjalne zaproszenia dotyczące projektów związanych z realizacją sieci bazowej wyłącznie w państwach członkowskich uprawnionych do korzystania z Funduszu Spójności, zwłaszcza dotyczące realizacji projektów wymienionych w załączniku. W trakcie realizacji tych zaproszeń największy możliwy priorytet nadaje się projektom odpowiadającym alokacjom krajowym w ramach Funduszu Spójności.

<sup>(1)</sup> COM (2011) 665 wersja ostateczna.

<sup>(2)</sup> COM (2011) 650 wersja ostateczna.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001809/12  
to the Commission  
Tadeusz Cymański (EFD) and Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)  
(14 February 2012)**

*Subject:* A single transport network (TEN-T)

In December 2011 the Commission published a proposal for a regulation containing a framework for the creation of a single European transport network (TEN-T). The aim is to integrate different types of transport infrastructure into single network. The Commission has earmarked nearly EUR 32 billion for the development of transport infrastructure between 2014 and 2020 as part of the Connecting Europe Facility.

Furthermore, in line with Article 50 of the proposal for a regulation, the Commission has prepared a preliminary list of 10 trans-European corridor projects that will be given priority when the funds for the Connecting Europe Facility are being allocated. At the head of the list is the key project for connecting the Baltic Sea with the Mediterranean basin and the Suez Canal: the Baltic-Adriatic Corridor.

In the current economic crisis, some Member States could well suspend investment in large-scale infrastructure projects for certain periods of time. If this occurs, the relevant national or local authorities in the Member State concerned will not make any applications for co-financing of projects connected with the construction of trans-European corridors. Once the economic situation changes, however, they may be prepared to increase the number of projects if the funding earmarked for the Connecting Europe Facility is not exhausted beforehand.

— How is the Commission planning to guarantee fair access to the Connecting Europe Facility for all Member States?

— Is the Commission planning to guarantee proportional funding from the financial instrument for individual Member States throughout the multiannual financial perspective for 2014-2020?

**Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission  
(28 March 2012)**

In the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) regulation <sup>(1)</sup> proposed on 19 October 2011 by the European Commission together with the revised Guidelines for the Trans-European Network (TEN-T) <sup>(2)</sup>, the Commission has identified some priorities for the financing of the European transport infrastructure, including a list of projects on the 10 corridors of the Core Network of the TEN-T.

Competition with the calls for proposals under the CEF does not mean 'first come — first served'. Rather, it means that certain criteria — maturity, quality and EU added value — need to be fulfilled. EU added value includes the element of geographical distribution: it is not in the Commission interest to support projects in only some of the Member States, even if on average the maturity and/or quality of projects in certain of these Member States is comparatively higher. The goal of the Commission is to build a trans-European network in all Member States, including in all Cohesion Member States.

Moreover, in order to ensure that Cohesion Member States can fully benefit of the objectives of the Connecting Europe, EUR 10 billion have been ring-fenced to ensure a specific treatment regarding co-funding rates for Cohesion Member States, while ensuring the focus on projects of high EU added value and using the procedure of calls for proposals which proved successful under the current TEN-T

Specific calls shall be launched for projects implementing the core network exclusively in Member States eligible for funding from the Cohesion Fund, in particular to realise the projects listed in the annex. When implementing these calls, greatest possible priority shall be given to projects respecting the national allocations under the Cohesion Fund.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2011) 665 final.

<sup>(2)</sup> COM(2011) 650 final.

(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001810/12  
adresată Comisiei**

**Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**

(14 februarie 2012)

*Subiect:* Acțiuni xenofobe în Olanda

Site-ul Partidului Libertății (PVV) din Olanda îndeamnă cetățenii olandezi să semnaleze „dificultățile” pe care le întâmpină din cauza aflului de imigranți din Europa de Est, respectiv dacă se află în situația de a-și fi pierdut locul de muncă în fața unui polonez, bulgar, român sau alt est-european etc. Comisia este rugată să exprime un punct de vedere oficial cu privire la această acțiune xenofobă.

**Răspuns dat de dna Reding în numele Comisiei**

(20 aprilie 2012)

Comisia dorește să aducă în atenția distinsului membru declarația făcută în cadrul dezbaterii din ședința plenară din 13 martie 2012 <sup>(1)</sup>. Comisia sprijină pe deplin rezoluția comună adoptată de Parlamentul European la 15 martie 2012 <sup>(2)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=CRE&reference=20120313&secondRef=ITEM-012&language=EN>.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P7-TA-2012-0087+0+DOC+XML+V0//RO>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001810/12  
to the Commission  
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)  
(14 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Acts of xenophobia in The Netherlands

The Dutch Freedom Party (PVV) website is urging Dutch citizens to flag up 'the difficulties' they are facing due to the influx of Eastern European immigrants, and whether they find themselves in a situation in which they have lost their job to a Polish, Bulgarian, Romanian or any other Eastern European citizen. Would the Commission be willing to express a formal position on this act of xenophobia?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission  
(20 April 2012)**

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to the statement made in the plenary debate on 13 March 2012 <sup>(1)</sup>. The Commission fully supports the joint resolution adopted by the European Parliament on 15 March 2012 <sup>(2)</sup>.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=CRE&reference=20120313&secondRef=ITEM-012&language=EN>.

<sup>(2)</sup> <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P7-TA-2012-0087+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN&language=EN>.

(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001811/12**  
**adresată Comisiei**  
**Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**  
(14 februarie 2012)

*Subiect:* Redirecționarea unor fonduri pentru dezvoltare rurală

În urma reuniunii neoficiale a Consiliului European din ianuarie 2012, președintele Barroso a propus ca statele membre să redirecționeze fondurile încă nealocate în cadrul fondurilor structurale și de coeziune ale UE către susținerea IMM-urilor și combaterea șomajului în rândul tinerilor. Comisia este rugată să precizeze dacă ar putea avea în vedere inițiative asemănătoare în privința fondurilor pentru dezvoltare rurală, având în vedere mai ales necesitatea sprijinirii celor două domenii menționate în mediul rural.

**Răspuns dat de dl Cioloș în numele Comisiei**  
(28 martie 2012)

Fondul european agricol pentru dezvoltare rurală (FEADR) nu este inclus în propunerea formulată de președintele Barroso cu ocazia summitului informal al Consiliului European din ianuarie 2012. Aceasta se datorează în principal faptului că o parte importantă a fondurilor programate de statele membre pentru perioada 2007 — 2013 au fost deja plătite beneficiarilor finali sau alocate unor acțiuni sau proiecte deja aprobate. Trebuie subliniat că o parte importantă a acestor fonduri este deja destinată sprijinirii IMM-urilor din zonele rurale și contribuie la combaterea șomajului în rândul tinerilor.

---

*(English version)*

**Question for written answer E-001811/12  
to the Commission**

**Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**

*(14 February 2012)*

*Subject:* Redirection of funds for rural development

Following the January 2012 informal summit of the European Council, President Barroso has proposed that Member States redirect the funds that have not yet been allocated from the EU Structural and Cohesion Funds towards supporting SMEs and fighting youth unemployment. Can the Commission specify whether it might envisage similar initiatives in the case of the rural development funds, with particular regard to the need to ensure support in the two aforementioned areas in the rural environment?

**Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission**

*(28 March 2012)*

The European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) is not included in the President Barroso's proposal to the January 2012 informal summit of the European Council. This is mainly because an important part of the funds programmed by the Member States for the period 2007-2013 have already been paid to final beneficiaries or allocated to actions or projects already approved. To be noted that a substantial part of these funds are already targeted to supporting SMEs in rural areas, and have an effect on fighting youth unemployment.

---

(българска версия)

**Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-001812/12**

**до Комисията**

**Ивайло Калфин (S&D)**

(15 февруари 2012 г.)

*Относно:* Инициатива на Комисията за оказване на помощ на държавите членки с висока безработица сред младежите

В края на януари Комисията обяви план за оказване на помощ на осемте държави членки с най-висока безработица сред младежите. Съгласно описаното, планът ще помогне на тези държави да въведат конкретни мерки за борба с проблема, като използват неусвоените средства от структурните фондове и от Кохезионния фонд за бюджетния период 2007-2013 г.

Във връзка с това бих желал да помоля Комисията да предостави разяснения относно тази инициатива, както следва:

Какви критерии е използвала Комисията при определяне на осемте държави членки, с които да работи срещу безработицата сред младежите?

Защо осем? Съществува ли възможност тази инициатива да се приложи спрямо всички държави членки, в които безработицата сред младежите надвишава средната стойност за ЕС (22 % от работната сила)?

Какъв подход ще възприеме Комисията във връзка с неразпределените суми за структурно финансиране? Някои държави вече са изчерпали наличните кохезионни средства, докато други все още разполагат със значителни суми за разпределяне.

Какви мерки ще предложи Комисията на осемте държави членки за борба с безработицата сред младежите? Биха ли могли други държави членки с високи равнища на безработица сред младежите да приложат сходни мерки?

Планира ли Комисията да предложи намаляване на изискванията за национално съфинансиране на проектите, като по този начин стимулира МСП и заетостта сред младежите?

Каква е времевата рамка на ангажимента на Комисията по този въпрос спрямо държавите, които отговарят на изискванията?

Кой член на Комисията ще отговаря за предлагането и изпълнението на мерките във връзка с инициативата на г-н Барозу?

**Отговор, даден от г-н Андор от името на Комисията**

(20 март 2012 г.)

Инициативата „Възможности за младежта“<sup>(1)</sup> се отнася за ЕС и за всички държави-членки. Комисията има готовност да предостави подкрепа на всяка държава-членка при изготвянето и изпълнението на мерките за младежка заетост. В съответствие с подкрепата на инициативата от страна на Европейския съвет, обаче, беше даден приоритет на осемте държави-членки с най-висок коефициент на младежка безработица<sup>(2)</sup>

Решението относно това кои от посочените в инициативите мерки да бъдат взети предвид и как ресурсите от структурните фондове на ЕС, които все още са налични в съответните държави-членки, да бъдат използвани по-ефективно за финансирането на мерките, ще зависи от националната ситуация. Осемте екипа за действие ще проучат съвместно с представители на националната администрация начините за ускоряване на съществуващите програми или за тяхното разширяване с цел да обхванат повече безработни младежи чрез увеличаване на бюджета или включване на допълнителни целеви групи.

Комисията ще предостави цялата необходима помощ за повторно планиране на неразпределените ресурси от структурните фондове. Въпреки че няма конкретни договорености относно съфинансирането при мерките за младежка заетост, държавите-членки в най-тежко бюджетно положение имат право на по-висока ставка на съфинансиране (до 95 %) за цялото подпомагане по структурните фондове.

При инициативата се прилага интегриран тематичен подход, който обхваща различни портфейли на Комисията, и по-специално заетостта, образованието и регионалната политика. Основната отговорност за изпълнението на мерките ще носят държавите-членки. Комисията и държавите-членки ще докладват за резултатите по време на Европейския съвет.

<sup>(1)</sup> Вж. Съобщение на Комисията „Инициатива Възможности за младежта“ (COM(2011) окончателен от 20 декември 2011 г.).

<sup>(2)</sup> Коефициенти на младежката безработица (на лица между 15 и 24 години) (ноември 2011 г.): ES: 49,6 %; EL: 46,6 %; SK: 35,1 %; LT: 31,1 %; PT: 30,7 %; IT: 30,1 %; LV: 29,9 %; IE: 29,3 % (източник: Евростат).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001812/12  
to the Commission  
Ivailo Kalfin (S&D)  
(15 February 2012)**

*Subject:* Commission initiative to assist Member States with high youth unemployment

At the end of January the Commission announced a plan to assist the eight Member States with the highest youth unemployment. As described, it will help them to introduce specific measures to combat the problem by using unspent structural and cohesion funds for the 2007-2013 budget period.

In this regard I would like to ask the Commission for a clarification of this initiative as follows:

What were the criteria used by the Commission to identify the eight Member States to work with to combat youth unemployment?

Why eight? Would it be possible to apply this initiative to all the Member States where youth unemployment exceeds the EU average (22 % of the labour force)?

What will be the Commission's approach in relation to the amounts of structural funding which remain unallocated? Some countries have already exhausted the cohesion funding available, while others still have considerable amounts to allocate.

What are the measures that the Commission will propose to the eight Member States to combat youth unemployment? Could other Member States with high youth unemployment rates apply similar measures?

Does the Commission plan to propose a decrease in the requirements for national co-financing of projects, stimulating SMEs and youth employment?

What is the time frame for the Commission's engagement with the eligible countries on this issue?

Which Commissioner will be in charge of proposing and implementing the measures relating to Mr Barroso's initiative?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission  
(20 March 2012)**

The Youth Opportunities Initiative <sup>(1)</sup> (YOI) concerns the EU and all Member States. The Commission is ready to provide each Member State with support in designing and delivering youth employment measures. However, following the European Council's endorsement of the YOI, the eight Member States with the highest youth unemployment rates have been given priority <sup>(2)</sup>.

Deciding what measures should given consideration among those recommended in the YOI and how to use EU Structural Fund resources still available in those Member States more effectively to fund them will depend on the national situation. Together with national officials, the eight action teams will explore ways of speeding up existing programmes or extending them to cover more young unemployed by increasing the budget or involving additional target groups.

The Commission will provide any help necessary in reprogramming unallocated Structural Fund resources. Although there is no specific co-financing arrangement for youth employment measures, Member States in the most difficult budgetary situation are entitled to a higher rate of co-financing (up to 95 %) for all Structural Fund assistance.

The YOI applies an integrated thematic approach covering various Commission portfolios, and in particular employment, education and regional policy. The national authorities will have the main responsibility for implementing the measures. The Commission and Member States will report on the results in the European Council.

<sup>(1)</sup> See Commission communication 'Youth Opportunities Initiative' (COM(2011) 933 final of 20 December 2011).

<sup>(2)</sup> Youth (15-24) unemployment rates in November 2011: ES: 49.6 %; EL: 46.6 %; SK: 35.1 %; LT: 31.1 %; PT: 30.7 %; IT: 30.1 %; LV: 29.9 %; IE: 29.3 % (source: Eurostat).

(българска версия)

**Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-001813/12**

**до Комисията**

**Евгени Кирилов (S&D)**

(15 февруари 2012 г.)

*Относно:* Максимално допустими разходи за трудово възнаграждение за България по програма „Учене през целия живот“ за 2012 г.

В своето Ръководство за програмата „Учене през целия живот“ за 2012 г. Европейската комисия е приела максимален размер на дневното трудово възнаграждение за участниците в проекти по програмата, което в случая на България води до двойно намаляване на ставките спрямо 2011 г. и до двойно намаляване спрямо най-ниските ставки, приложими за други участващи държави от ЕС и извън ЕС. Това поставя българските научни кадри в крайно неизгодно положение в случай на тяхно включване в съвместен проект и вече е довело до протести от български научни институции и до отказ от участието им в проекти по тази програма.

1. Може ли Комисията да обясни и подробно да обоснове как се е стигнало до това драстично намаляване на ставките за България за 2012 г., при положение че не при всички държави има намаляване и при нито една то не е наполовина спрямо 2011 г.?

2. С оглед на целите на програмата на ЕС „Учене през целия живот“, какво е становището на Комисията за възможността те да бъдат постигнати, при положение че има отказ от участие на български научни кадри поради неравностойно третиране спрямо останалите участници? Счита ли Комисията, че има несъвършенства в настоящата регулаторна рамка за тази програма и смята ли да предложи изменения за тяхното преодоляване в бъдеще?

**Отговор, даден от г-жа Василиу от името на Комисията**

(28 март 2012 г.)

В съответствие с Финансовия регламент в годишната работна програма за 2012 г. по Програмата за обучение през целия живот се актуализират еднократните суми и фиксираните суми за дългосрочен задграничен престой, свързани с дневните разходи и дневните разходи за персонал за участващите държави. При тази актуализация се вземат под внимание данни от Евростат и националните статистически служби, за да се осигури надеждност и последователност.

По отношение на дневните разходи за персонал актуализацията се основава на резултатите от статистическо проучване на пазара на труда, проведено през 2011 г. Една и съща процедура се прилага за всички участващи държави в Програмата за обучение през целия живот.

Комитетът на програмата даде положително становище за тези фиксирани суми на 3 май 2011 г.

Тъй като основен резултат на въпросното актуализиране е намаляването на максимално допустимите дневни фиксирани суми за персонал за България, които са по-високи от реалните разходи за персонал, които възникват за участниците в програмата, становището на Комисията е, че потенциалното отрицателно въздействие върху изпълнението на Програмата за обучение през целия живот в България ще бъде ограничено.



(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001813/12  
to the Commission**

**Evgeni Kirilov (S&D)**

(15 February 2012)

*Subject:* Maximum permissible expenditure on remuneration under the 'Lifelong Learning' Programme for 2012 in the case of Bulgaria

In its manual for the 'Lifelong Learning' Programme for 2012, the Commission adopted a maximum per diem rate of remuneration for participants in projects under the programme, which in Bulgaria's case has resulted in a halving of the rates in comparison to 2011 and a halving of the rates in relation to the lowest rates applicable to other participating EU and non-EU Member States. This puts Bulgarian researchers included in joint projects at an extreme disadvantage, and has already sparked protests by Bulgarian research institutions and led to their refusing to participate in projects under this programme.

1. Can the Commission explain and justify in detail this drastic reduction in the rates for Bulgaria for 2012, given the fact that the reduction does not apply to all countries and that the rates have not been halved in comparison to 2011 for any other country?
2. What is the Commission's view on the possibility of achieving the goals of the EU's 'Lifelong Learning' Programme, given the fact that Bulgarian researchers are refusing to take part in it because they are being placed at a disadvantage compared to other participants in the programme? Does the Commission consider there to be imperfections in the programme's current regulatory framework and does it intend to propose amendments to overcome these in the future?

**Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission**

(28 March 2012)

In compliance with the Financial Regulation, the 2012 Annual Work Programme for the Lifelong Learning Programme (LLP) updates the lump sums and flat-rates for long-term transnational stays regarding subsistence costs and daily staff costs for participating countries. This update takes account of data from Eurostat and national statistical offices to ensure reliability and coherence.

As regards daily staff costs, the update is based on the results of a statistical study of the labour market conducted in 2011. The same procedure is applied to all LLP participating countries.

The LLP Committee gave a favourable opinion to these rates on 3 May 2011.

As the update in question resulted mainly in the reduction of the maximum allowable daily staff rates for Bulgaria which are higher than the real staff costs actually arising for Programme participants, the Commission's view is that the potential negative impact on the implementation of LLP in Bulgaria will be limited.

(Verzjoni Maltija)

**Mistoqsija ghal twegiba bil-miktub E-001815/12**  
**lill-Kummissjoni**  
**Louis Grech (S&D)**  
(15 ta' Frar 2012)

Suġġett: It-traġedja tal-Costa Concordia

L-incident reċenti tal-Costa Concordia huwa prova li minkejja l-avvanzi fit-teknoloġija tat-trasport marittimu u l-miżuri implimentati fil-qasam tas-saħha u s-sikurezza fir-rigward tal-persuni abbord bastimenti kbar, xorta għadhom jeżistu nuqqasijiet fis-sistema.

Matul is-snin, l-UE hadet ċerti passi sabiex tiżgura li l-passiġġieri abbord bastimenti kbar ikunu provduti b'salvagwardji u protezzjoni adegwati. Eżempju ta' dan hi d-Direttiva 2011/15/UE, li temenda d-Direttiva 2002/59/KE u tistabbilixxi sistema għall-monitoraġġ u l-informazzjoni dwar it-traffiku tal-bastimenti fil-Komunità. Din id-Direttiva tobbliga lill-Istati Membri sabiex iwettqu kontrolli fuq it-thaddim tas-sistemi ta' informazzjoni tagħhom u biex jintroduċu pieni finanzjarji sabiex jiskoraġġixxu n-nuqqas ta' konformità mar-rekwiżiti tagħha fir-rigward tal-ġarr ta' tagħmir. Barra minn hekk, għandu jkun hemm kooperazzjoni bejn il-Kummissjoni u l-Istati Membri tal-UE, immirata lejn l-iżvilupp eventwali ta' sistema Ewropea ta' monitoraġġ, kontroll u informazzjoni għat-traffiku marittimu.

Il-Kummissjoni tinsab kuntenta bil-mod li bih din id-Direttiva qed tiġi implimentata mill-Istati Membri?

Il-Kummissjoni bihsiebha tfassal miżuri godda u mtejba li jissalvagwardjaw u jippreparaw ahjar lill-passiġġieri abbord bastimenti kbar f'każ ta' emerġenza?

**Twegiba mogħtija mis-Sur Siim Kallas fisem il-Kummissjoni**  
(14 ta' Marzu 2012)

1. Skont id-Direttiva tal-UE 2002/59/KE li tistabbilixxi Sistema għall-Monitoraġġ u l-Infurmazzjoni dwar it-Traffiku tal-Bastimenti fil-Komunità <sup>(1)</sup>, il-bastimenti kollha tal-passiġġieri fil-portijiet tal-UE huma meħtieġa jkunu mghammra b'sistema ta' identifikazzjoni awtomatika (AIS) li tippermetti lill-istati kostali jagħmlu monitoraġġ tal-bastimenti tul il-kosta tagħhom. Filwaqt li l-infurzar tal-liġi tal-UE huwa r-responsabbiltà tal-Istati Membri, il-Kummissjoni tikkontrolla l-implimentazzjoni tagħha. F'dan il-kuntest, il-Kummissjoni allokat lill-Agenzija Ewropea għas-Sigurtà Marittima (EMSA) il-kompitu li twestaq żjarat ta' spezzjoni lill-Istati Membri sabiex tagħmel monitoraġġ tal-implimentazzjoni tad-Direttiva 2009/59/KE. Tittiehed azzjoni xierqa ta' segwitu mill-Kummissjoni wara li jsiru dawn l-ispezzjonijiet. F'termini tal-effettività u l-implimentazzjoni tad-Direttiva 2002/59/KE, il-Kummissjoni fl-2011 harġet Rapport lill-Parlament u lill-Kunsill Ewropew li jivvaluta l-implimentazzjoni u l-impatt tal-miżuri meħuda u <sup>(2)</sup> tesprimi impressjoni ġeneralment pożittiva tal-implimentazzjoni tad-Direttiva mill-Istati Membri.

2. Il-Kummissjoni se tkompli bir-reviżjoni tagħha li għaddeja bħalissa tal-leġislazzjoni eżistenti dwar is-sigurtà tal-bastimenti tal-passiġġieri tal-UE, li bdiet fl-2010. Minbarra l-aġġornament tal-leġislazzjoni dwar il-bastimenti domestiċi tal-passiġġieri, il-Kummissjoni beħsiebha thares lejn kwistjonijiet kritiċi bħall-istabbiltà tal-bastimenti wara ħsara, l-istandards operazzjonali tas-sigurtà, il-mezzi ta' evakwazzjoni u proċeduri relatati, it-taħriġ tal-ekwipaġġ u l-komunikazzjoni mal-passiġġieri. F'dan il-kuntest, se tqis ukoll is-sejbiet tal-investigazzjoni li għaddeja dwar il-"Costa Concordia", meta dawn ikunu disponibbli, u tiddeċiedi dwar inizjattivi addizzjonali kif xieraq. Il-Kummissjoni bihsiebha ssewwi approċċ doppju mal-Organizzazzjoni Marittima Internazzjonali (IMO) dwar dan is-suġġett.

<sup>(1)</sup> ĠUL 208, 5.8.2002.

<sup>(2)</sup> (COM(2011) 232 finali 28,4.2011).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001815/12  
to the Commission  
Louis Grech (S&D)  
(15 February 2012)**

*Subject:* The *Costa Concordia* tragedy

The recent *Costa Concordia* incident is proof that despite advances in shipping technology and measures employed in terms of health and safety with regards to persons on board large ships, gaps still persist in the system.

Over the years the EU has taken steps to ensure that passengers on board large sea vessels are provided with adequate safeguards and protection. Directive 2011/15/EU, which amends Directive 2002/59/EC and establishes the Community Vessel Traffic Monitoring and Information system, is a case in point. This directive obliges Member States to make regular checks on the operation of their information systems and to introduce financial penalties to act as a deterrent against failure to comply with its requirements with regard to the carrying of equipment. In addition, there must be cooperation between the Commission and Member States, geared towards the future development of the European monitoring, control and information system for maritime traffic.

Is the Commission satisfied with the way this directive is being implemented by Member States?

Does the Commission intend to map out new and improved measures which will better safeguard and equip passengers aboard large ships in the eventuality of an emergency?

**Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission  
(14 March 2012)**

1. Under the EU Directive 2002/59/EC establishing a Community Vessel Traffic Monitoring and Information System <sup>(1)</sup>, all passenger ships calling at EU ports are required to be fitted with an automatic identification system (AIS) which allows coastal states to monitor ships along their coast. While the enforcement of EC law is the responsibility of Member States, the Commission control its actual implementation. In this context, the Commission has assigned to the European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA) the task of conducting inspection visits to the Member States in order to monitor the implementation of Directive 2002/59/EC. Appropriate follow up action is taken by the Commission further to these inspections. In terms of effectiveness and implementation of Directive 2002/59/EC, the Commission issued in 2011 a Report to the European Parliament and the Council assessing the implementation and the impact of the measures taken <sup>(2)</sup> expressing a generally positive impression of the implementation of the directive by Member States.

2. The Commission will continue with its ongoing review of the existing EU passenger ship safety legislation, which started in 2010. In addition to the update of legislation on domestic passenger ships, the Commission intends to look at critical issues such as ship stability after damage, operational safety standards, means of evacuation and related procedures, crew training and communication with passengers. In this context, it will also take into account the findings of the ongoing investigation on the *Costa Concordia*, when available, and decide additional initiatives as appropriate. The Commission plans to follow a twin-track approach with the International Maritime Organisation (IMO) on this subject.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ L 208, 5.8.2002.

<sup>(2)</sup> (COM(2011) 232 final, 28.4.2011).





## ABONNEMENTSPRISER 2013 (ekskl. moms, inkl. normale forsendelsesomkostninger)

EU-Tidende, L- + C-udgaven, kun papirudgave	22 officielle EU-sprog	1 300 EUR pr. år
EU-Tidende, L- + C-udgaven, papirudgave + årlig dvd	22 officielle EU-sprog	1 420 EUR pr. år
EU-Tidende, L-udgaven, kun papirudgave	22 officielle EU-sprog	910 EUR pr. år
EU-Tidende, L- + C-udgaven, månedlig kumulativ dvd	22 officielle EU-sprog	100 EUR pr. år
Supplement til EUT (S-udgaven), udbud og offentlige kontrakter, dvd, 1 udgave pr. uge	Flersproget: 23 officielle EU-sprog	200 EUR pr. år
EU-Tidende, C-udgaven — udvælgelsesprøver	Sprog iht. udvælgelsesprøve(r)	50 EUR pr. år

*Den Europæiske Unions Tidende*, der udkommer på EU's officielle sprog, fås i abonnement i 22 sprogudgaver. EU-Tidende omfatter L-udgaven (retsforskrifter) og C-udgaven (meddelelser og oplysninger).

Der abonneres særskilt på hver sprogudgave.

I henhold til Rådets forordning (EF) nr. 920/2005, offentliggjort i EU-Tidende L 156 af 18. juni 2005, er Den Europæiske Unions institutioner midlertidigt fritaget for forpligtelsen til at udarbejde og offentliggøre alle retsakter på irsk. Irske udgaver af EU-Tidende vil derfor blive markedsført særskilt.

Abonnementet på supplementet til EU-Tidende (S-udgaven (udbud og offentlige kontrakter)) omfatter alle udgaver på de 23 officielle sprog på én dvd.

Abonnenter på *Den Europæiske Unions Tidende* kan uden ekstra omkostninger rekvirere eksemplarer af diverse bilag til EU-Tidende (C ... A-udgaver). Abonnenterne gøres opmærksom på udgivelsen af bilagene ved hjælp af »meddelelser til læserne« i *Den Europæiske Unions Tidende*.

## Salg og abonnementer

Betalingsabonnementer på diverse tidsskrifter, som f.eks. *Den Europæiske Unions Tidende*, kan købes gennem vore salgsganter. Listen over salgsganterne findes på internettet:

[http://publications.europa.eu/others/agents/index\\_da.htm](http://publications.europa.eu/others/agents/index_da.htm)

**EUR-Lex (<http://eur-lex.europa.eu>) giver direkte og gratis adgang til EU-retten. Via dette netsted kan man konsultere *Den Europæiske Unions Tidende*, og netstedet indeholder endvidere traktaterne, retsforskrifter, retspraksis og forberedende retsakter.**

**Yderligere oplysninger om Den Europæiske Union findes på: <http://europa.eu>**

