

It should be noted that under the terms of the Commission's decision approving the aid, the combined total shipbuilding capacity of all the yards involved was limited to 210 000 compensated gross registered tonnes (cgrt) for a period of 10 years. The Astano yard formerly had a shipbuilding capacity of 135 000 cgrt. Against that background it is very difficult to see under what circumstances the restrictions on Astano's activities could be relaxed.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 27 E, 29.1.2000, p. 66.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ C 170 E, 20.6.2000, p. 141.

---

(2000/C 280 E/202)

**WRITTEN QUESTION E-0097/00**

**by Camilo Nogueira Román (Verts/ALE) to the Commission**

(26 January 2000)

*Subject:* Involvement of the Spanish Autonomous Communities in Union institutions

In answer to my general question on the above subject tabled on 12 October 1999 (E-1823/99) <sup>(1)</sup>, the Commission indicated on 25 November 1999 that, under Article 203 (former Article 146) of the EC Treaty, Member States were permitted to choose their representatives in the Council according to their specific circumstances.

The Spanish Government has recently refused to allow the Autonomous Communities to play a direct role in the EU institutions by representing their people in matters falling under their responsibility, although the Congress of Deputies gave its endorsement for them to do so as long as two years ago.

In view of the plain fact that the Autonomous Communities are thus being prevented from exercising their constitutional powers — even when, like Galicia, they are recognised to constitute nations in their own right — will the Commission undertake to secure and guarantee their involvement in the reform of the Treaties to be tackled by the Intergovernmental Conference in the year 2000, bearing in mind, moreover, that a privilege along these lines has already been granted to countries such as Austria, Belgium, and Germany?

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 203 E, 18.7.2000, p. 58.

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

(25 February 2000)

The Commission would point out that Article 203 (formerly Article 146) of the EC Treaty states that the Council must consist of a representative of each Member State at ministerial level, authorised to commit the government of that Member State. The Community institutions have no role to play in the choice of this representative, who is selected by the individual Member States in accordance with their constitutional law. The Commission sees no reason to propose an amendment to this provision.

---

(2000/C 280 E/203)

**WRITTEN QUESTION P-0101/00**

**by Jonas Sjöstedt (GUE/NGL) to the Council**

(19 January 2000)

*Subject:* EU asylum policy

In reply to my oral question H-0722/99, the Council explains that there are no common definitions in the EU of what constitutes a 'safe country of origin' and a 'manifestly unfounded' request for asylum.

In the light of that answer, will the Council say:

1. whether the decisions on asylum policy taken at the Tampere Summit have any implications for how Member States should assess asylum cases in which the applicant has been subject to persecution other than State persecution, and
2. whether the Summit's decision on the 'full and inclusive' application of the Geneva Convention has any practical implications for how Member States should deal with and assess individual asylum cases?

### **Reply**

(13 March 2000)

The Tampere European Council, while providing for the future common European asylum system to be based on the full and inclusive application of the Geneva Convention, calls for the establishment in the short term of, inter alia, common standards for a fair and effective asylum procedure, approximated rules on the recognition and content of refugee status as well as measures on subsidiary forms of protection. The European Council calls upon the Council to achieve these aims on the basis of proposals to be submitted by the Commission. The implications for the Member States mentioned in the Honorable Member's questions will flow from those proposals which the Council will examine as a matter of priority.

(2000/C 280 E/204)

### **WRITTEN QUESTION E-0104/00**

**by Markus Ferber (PPE-DE) to the Commission**

(26 January 2000)

*Subject:* Allocation of Media II Programme appropriations to different Member States

The Media II Programme assists audiovisual projects. It covers three main areas of activity: training, project development, and the marketing and distribution of European film and television productions in other Member States.

What amounts have the different Member States received in assistance for the above three areas of activity since the programme's launch? Why?

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

(2 March 2000)

The Honourable Member is asked to refer to the 'Commission report on the results obtained under the MEDIA II programme (1996-2000) from 1 January 1996 to 30 June 1998' <sup>(1)</sup>, forwarded to Parliament on 16 March 1999.

More specifically, beneficiaries are selected by the Commission in accordance with the arrangements laid down by Council Decisions 95/564/EC of 22 December 1995 on the implementation of a training programme for professionals in the European audiovisual programme industry (Media II — Training) <sup>(2)</sup> and 95/563/EC of 10 July 1995 on the implementation of a programme encouraging the development and distribution of European audiovisual works (Media II — Development and Distribution) (1996-2000) <sup>(2)</sup>.

The projects co-financed by the Commission are not selected on the basis of nationality or Member State of origin but by virtue of their quality and European added value. Calls for proposals are published in the Official Journal. Guidelines are laid down, setting out the various eligibility and selection criteria.

A final report will be forwarded to Parliament when the MEDIA II programme has run its course, at the end of 2000.

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(99) 91 final.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ L 321, 30.12.1995.