

proposals for a Regulation on the accelerated phasing out of single-hull oil tankers. The 'Erika II' proposals<sup>(2)</sup> include a proposals for a Directive establishing a Community monitoring, control and information system for maritime traffic, a Regulation establishing an European oil pollution damage compensation fund and a Regulation establishing a European Maritime Safety Agency.

The Commission systematically collects data from Member States on the weight and nature of goods transported to and from Community ports, according to Council Directive 95/64/EC<sup>(3)</sup> on the 'statistical returns in respect of carriage of goods and passengers by sea'. The data received is however not yet of a character to enable a full overview of the transport of dangerous goods in the Mediterranean. The Commission furthermore supports a project in the framework of the Euromed co-operation to improve the statistics on goods transported by sea in the Mediterranean.

Through Council Directive 93/75/EEC<sup>(4)</sup> concerning 'minimum requirements for vessels bound for or leaving Community ports and carrying dangerous and polluting goods'(Hazmat Directive), vessels carrying dangerous cargo bound for or leaving Community ports are required to report to the competent authority of those states the nature of such goods, their quantity and location on board. Discussions within the institutions are on-going to broaden and to improve the effectiveness of this reporting regime<sup>(5)</sup>.

It is also the intention to impose the mandatory carriage of Automatic Identification System(AIS) transponders and Voyage Data Recorders(VDRs) to all ships sailing to and from Community ports.

A more accurate collection, recording and evaluation of data on maritime safety will be undertaken by the future European Maritime Safety Agency<sup>(6)</sup>. One of the tasks of this Agency is to provide the Commission and the Member States with objective, reliable and comparable information and data on maritime safety to enable them to take the necessary steps to improve maritime safety.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(2000) 142 final.

<sup>(2)</sup> COM(2000) 802 final.

<sup>(3)</sup> Council Directive 95/46 of 8 December 1995 on statistical returns in respect of carriage of goods and passengers by sea (OJ L 320, 30.12.1995).

<sup>(4)</sup> Council Directive 93/75/EC of 13 September 1993 concerning minimum requirements for vessels bound for or leaving Community ports and carrying dangerous or polluting goods (OJ L 247, 5.10.1993). Directive as last amended by Commission Directive 98/74/EC (OJ L 276, 13.10.1998).

<sup>(5)</sup> COM(2000) 802 final — 2000/0325 (COD).

<sup>(6)</sup> COM(2000) 802 — 2000/0327 (COD).

(2002/C 40 E/124)

#### WRITTEN QUESTION E-1855/01

by **Michl Ebner (PPE-DE) to the Commission**

(27 June 2001)

*Subject:* Premiums for beef and veal (Germany)

As part of its revision of the common organisation of the market in beef and veal, the Commission has decided to apply the limit value of 90 ABU per holding and age category more stringently when allocating the special premium, partly in order to reduce the production incentive and to stabilise the beef and veal market. The number of animals eligible for payment of the premium is determined on the basis of the stocking density of adult bovine units per hectare.

Can the Commission indicate:

- whether, in future, it intends to introduce the limit value of 90 ABU for all direct payment schemes;
- how many holdings in Germany currently exceed that limit;

- how many holdings in Germany are currently below that limit;
- what the implications (additional expenditure or savings) of this measure would be — in absolute figures and/or as a percentage — for the total budget for the beef and veal sector;
- whether it is considering the introduction of a ceiling of this nature for the payment of premiums in the sheepmeat sector and in other comparable sectors?

(2002/C 40 E/125)

**WRITTEN QUESTION E-1856/01**

**by Michl Ebner (PPE-DE) to the Commission**

(27 June 2001)

*Subject:* Premiums for beef and veal (Italy)

As part of its revision of the common organisation of the market in beef and veal, the Commission has decided to apply the limit value of 90 ABU per holding and age category more stringently when allocating the special premium, partly in order to reduce the production incentive and to stabilise the beef and veal market. The number of animals eligible for payment of the premium is determined on the basis of the stocking density of adult bovine units per hectare.

Can the Commission indicate:

- whether, in future, it intends to introduce the limit value of 90 ABU for all direct payment schemes;
- how many holdings in Italy currently exceed that limit;
- how many holdings in Italy are currently below that limit;
- what the implications (additional expenditure or savings) of this measure would be — in absolute figures and/or as a percentage — for the total budget for the beef and veal sector;
- whether it is considering the introduction of a ceiling of this nature for the payment of premiums in the sheepmeat sector and in other comparable sectors?

(2002/C 40 E/126)

**WRITTEN QUESTION E-1857/01**

**by Michl Ebner (PPE-DE) to the Commission**

(27 June 2001)

*Subject:* Premiums for beef and veal (the Netherlands)

As part of its revision of the common organisation of the market in beef and veal, the Commission has decided to apply the limit value of 90 ABU per holding and age category more stringently when allocating the special premium, partly in order to reduce the production incentive and to stabilise the beef and veal market. The number of animals eligible for payment of the premium is determined on the basis of the stocking density of adult bovine units per hectare.

Can the Commission indicate:

- whether, in future, it intends to introduce the limit value of 90 ABU for all direct payment schemes;
- how many holdings in the Netherlands currently exceed that limit;
- how many holdings in the Netherlands are currently below that limit;
- what the implications (additional expenditure or savings) of this measure would be — in absolute figures and/or as a percentage — for the total budget for the beef and veal sector;
- whether it is considering the introduction of a ceiling of this nature for the payment of premiums in the sheepmeat sector and in other comparable sectors?