To enforce the UN Security Council Resolution, the Community adopted Council Regulation (EC) No 467/2001 of 6 March 2001 prohibiting the export of certain goods and services to Afghanistan, strengthening the flight ban and extending the freeze of funds and other financial resources in respect of the Taliban of Afghanistan [1]. Subsequently, the Commission adopted Regulation (EC) No 2199/2001 of 12 November 2001 [2] amending Council regulation (EC) No 467/2001 based on the updated UN Security Council list [3] where Barakhat organisations, inter alia, were listed. Accordingly, it also ceased making payments in Somalia through the Barakhat organisation.

Resolution 1390(2002) amends and continues the financial restrictions of Resolution 1333(2000) and provides that the sanctions in relation to Afghanistan should be repealed. A Commission proposal to take the necessary measures was made on 6 March 2002 [4].

5. to 7. No. The aim is to reinforce the fight against terrorism and more specifically its financing mechanisms. The financial restrictions imposed by Community Regulations target specific organisations and persons, not all remittances to Somalia.

Other organisations carrying out remittances from and to Somalia are still operating in the country, such as Amaala and Dahabshil that have partially filled the void left by Barakhat. Recently, a 'Union Bank of Somalia' was created. Also, a considerable number of smaller remittance organisations have been created and/or are operating in Somalia on a more local basis. However, some rural Communities, mainly in Southern Somalia, still experience a lack of sufficient channels to receive remittances from families abroad.

8. The payment transaction situation is improving. Nevertheless, normal economic and financial relations with Somalia depend in the end on Somali political forces' and Somali civil society's determination to re-establish sustainable governance in the country in order to harmoniously participate in the international Community.

---

(1) OJ L 67, 9.3.2001.
(2) OJ L 295, 13.11.2001.
(3) AFG/163-SC/7206 of 9 November 2001.
(4) COM(2002) 117.

(2003/C 52 E/017)

WRITTEN QUESTION E-0620/02

by Mario Borghezio (NI) to the Commission

(5 March 2002)

Subject: Global terrorism: a European response

The 'Evil Axis', as George W. Bush calls it, which runs from Tehran to Baghdad and Pyongyang, could, in the medium-term, lead to a level of international terrorism that would make the 11 September attacks on the Twin Towers in New York seem like a bad joke.

Iran apparently has Shahab-3, Shahab-4 and Shahab-5 ballistic missiles at an advanced stage of construction which have a range of 1300, 2000 and 5500 km respectively.

Iraq is reported to have Al-Hussein and Al-Abbas ballistic missiles with ranges of between 600 and 1 000 km.

North Korea has Nodong-1, Nodong-2, Taepodong-1 and Taepodong-2 ballistic missiles at an advanced stage of development with ranges of between 1 300 and 6 000 km.

These missiles — armed with nuclear, chemical and biological warheads — could, within the space of a few hours, destroy the whole of the Western world, while China would not stand back looking on.

Although the war against international terrorism has a defence weapon in the shape of the Space Shield and is fought on battlefields, it is won by secret diplomacy, the latest form of signals intelligence.

- How does Europe intend to respond to such scenarios? In particular, does the European Union not intend to create synergies in the intelligence sector between the various national intelligence organisations, using new systems of non-integer digital cryptography?
- Are there no plans to establish an advanced European Institute of Intelligence with links to the scientific and academic community?

Answer given by Mr Patten on behalf of the Commission

(30 April 2002)

The Commission thanks the Honourable Member for his insights. There are currently no plans of which the Commission is aware to rise to the challenge outlined.

(2003/C 52 E/018) **WRITTEN QUESTION E-0624/02**

by Stavros Xarchakos (PPE-DE) to the Commission

(5 March 2002)

Subject: Reduction of car prices

The Commission recently presented its proposal on opening the market in cars. In order to achieve the greatest possible consensus, it also stated its intention officially to consult Parliament (and the organisations concerned) even though there is no formal requirement to do so at the present stage of drawing up the draft regulation. The ultimate goal is to bring down car prices, encourage competition and benefit consumers.

However, while the Commission is making such an effort, there are countries such as Greece and Denmark where car prices remain exceptionally high owing to the special sales tax which is particularly high on vehicles of over 1800 c.c. Moreover, diesel engines, which are particularly economical (their emissions are also less harmful than those of petrol engines) are banned in Greek cities, which restricts Greek consumers to the 1000-1600 c.c. bracket. The purchasing power of Greeks is much less than that of the average consumer in the other Member States, which means that a much higher percentage of pay is needed to acquire a car of one's own in Greece. Finally, the tax system uses the cubic capacity of the engine rather than its power as its reference point and, therefore, cars using obsolete technology are taxed at the same rate as hi-tech vehicles.

Is the Commission aware of this situation? Why does Greece appear to have the highest rate of car tax in the EU? When will this situation change? Is this excessive taxation consistent with the harmonisation required of a single internal market?

Answer given by Mr Bolkestein on behalf of the Commission

(23 May 2002)

As the Honourable Member is aware, the Commission has indeed adopted a draft Commission Regulation on the application of Article 81(3) of the EC Treaty to categories of vertical agreements and concerted practices in the motor vehicle industry [1]. The Member of the Commission responsible for Competition presented the proposal at the Parliament's Plenary session on 5 February 2002 and at the Parliament's Economic and Monetary Affairs Committee (EMAC) on 19 February 2002. The objective of the proposal is