

Could the Commission state the technical reasons for the foregoing of this Community aid?

Does it not agree that the increasingly patent omissions and the discrepancies between the data from the different institutional sources seriously affect the credibility of these institutions and might be due to possible fraud against Community funds, or is it already able to discount this possibility of fraud?

(¹) OJ C 70 E, 20.3.2004, p. 45.

**Joint answer to Written Questions
E-2631/03, E-2632/03,
E-2633/03, E-2634/03, E-2635/03, E-2636/03, E-2637/03,
E-2638/03, E-2639/03, E-2640/03, E-2641/03 and E-2642/03
given by Mr Fischler on behalf of the Commission**

(28 October 2003)

The Honourable Member has received data from various sources, which all have been collected in a certain context and for certain purposes and consequently have their own significance as it has been explained in the Commission's joint reply to the Honourable Member's Written Questions E-1477/03 to E-1480/03 (¹) and to its reply to the Honourable Member's Written Question E-2586/03 (²).

As it has been stated in these replies, both databases are conceptually different and therefore no conclusions can be drawn upon possible discrepancies.

(¹) OJ C 70 E, 20.3.2004, p. 45.

(²) See page 129.

(2004/C 78 E/0150)

WRITTEN QUESTION E-2645/03

by Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE-DE) to the Commission

(10 September 2003)

Subject: Amendment of Article 25(1) of the Kyoto Protocol regarding entry into force

The Kyoto Protocol will enter into force when it has been ratified by not less than 55 parties to the UNFCCC accounting for at least 55 % of the total CO₂ emissions of the Annex I countries. At present the Protocol has been accepted by 113 states making up over 80 % of the world's population, but the proportion of emissions accounted for by the Annex I countries which have ratified it stands at only 44,2 % and, even taken together, the remaining Annex I countries (Liechtenstein, Monaco, and Australia, whose combined total is 2,1 %) will not raise the figure above the 55 % threshold unless either Russia (17,4 %) or the United States (36,1 % of the Annex I countries' emissions) can likewise be persuaded to give its support. The US has already publicly distanced itself from the Protocol. Russia thus holds the key.

From a climate change perspective the Protocol naturally needs if nothing else to enter into force on schedule. It might in any case be strategically better for the purposes of the negotiations to be conducted with Russia and helpful to all sides if Russia agreed to participate, but as regards entry into force of Protocol this is not absolutely essential.

Has the Commission thought of taking immediate steps in order to amend Article 25(1) of the Protocol in accordance with the procedure under Article 20 with a view to replacing the requisite 55 % with, say, just 45 % of the Annex I countries' emissions, thus ensuring that, whatever happens, the Protocol can enter into force?

Answer given by Mrs Wallström on behalf of the Commission

(23 October 2003)

Amendment of Article 25(1) of the Kyoto Protocol is not feasible from a legal point of view. Article 20 of the Kyoto Protocol defines the procedure that has to be followed for amendments to the Protocol itself. As the responsibility for adoption of any amendments lies with the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties of the Kyoto Protocol, this procedure is applicable only once the Kyoto Protocol has entered into force. The conditions in Article 25(1) also underline the need to address the global problem of climate change by international action involving broad participation.

(2004/C 78 E/0151)

WRITTEN QUESTION P-2647/03

by Bart Staes (Verts/ALE) to the Commission

(28 August 2003)

Subject: Use of synthetic prohormones for livestock fattening

Reports in the Flemish press suggest that the law enforcement authorities in Belgium are investigating a new livestock fattening product, which promotes the production of testosterone. It is apparently a synthetic version of a natural prohormone. The substance stimulates the brain to produce hormones naturally produced by the body, in this case testosterone. Hormones of this kind are banned in Belgium. According to the report, the hormone also contains dehydroepiandrosterone (DHEA), which causes liver damage and probably has other side-effects.

Is the Commission aware of this technique?

If so, what action has it already taken?

If not, does it intend to ask the European Food Safety Authority to issue a scientific opinion on the matter in accordance with Article 29(1)(a) of Regulation (EEC) 178/2002⁽¹⁾?

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 31, 1.2.2002, p. 1.

Answer given by Mr Byrne on behalf of the Commission

(18 September 2003)

The Commission is aware that so-called pro-hormones can be used to stimulate the natural production of androgenic and oestrogenic hormones in livestock in order to stimulate growth. DHEA is such a substance. This substance is covered by Directive 96/22/EC of 29 April 1996 concerning the prohibition on the use in stockfarming of certain substances having a hormonal or thyrostatic action and of β -agonists⁽¹⁾.

It is the responsibility of the Member States to verify compliance with this legislation by applying Council Directive 96/23/EC of 29 April 1996 on measures to monitor certain substances and residues thereof in live animals and animal products⁽¹⁾ and to take the appropriate measures.

With the support of the Commission, the Community Reference Laboratory responsible for hormones is gathering the available technical information and is organising a workshop at which the issue will be discussed with the Member States in October 2003.

The Scientific Committee on Veterinary measures relating to Public Health (SCVPH) evaluated the risks to human health from hormone residues in bovine meat and meat products treated with hormones for growth promotion in 1999, in 2000 and again in 2002. The reports are available on http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/index_en.html. Consequently the Commission does not intend at present to ask the European Food Safety Authority to issue a scientific opinion on the matter, in accordance with Article 29(1)(a) of