ISSN 1725-2431

Official Journal of the European Union

C 235 E

English edition

Information and Notices

Volume 56

14 August 2013

Notice No | Contents | Page

EN

Notice to reader

This publication contains written questions by Members of the European Parliament and their answers given by a European Union institution.

For each question and answer, the original language version is presented before a possible translation.

In some cases, it is possible that the answer is given in a language other than the question. This depends on the working language of the committee requested to provide the answer.

These questions and answers are published in accordance with Rules 117 and 118 of the Rules of Procedure of the European Parliament.

All questions and answers can be accessed via the website of the European Parliament (Europarl) under the heading 'Parliamentary questions':

http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

ABBREVIATIONS USED FOR POLITICAL GROUPS

PPE	Group of the European People's Party (Christian Democrats)
S&D	Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament
ALDE	Group of the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe
Verts/ALE	Group of the Greens/European Free Alliance
ECR	European Conservatives and Reformists Group
GUE/NGL	Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left
EFD	Europe of Freedom and Democracy Group
NI	Non-attached Members

EN

IV

(Notices)

NOTICES FROM EUROPEAN UNION INSTITUTIONS, BODIES, OFFICES AND AGENCIES

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

WRITTEN QUESTIONS WITH ANSWER

Written questions by Members of the European Parliament and their answers given by a European Union institution

(2013/C 235 E/01)

Contents **Page**

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-012419/11
aan de Commissie
Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE)
(6 januari 2012)

Betreft: Concurrentiepositie energie-intensieve industrie op mondiaal niveau

Tegen de energie-intensieve industrie in Azië, waar men met goedkope stroom en zonder strenge beperkingen voor CO_2-uitstoot, tegen lage prijzen kan produceren, valt in landen als Nederland niet tegen te concurreren. Zo blijkt ook voor het Zeeuwse Zalco, dat wegens de hoge energieprijzen waarschijnlijk 620 mensen moet ontslaan.

In september 2011 voerde ik in het Europees Parlement al het debat inzake de richtsnoeren betreffende overheidssteun aan energie-intensieve ondernemingen. Daarbij ging het om het verstrekken van financiële compensatie vanaf 2013 aan ondernemingen die een relatief hoog aandeel van elektriciteit in de kostprijs hebben, bijvoorbeeld een aluminiumsmelter of een electro-oven (schrootsmelter). De situatie bij Zalco en gelijksoortige bedrijven laat echter zien dat onmiddellijke bijstelling met betrekking tot compensatie voor de hoge energieprijzen noodzakelijk is. Met het huidige mondiale level playing field komen steeds meer bedrijven uit deze sector in de problemen. Met het oog op het risico voor carbon leakage, alsmede de werkgelegenheid en concurrentiepositie in Europa is een bijstelling noodzakelijk.

1. Is de Commissie ook van mening dat een volledige compensatie voor energie-intensieve bedrijven op korte termijn vorm dient te krijgen om carbon leakage tegen te gaan en het level playing field, alsmede de concurrentiepositie voor deze sector te herstellen?

2. Valt de steun in de vorm van ontheffing van transportkosten voor baseload-afnemers van elektriciteit in Duitsland en België, waaronder gelijksoortige bedrijven als Zalco, binnen de Guidelines for State Aid in de context van het ETS?

3. Kan de Commissie inschatten of de Nederlandse aluminiumsector, zoals Zalco en andere bedrijven, binnen de regeling valt die in september 2011 met het Parlement is besproken?

4. Is de Commissie in het kader van het level playing field bereid om bij de regeling voor overheidssteun in de context van de nieuwe EU-regeling voor de handel in broeikasgasemissierechten volledige transparantie te geven over welke lidstaat wel en welke niet gebruik hiervan maakt?

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-012683/11
aan de Commissie
Christofer Fjellner (PPE)
(11 januari 2012)

Betreft: Overheidssteun en emissiehandel

Het doel van de EU-verdragsregels inzake overheidssteun is zorgen dat de concurrentie binnen de EU niet wordt verstoord door lidstaten die een bepaald bedrijf of een bepaald soort productie economisch bevoordelen. Na de herziening van de richtlijn inzake de handel in emissierechten in 2013 zullen de lidstaten in staat zijn bepaalde bedrijven te compenseren voor het effect dat de emissiehandel heeft op de prijs van elektriciteit (ook wel „indirecte impact" genoemd). Compensatie voor de indirecte impact van emissiehandel resulteert in verstoorde concurrentie, waardoor Europese bedrijven in een nadelige positie terechtkomen ten opzichte van bedrijven buiten de EU.

Hoe gaat de Commissie ervoor zorgen dat de afwijkende toepassing van de EU-regelgeving inzake overheidssteun binnen de Unie er niet toe leidt dat bedrijven in de EU benadeeld worden op de interne markt en op het gebied van mondiale concurrentie?

Antwoord van de heer Almunia namens de Commissie

(9 februari 2012)

De Commissie heeft een ontwerp-reeks van tijdelijke maatregelen ([1]) bekendgemaakt die het de lidstaten mogelijk moeten maken op grond van de EU-staatssteunregels het risico op een „koolstoflek" te compenseren zoals gedefinieerd in de Richtlijn inzake de EU-regeling voor de handel in broeikasgasemissierechten voor de periode 2013-2020.

Op basis van de beschikbare feiten en input van een openbare raadpleging heeft de Commissie een klein aantal sectoren vastgesteld (waaronder aluminiumproductie) die een aanzienlijk risico lopen op een „koolstoflek" ten gevolge van toegenomen CO_2-kosten in de elektriciteitsprijzen. Deze sectoren zouden een compensatie moeten kunnen krijgen die beperkt is tot het noodzakelijke minimum om concurrentieverstoringen op de interne markt zo klein mogelijk te houden. Het voorstel van de Commissie wil drie doelstellingen met elkaar verzoenen: het voorkomen van een aanzienlijk risico op „koolstoflekken" veroorzaakt door de toegenomen CO_2-kosten in de elektriciteitsprijzen; het handhaven van de door de EU ETS gecreëerde prijssignalen om brandstoffen op kosteneffectieve wijze koolstofvrij te maken; en het zo klein mogelijk houden van concurrentieverstoringen op de interne markt door subsidieraces binnen de EU te vermijden in deze tijden van economische onzekerheid en budgettaire discipline. In het bijzonder zal de Commissie regelmatig de steun controleren die wordt verleend aan ondernemingen in sectoren waarvan wordt aangenomen dat zij worden blootgesteld aan een aanzienlijk risico op een „koolstoflek" doordat kosten voor emissierechten in de elektriciteitsprijzen worden doorgerekend. Om doorzichtigheid te garanderen, zal de Commissie de lidstaten opleggen dat zij de volledige tekst van de relevante steunregelingen op het internet moeten bekendmaken.

De Commissie en de lidstaten zullen de ontwerp-regels in januari 2012 bespreken. De uiteindelijke regels zullen vermoedelijk in de loop van het eerste kwartaal van 2012 door de Commissie worden vastgesteld.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/competition/consultations/2012_emissions_trading/index_en.html

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-012419/11
till kommissionen
Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE)
(6 januari 2012)

Angående: Konkurrensställning för energiintensiv industri på global nivå

Den energiintensiva industrin i länder som Nederländerna kan inte konkurrera mot Asien där man kan producera till låga priser utan strikta gränser för koldioxidutsläpp. Detta är även fallet för företaget Zalco i provinsen Zeeland som troligen måste avskeda 620 personer på grund av de höga energipriserna.

Redan i september 2011 debatterade jag i Europaparlamentet om riktlinjer om statligt stöd till energiintensiva företag. Då handlade det om att ge ekonomisk kompensation från och med 2013 till företag där el utgör en relativt stor del av tillverkningskostnaden, t.ex. företag som smälter aluminium eller använder elugnar (för skrotsmältning). Men läget för Zalco och liknande företag visar att det behövs omedelbara anpassningar för att kompensera dem för de höga energipriserna. Med dagens globala, lika villkor hamnar allt fler företag i branschen i svårigheter. En anpassning är nödvändig med tanke på risken för koldioxidläckage och situationen för sysselsättningen och konkurrenskraften i EU.

1. Anser även kommissionen att en fullständig kompensation till energiintensiva företag behöver utformas på kort sikt för att motverka koldioxidläckage och återställa de lika villkoren och konkurrenssituationen för denna bransch?

2. Hamnar stödet i form av minskade transportkostnader för baslastavnämare av elektricitet i Tyskland och Belgien, dit även likartade företag som Zalco hör, innanför riktlinjerna för statligt stöd inom ramen för ETS?

3. Kan kommissionen göra en bedömning av om den nederländska aluminiumbranschen, t.ex. Zalco och andra företag, omfattas av det system som diskuterades med parlamentet i september 2011?

4. Är kommissionen beredd att mot bakgrund av lika villkor ge full insyn i bestämmelserna för statligt stöd i samband med EU:s nya utsläppshandelssystem om vilka medlemsstater som drar nytta av det och vilka som inte gör det?

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-012683/11
till kommissionen
Christofer Fjellner (PPE)
(11 januari 2012)

Angående: Statsstöd och ETS-handel

Syftet med EU-fördragets regler om statligt stöd är att säkerställa att konkurrensförhållandena inom EU inte snedvrids genom att medlemsstaterna ekonomiskt gynnar ett visst företag eller en viss produktion. I och med revisionen av utsläppshandelsdirektivet finns det från 2013 möjlighet för medlemsstaterna att kompensera vissa företag för utsläppshandelns påverkan på elpriset (s.k. indirekt effekt). Frågan om kompensation för indirekt effekt från utsläppshandeln leder till en snedvridning av konkurrensen, till nackdel för företag inom EU men till förmån för företag utanför EU.

Hur säkerställer kommissionen att tillämpningen av EU:s regler om statligt stöd, när de tillämpas olika inom unionen, inte leder till att företag inom EU missgynnas på den inre marknaden respektive i den globala konkurrensen?

Samlat svar från Joaquín Almunia på kommissionens vägnar
(9 februari 2012)

Kommissionen har offentliggjort en rad utkast till tillfälliga åtgärder ([1]) så att medlemsstaterna i enlighet med EU:s regler för statligt stöd kan kompensera för risken för koldioxidläckage enligt definitionen i direktivet om EU:s system för handel med utsläppsrätter för perioden 2013-2020.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/competition/consultations/2012_emissions_trading/index_en.html

På grundval av tillgängliga fakta samt bidrag vid ett offentligt samråd har kommissionen ringat in ett litet antal sektorer (bl.a. framställning av aluminium) som löper betydande risk för koldioxidläckage till följd av ökade koldioxidkostnader i elpriserna. Dessa sektorer bör kunna få kompensation som inskränker sig till det minimum som krävs för att motverka en snedvridning av konkurrensen på den inre marknaden. Kommissionens förslag syftar till att få balans mellan tre mål: för att förhindra en betydande risk för koldioxidläckage till följd av höjda koldioxidkostnader i elpriserna, för att bevara de prissignaler som skapas av EU:s utsläppshandelssystem för att åstadkomma en kostnadseffektiv utfasning av fossila bränslen och för att motverka en snedvridning av konkurrensen på den inre marknaden genom att undvika bidragskapplöpning inom EU i en tid av ekonomisk osäkerhet och budgetdisciplin. Kommissionen kommer främst att regelbundet övervaka stöd till företag inom sektorer som anses löpa stor risk för koldioxidläckage på grund av kostnader för utsläppsrätter i EU:s utsläppshandelssystem som förs vidare till elpriset. För att skapa insyn kommer kommissionen att anmoda medlemsstaterna att på internet offentliggöra den fullständiga texten till alla relevanta stödordningar.

Kommissionen och medlemsstaterna kommer att diskutera utkastet till regler i januari 2012. De slutliga reglerna förväntas antas av kommissionen under första kvartalet 2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012419/11
to the Commission
Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE)
(6 January 2012)

Subject: Global competitiveness of energy-intensive industries

Countries such as the Netherlands cannot compete with energy-intensive industries in Asia, where low-cost production is possible thanks to the use of cheap electricity and the absence of strict limits on CO_2 emissions. Among the companies affected is Zalco in Zeeland, which will probably have to make 620 people redundant because of high energy prices.

At the European Parliament, I raised the issue of the guidelines for state aid to energy-intensive undertakings as long ago as September 2011. What concerned me was the need to provide financial compensation, as from 2013, to undertakings a relatively large proportion of whose costs is accounted for by electricity, for example an aluminium smelter or an electro-furnace (scrap metal smelter). However, the situation at Zalco and similar businesses shows that an immediate adjustment is needed to compensate for the high price of energy. With the current direct global competition, more and more businesses in this sector are encountering problems. Mindful of the risk of carbon leakage and the issues of employment and competition in Europe, an adjustment is required.

1. Does the Commission agree that energy-intensive businesses should be fully compensated without delay in order to combat carbon leakage and restore the level playing field and the competitiveness of this sector?

2. Is aid in the form of exemption from transmission costs for baseload customers purchasing electricity in Germany and Belgium, including businesses similar to Zalco, covered by the Guidelines for State Aid in the context of the ETS?

3. Can the Commission assess whether the Dutch aluminium industry, including businesses such as Zalco, is covered by the arrangement discussed with Parliament in September 2011?

4. Bearing in mind the requirement of a level playing field, will the Commission, when regulating state aid in the context of the new EU rules on trading in greenhouse gas emission allowances, ensure complete transparency as to which Member States are making use of such aid and which are not?

Question for written answer E-012683/11
to the Commission
Christofer Fjellner (PPE)
(11 January 2012)

Subject: State aid and emissions trading

The purpose of EU Treaty rules on state aid is to ensure that competition within the EU is not distorted by Member States economically favouring a particular company or a particular type of production. Following the revision of the Emissions Trading Directive, from 2013 Member States will be able to compensate certain companies for the impact emissions trading has on the price of electricity (also known as 'indirect impact'). The issue of compensation for the indirect impact of emissions trading leads to a distortion of competition, which places European companies at a disadvantage and benefits companies outside the EU.

How will the Commission ensure that the application of EU rules on state aid, where they are applied differently in the Union, will not lead to companies in the EU being placed at a disadvantage in the internal market and in global competition, respectively?

Joint answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(9 February 2012)

The Commission has published a draft set of temporary measures ([1]) aimed at enabling Member States to compensate under EU state aid rules for the risk of carbon leakage as defined in the directive on the EU Emission Trading Scheme (ETS) for the period 2013-2020.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/competition/consultations/2012_emissions_trading/index_en.html

Based on the available facts and on input from a public consultation, the Commission has identified a small number of sectors (including aluminium production) that are at significant risk of carbon leakage as a result of increased CO_2 costs in electricity prices. These sectors should be able to receive compensation limited to the minimum necessary in order to minimise competition distortions in the internal market. The Commission proposal aims at balancing three objectives: to prevent a significant risk of carbon leakage due to the increase of CO_2 costs in the electricity prices, to preserve the price signals created by the EU ETS to achieve cost-effective decarbonisation and to minimise competition distortions in the internal market by avoiding subsidy races within the EU at a time of economic uncertainty and budgetary discipline. In particular, the Commission will regularly monitor aid granted to undertakings in sectors deemed to be exposed to a significant risk of carbon leakage due to EU ETS allowance costs passed on in electricity prices. In order to ensure transparency, the Commission will require the Member States to publish the full text of the relevant aid schemes on the Internet.

The Commission and the Member States will discuss the draft rules in January 2012. The final rules are expected to be adopted by the Commission during the first quarter of 2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012605/11
to the Commission
Catherine Stihler (S&D)
(10 January 2012)

Subject: French healthcare

In 2007 the French authorities announced that Britons and other EU nationals resident in France who had not reached retirement age were to have their entitlement to French state health cover removed. This means that any EU expats who are not officially retired, are not working and have not lived in France for more than five years will lose their right to French state healthcare and will not have access to a *carte vitale*. They will be expected to take out private medical insurance instead.

Could the Commission look into whether this new law is not contrary to Community law, in particular to Regulation (EEC) No 1408/71 on the coordination of the social security schemes of the Member States? If it is not contrary to Community law, could the Commission please inform us as to why?

Question for written answer E-000139/12
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(17 January 2012)

Subject: Early retirees' entitlement to healthcare in France

Since November 2007, the French authorities have been informing early retirees from other Member States (that is, those citizens who are classed as 'inactive' and below the state retirement age) that in order to have health cover they are required to take out private health insurance.

I note that the Commission has been investigating this matter, in the light of France's obligations under Regulation 883/2004, and that France informed officials last year that it would publish new provisions to cover those EU citizens under state pension age who moved to the country without having previously worked there or without current plans to seek work.

Can the Commission confirm whether such measures are now in place?

If not, can the Commission state what further action it is taking? If the measures are in place, is the Commission satisfied that they are fully in line with France's legal obligations?

Joint answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(15 February 2012)

United Kingdom citizens who are not yet in receipt of a United Kingdom state pension and who habitually reside in France are subject to French social security legislation by virtue of Article 11(3)(e) of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 ([1]). Article 4 of that regulation states that such persons 'shall enjoy the same benefits and be subject to the same obligations under the legislation of [France] as nationals thereof'. In the Commission's view, the requirement for this group of United Kingdom nationals to have resided in France for five years before being admitted to the French 'Couverture Maladie Universelle' (CMU) healthcare scheme is not in conformity with Article 4 of the regulation.

Since the introduction of revised rules of access to the CMU in 2007, the Commission has been in regular contact with the French authorities to ensure that the CMU's rules of access comply with the requirements of EC law. On 9 June 2011 the French authorities issued a new 'Circulaire' ([2]) which the Commission hoped would herald a new approach to the admission of non-active EU nationals to the CMU.

Since June 2011 the Commission has been monitoring the way the 'Circulaire' is being applied in practice to see whether this is in line with the letter and the spirit of the regulation. As a result, it has concerns that the French authorities are continuing to refuse admission to the CMU in breach of EC law. The Commission has raised its concerns with the French authorities and hopes that this difficult matter can be resolved soon.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the coordination of social security systems, OJ L 166, 30.4.2004.
([2]) DSS/DACI/2011/225.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-012622/11
komissiolle
Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE) ja Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE)
(11. tammikuuta 2012)

Aihe: Susikannan pienentyminen ja korvauskäytäntö Suomessa

Susi on määritelty Suomessa erittäin uhanalaiseksi lajiksi, jonka kannan koko on 135-145 yksilöä koko maassa. Lisääntyvä susikanta rajoittuu poronhoitoalueen eteläpuolelle. Poronhoitoalueella susi kuuluu luontodirektiivin liitteen V lajeihin, ja alueelle päätyneet sudet tapetaan. Tästä huolimatta valtaosa susien vuoksi Suomessa maksettavista korvauksista kohdentuu poronhoitoalueelle. Poronhoitoalueen korvaukset ovat pois alueen eteläpuolisella alueella toteutetuista suden suojelutoimenpiteistä (mm. ennaltaehkäisykeinojen käyttö, kuten petoaitojen saaminen, hankalaa; valistustyötä ei tehdä).

Riista- ja kalatalouden tutkimuslaitoksen (RKTL) viimeisimmän virallisen arvion mukaan susikannan koko on laskenut viimeisten viiden vuoden aikana yli sadalla yksilöllä ja kehitys vuoden takaisesta on niin ikään negatiivinen. Asiantuntijoiden mukaan suurin syy kannan pienenemiseen on salakaatojen jatkuminen.

Komissio vastasi 10. toukokuuta 2010 jättämäämme kysymykseen, että se on pannut hyvillään merkille Suomessa tehdyt uudistukset erityisesti vahinkokorvausten kohdalla mutta että se on edelleen tyytymätön susikannan kehitykseen. Komissio ilmoitti haluavansa antaa Suomelle vielä lisäaikaa näytöille, mutta totesi myös, että mikäli tilanne ei näytä kohentuvan, komissio harkitsee toimenpiteisiin ryhtymistä.

Katsooko komissio, että Suomessa harjoitettava susien suojelu on korvauskäytännöltään järkevää, vaikka valtaosa korvauksista kohdistuu poronhoitoalueelle, jossa susia ei sallita? Katsooko komissio niin ikään tarpeelliseksi viimeisten kanta-arvioiden perusteella ryhtyä toimenpiteisiin, jotta salakaadot Suomessa saataisiin kuriin ja susikanta kääntyisi kasvuun?

Janez Potočnikin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(27. helmikuuta 2012)

Suomen viranomaisilta 24. elokuuta 2011 saadun ilmoituksen mukaan poronhoitoalueella elää yksi seitsenjäseninen susilauma, minkä lisäksi susia esiintyy poronhoitoalueen etelä- ja itäosissa. Kaikkiaan Suomen poronhoitoalueella elää 20-25 sutta. Susien tiedetään aiheuttavan jonkin verran vahinkoa poroille. Petoeläinten aiheuttamista vahingoista maksetaan poronhoitoalueella korvauksia muidenkin kuin susien vuoksi. Olemme samaa mieltä arvoisien parlamentin jäsenten kanssa siitä, että korvaukset ovat vain yksi keino pyrittäessä lisäämään susien suojelun arvostusta, ja kehotamme Suomea ryhtymään kaikkiin asianmukaisiin toimiin.

Komissio viittaa parlamentin jäsenten kirjallisiin kysymyksiin E-3942/2008 (Satu Hassi) sekä E-3765/2009 ja E-3329/2010 ([1]) (Satu Hassi ja Sirpa Pietikäinen) annettuihin vastauksiin, jotka liittyvät Suomen salametsästyksen osalta toteuttamiin toimiin. Komissio katsoo, että Suomelle olisi annettava lisää aikaa osoittaa, että sen valitsema lähestymistapa toimii. Jos tilanne ei näytä kohentuvan, komissio ei epäröi ryhtyä asiamukaisiin toimenpiteisiin, mukaan lukien tarpeen vaatimat oikeudelliset toimet.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012622/11
to the Commission
Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE) and Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE)
(11 January 2012)

Subject: Diminishing wolf stock and damages payout practice in Finland

The wolf has been assigned the status of an endangered species in Finland, with the population comprising only 135 to 145 individuals in the entire country. Stock increase is restricted to areas south of the area designated for reindeer herding. Within the area designated for reindeer herding, the wolf is considered a species under Annex V of the Habitats Directive, and any wolves straying in this area are killed. Despite this fact most of the damages payable in Finland because of wolves arise in the reindeer herding area. The payouts in the reindeer herding area are subtracted from the wolf conservation measures carried out in regions south of the reindeer herding area (e.g. the use of preventive measures, such as acquiring fences to prevent the access of beasts, is difficult; the public is not being educated on the topic).

According to the latest official estimate of the Finnish Game and Fisheries Research Institute (RKTL), the wolf stock has fallen in the past few years by more than a hundred individuals, and the trend since one year ago is negative as well. Experts say that the main reason for the diminishing stock is continued poaching.

The Commission replied, in its response to our question on 10 May 2010, that it has taken note of the reforms put into effect in Finland positively, especially in the field of damages payouts, but that it remains unsatisfied with the development of the wolf stock. The Commission expressed its wish to allow Finland more time to come up with positive proof, but also stated that if no positive developments appear to be in sight it will consider taking action.

Does the Commission consider that wolf conservation in Finland is prudent in terms of its damages payout practice, although majority of the damages arise in the reindeer herding area where wolves are not tolerated? Furthermore, does the Commission consider it requisite, based on the latest stock estimates, to take action to clamp down poaching in Finland and to achieve an increase in the wolf stock?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(27 February 2012)

The Finnish authorities' report received on 24 August 2011 states that there is one pack of seven wolves living in the reindeer herding area. In addition, there are wolves present in the southern and eastern parts of the reindeer herding area. Altogether there are 20-25 wolves in the Finnish reindeer herding area. Wolves are known to cause certain damage to reindeer herding. Compensation paid for predator damages in the reindeer herding area is not limited to wolves. We agree with the Honourable Members that compensation is just one tool to be applied when acceptance for the protection of wolves is sought, and would encourage Finland to implement all relevant measures.

The Commission would refer the Honourable Members to its answers to Written Question E-3942/2008 by Ms Hassi, and written questions E-3765/2009 and E-3329/2010 ([1]) by Ms Hassi and Ms Pietikäinen regarding the measures taken by Finland in relation to poaching. The Commission considers that Finland should be given more time to show that the adopted approach works. Should there be no improvement of the situation the Commission will not hesitate to take appropriate action, including legal steps, if necessary.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-012628/11
προς την Επιτροπή
Michail Tremopoulos (Verts/ALE)
(11 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Ενέργειες για αύξηση της διείσδυσης μικρών αιολικών στο ενεργειακό μίγμα

Στην ερώτησή μου E-009353/2011 με θέμα «Ενέργειες για αύξηση της διείσδυσης μικρών αιολικών στο ενεργειακό μίγμα», ο Επίτροπος Ενέργειας κ. Oettinger απάντησε ότι η Επιτροπή μπορεί να στηρίξει δράσεις σχετικές με μικρής κλίμακας αιολικές μονάδες στο πλαίσιο των διαρθρωτικών ταμείων. Ο Επίτροπος Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης κ. Hahn και ο υπουργός Ανάπτυξης, Ανταγωνιστικότητας και Ναυτιλίας Μιχάλης Χρυσοχοΐδης, στις 14 Δεκεμβρίου 2011, αναφέρθηκαν σε ένα σχέδιο δράσης 181 έργων συνολικού ύψους 11,5 δισ. ευρώ ([1]), τα οποία χρηματοδοτούνται από το ΕΣΠΑ και έχουν ορίζοντα ολοκλήρωσης ως το 2015. Ειδικότερα, ο Επίτροπος Hahn δήλωσε ότι η σύνταξη του καταλόγου με τα 181 έργα δεν έχει ολοκληρωθεί ακόμα και ότι αναμένεται να προστεθούν νέα έργα και ενδεχομένως να αφαιρεθούν τα έργα εκείνα που θα περατωθούν ([2]). Στην τελευταία μορφή του καταλόγου, όμως ([3]), για τον τομέα της ενέργειας προορίζονται συνολικά 690 εκατ. ευρώ, αλλά κανένα από τα σχετικά έργα δεν αφορά μικρής κλίμακας αιολικές μονάδες ή άλλες ΑΠΕ με την εξαίρεση 5 εκατ. ευρώ για πιλοτικό έργο αξιοποίησης της γεωθερμίας.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Σκοπεύει η Επιτροπή να να συνεργαστεί με την ελληνική κυβέρνηση ή και με άλλους εγχώριους φορείς ώστε να συμπεριλάβει στον κατάλογο αυτών των 181 έργων δράσεις για την προώθηση αιολικών μικρής κλίμακας, ειδικά στα νησιά όπου κάθε χρόνο η Ελλάδα πληρώνει 700 εκατ. ευρώ για αγορά μαζούτ και ντήζελ προκειμένου να καλύψει τις τοπικές ανάγκες ηλεκτροπαραγωγής;

2. Υπάρχουν επαρκή κονδύλια στο ΕΣΠΑ 2007-2013 ώστε να προωθηθούν τέτοιες δράσεις προώθησης μικρών αιολικών;

Απάντηση του κ. Oettinger εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(17 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

Μικρής κλίμακας έργα αιολικής ενέργειας μπορούν να χρηματοδοτούνται με την παρέμβαση μηχανισμών στήριξης όπως τιμολογίων τροφοδότησης και όχι αποκλειστικά μέσω επιχορηγήσεων με κεφάλαια από τα διαρθρωτικά ταμεία της ΕΕ. Η ομάδα δράσης της Επιτροπής για την Ελλάδα παρακολουθεί την πρόοδο των έργων και διερευνά το ενδεχόμενο τροποποιήσεων του καταλόγου έργων προτεραιότητας που αναφέρθηκε στην ερώτηση.

Στο πλαίσιο των κοινοτικών στρατηγικών κατευθυντήριων γραμμών, εναπόκειται σε κάθε κράτος μέλος να καθορίσει τις προτεραιότητές του στο αντίστοιχο Εθνικό Στρατηγικό Πλαίσιο Αναφοράς (ΕΣΠΑ) 2007-2013. Το ελληνικό ΕΣΠΑ αναφέρει ότι οι παρεμβάσεις στο πλαίσιο της στρατηγικής πρέπει, μεταξύ άλλων, να έχουν ως αντικείμενο «την αξιοποίηση των φυσικών συνθηκών των νήσων ως τόπων εγκατάστασης μονάδων παραγωγής ενέργειας από ανανεώσιμες πηγές […]». Έχουν δεσμευθεί κονδύλια στην κατηγορία «Ανανεώσιμη ενέργεια: αιολική ενέργεια». Δεν υπάρχει όμως υποκατηγορία παρέμβασης πραγματευόμενη ειδικώς τις μικρής κλίμακας μονάδες αιολικής ενέργειας.

([1]) http://www.mindev.gov.gr/?p=6074.
([2]) http://www.mindev.gov.gr/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/2011_12_14_omilies_YpAAN_Yfyp_Xan.doc
([3]) https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/ccc?key=0Ajg1MGYerw9NdHhyMWFlRUxUcVRvMkdBd01xOXNLTWc#gid=0.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012628/11
to the Commission
Michail Tremopoulos (Verts/ALE)
(11 January 2012)

Subject: Action to increase the penetration of small wind farms in the energy mix

In response to my Question E-009353/2011 on action to increase the penetration of small wind farms in the energy mix, Commissioner for Energy Mr Oettinger replied that the Commissioner can support actions in connection with small-scale wind farms under the structural funds. Commissioner for Regional Development Mr Hahn ([1]) ([2]) and Minister for Development, Competitiveness and Shipping Michael Chrysochoides referred on 14 December 2011 to an action plan for 181 projects totalling EUR 11.5 billion, funded under the NSRF, for completion by 2015. In fact, Commissioner Hahn stated that the list of 181 projects had not yet been completed, that new projects were expected to be added and that projects nearing completion might be removed ([3]). The final list earmarks EUR 690 million for the energy sector; however, none of the energy projects relate to small-scale wind farms or other RES and EUR 5 million for the pilot geothermal project has been removed.

Will the Commission answer the following:

1. Does the Commission intend to liaise with the Greek Government and/or other domestic operators for the purpose of including actions to promote small-scale wind farms in the list of 181 projects, especially on the islands, where Greece pays EUR 700 million a year to buy fuel oil and diesel in order to meet local energy generation requirements?

2. Does the NSRF 2007-2013 include specific appropriations for projects to promote small-scale wind farms?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(17 February 2012)

Small scale wind projects can be financed through operating support schemes such as feed in tariffs and not solely through capital grants from EU Structural Fund. The Commission Taskforce for Greece is monitoring project progress and exploring potential amendments to the project priority list mentioned.

Within the framework of the Community Strategic Guidelines, it is for each Member State to set out their priorities in the respective National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF) 2007-2013. The Greek NSRF states that interventions within the framework of the strategy shall *inter alia* address 'using the natural conditions of the islands as places for establishing energy production units from renewable energy sources […]'. Funds have been earmarked in the category 'Renewable Energy: Wind'. There is, however, no intervention sub-category specifically addressing small-scale wind energy installation.

([1]) http://www.mindev.gov.gr/?p=6074.
([2]) http://www.mindev.gov.gr/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/2011_12_14_omilies_YpAAN_Yfyp_Xan.doc
([3]) https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/ccc?key=0Ajg1MGYerw9NdHhyMWFlRUxUcVRvMkdBd01xOXNlTWc#gid=0.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012674/11
à la Commission
Emine Bozkurt (S&D) et Malika Benarab-Attou (Verts/ALE)
(11 janvier 2012)

Objet: Crimes haineux à Florence

Le mardi 13 décembre, un homme armé, connu comme étant un sympathisant de l'extrême droite, a été pris d'un accès de folie meurtrière à Florence. Il a tué deux vendeurs ambulants sénégalais et en a blessé trois autres avant de se donner la mort. Ces tirs ont été considérés comme racistes, vu que leur auteur a seulement visé des vendeurs d'origine africaine dans la rue.

En outre, la même semaine, un camp de Roms a été incendié par un groupe d'habitants, également en Italie. En Allemagne, en novembre dernier, il est apparu que des meurtres systématiques de citoyens ont été commis par des militants d'extrême droite en raison de l'origine turque des victimes et, en juillet, nous avons eu les attentats meurtriers en Norvège.

L'Union européenne dispose d'actes législatifs qui interdisent la discrimination sur la base de l'origine ethnique et de la race, comme la directive sur l'égalité raciale et la charte européenne des droits fondamentaux, pour veiller à ce que tous les citoyens soient égaux et à ce que leurs droits soient protégés de la même manière. Leurs droits doivent être respectés et les gouvernements de l'UE tenus par ces actes législatifs doivent prendre toutes les mesures nécessaires pour protéger les droits des citoyens et lutter contre toutes les formes de discrimination raciale et ethnique de la même manière pour tous les citoyens.

Quelles mesures spécifiques la Commission prendra-t-elle pour établir clairement que la discrimination et la violence raciales sont totalement inacceptables en Europe et que les crimes haineux doivent être empêchés par tous les moyens possibles?

Réponse donnée par Mme Reding au nom de la Commission
(15 février 2012)

La Commission a toujours condamné et rejeté toutes les formes et manifestations de racisme et de xénophobie, car ces phénomènes sont incompatibles avec les valeurs sur lesquelles est fondée l'Union européenne.

La Commission s'est engagée à utiliser tous les moyens dont elle dispose en vertu des traités pour lutter contre le racisme et la xénophobie.

En particulier, la Commission contrôle actuellement la mise en œuvre de la décision-cadre 2008/913/JAI du Conseil ([1]) qui oblige les États membres à prendre les mesures nécessaires pour faire en sorte que l'incitation publique à la violence ou à la haine relevant du racisme ou de la xénophobie soit punissable et que la motivation raciste ou xénophobe de toute autre infraction soit considérée comme une circonstance aggravante ou, à défaut, soit prise en considération pour la détermination des peines.

En outre, la directive 2000/43/CE du Conseil ([2]) met en œuvre le principe de l'égalité de traitement entre les personnes sans distinction de race ou d'origine ethnique, en interdisant toute discrimination raciale dans l'Union européenne dans les domaines de l'emploi et de la formation, de l'éducation, de la protection sociale (y compris la sécurité sociale et les soins de santé), des avantages sociaux et de l'accès aux biens et services (y compris en matière de logement). Cette directive interdit toute discrimination directe ou indirecte, le harcèlement et tout comportement consistant à enjoindre à quiconque de pratiquer une discrimination. Tous les États membres ont transposé cette directive dans leur droit interne, et la Commission européenne veille à la bonne application de cet instrument.

La Commission continue également de soutenir la lutte contre le racisme et la xénophobie, y compris la prévention de ces phénomènes, en apportant un concours financier aux activités menées à cette fin par les parties prenantes.

([1]) Décision-cadre 2008/913/JAI du Conseil du 28 novembre 2008 sur la lutte contre certaines formes et manifestations de racisme et de xénophobie au moyen du droit pénal, JO L 328 du 6.12.2008, p. 55.

([2]) Directive 200/43/CE du Conseil du 29 juin 2000 relative à la mise en œuvre du principe de l'égalité de traitement entre les personnes sans distinction de race ou d'origine ethnique, JO L 180 du 19.7.2000, p. 22.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-012674/11
aan de Commissie
Emine Bozkurt (S&D) en Malika Benarab-Attou (Verts/ALE)
(11 januari 2012)

Betreft: Haatdelicten in Firenze

Op dinsdag 13 december opende een dolle schutter, die bekendstond als iemand met extreem rechtse sympathieën, het vuur in Firenze. Hij schoot twee Senegalese straatverkopers dood en verwondde drie andere, waarna hij zelfmoord pleegde. De schietpartij zou raciaal geïnspireerd zijn, aangezien de schutter enkel de verkopers van Afrikaanse origine op straat bedreigde.

In diezelfde week werd er bovendien, eveneens in Italië, een Roma-kamp afgebrand door een boze menigte. In Duitsland kwam afgelopen november aan het licht dat er systematisch burgers waren vermoord door aanhangers van extreem rechts, vanwege hun Turkse afkomst, en in juli waren we allen getuigen van de moordpartij in Noorwegen.

De Europese Unie beschikt over wetten die discriminatie op basis van etnische afkomst of ras verbieden, zoals de EU-richtlijn gelijke behandeling ongeacht ras of etnische afstamming en het Europees Handvest van de grondrechten, om te garanderen dat alle burgers gelijk behandeld worden en dat hun rechten in gelijke mate gevrijwaard worden. Hun rechten moeten geëerbiedigd worden, en de regeringen van de EU die aan deze wetten onderworpen zijn, moeten de nodige maatregelen treffen om de rechten van de burgers te vrijwaren en alle vormen van discriminatie op basis van ras of etnische afstamming voor alle burgers te bestrijden.

Welke specifieke maatregelen denkt de Commissie te treffen om duidelijk te maken dat discriminatie op basis van ras en raciaal geweld absoluut onaanvaardbaar zijn in Europa en dat haatdelicten koste wat kost voorkomen moeten worden?

Antwoord van mevrouw Reding namens de Commissie
(15 februari 2012)

De Commissie heeft herhaaldelijk alle vormen en uitingen van racisme en vreemdelingenhaat veroordeeld en verworpen en zal dat in de toekomst blijven doen. Deze verschijnselen zijn immers onverenigbaar met de waarden waarop de Europese Unie is gegrondvest.

De Commissie wil zich inzetten voor de bestrijding van racisme en vreemdelingenhaat met alle middelen waarover zij krachtens de Verdragen beschikt.

Meer in het bijzonder houdt de Commissie toezicht op de uitvoering van Kaderbesluit 2008/913/JBZ ([1]), waarbij de lidstaten verplicht worden opzettelijk en publiekelijk aanzetten tot racistisch en xenofoob geweld of haat te bestraffen en om bij elk ander strafbaar feit of bij het bepalen van de strafmaat rekening te houden met racistische of xenofobe motieven als verzwarende omstandigheid.

Voorts wordt in Richtlijn 2000/43/EG ([2]) van de Raad het beginsel van gelijke behandeling van personen ongeacht ras of etnische afstamming ten uitvoer gelegd door een EU-wijd verbod op discriminatie op grond van ras of etnische afstamming bij de toegang tot arbeid, beroepsopleiding, onderwijs, sociale bescherming (met inbegrip van sociale zekerheid en gezondheidszorg), sociale voordelen, en toegang tot goederen en diensten (met inbegrip van huisvesting). De richtlijn verbiedt directe en indirecte discriminatie, intimidatie en de opdracht tot discrimineren. Alle EU-lidstaten hebben deze richtlijn in nationale wetgeving omgezet en de Europese Commissie verzekert de correcte uitvoering van dit instrument.

De Commissie blijft ook de bestrijding van racisme en vreemdelingenhaat steunen, inclusief het voorkomen van deze verschijnselen, door het verlenen van financiële steun voor op dit doel gerichte activiteiten van belanghebbenden.

([1]) Kaderbesluit 2008/913/JBZ van de Raad van 28 november 2008 betreffende de bestrijding van bepaalde vormen en uitingen van racisme en vreemdelingenhaat door middel van het strafrecht, PB L 328, blz. 55.

([2]) Richtlijn 2000/43/EG van de Raad van 29 juni 2000 houdende toepassing van het beginsel van gelijke behandeling van personen ongeacht ras of etnische afstamming, PB L 180 van 19.7.2000., blz. 22-26.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012674/11
to the Commission
Emine Bozkurt (S&D) and Malika Benarab-Attou (Verts/ALE)
(11 January 2012)

Subject: Hate crimes in Florence

On Tuesday 13 December, a gunman, a known sympathiser of the extreme right, went on a shooting spree in Florence. He killed two Senegalese street vendors and wounded three others before killing himself. The shooting spree was said to be racially motivated, since the gunman only aimed at the African descent vendors on the street.

Moreover, in the same week a Roma camp was burned down by a mob, also in Italy. In Germany last November it came to light that there have been systematic killings of citizens due to their Turkish descent by extreme rightists, and in July we witnessed the murderous attacks in Norway.

The European Union has laws that ban discrimination on the basis of ethnicity and race, such as the EU Racial Equality Directive and the EU Fundamental Rights Charter, to ensure that citizens are equal and that their rights will be equally safeguarded. Their rights need to be respected, and the governments of the EU bound by these laws have to take all necessary actions to safeguard citizens' rights and combat all forms of racial and ethnic discrimination for all citizens alike.

What specific action is the Commission going to take to make clear that racial discrimination and violence are utterly unacceptable in Europe and that hate crimes must be prevented by all possible means?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(15 February 2012)

The Commission has repeatedly condemned and rejected all forms and manifestations of racism and xenophobia and it will continue to do so, as these phenomena are incompatible with the values on which the EU is founded.

The Commission is committed to fighting against racism and xenophobia by all means available to it under the Treaties.

More specifically, the Commission is monitoring the implementation of Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA ([1]) which obliges Member States to penalise the intentional public incitement to racist or xenophobic violence or hatred and to take the racist or xenophobic motivation of any other offence into consideration as an aggravating circumstance or in the determination of the penalties.

Furthermore, Council Directive 2000/43/EC ([2]) implements the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin by prohibiting racial discrimination throughout the EU in the areas of employment and training, education, social protection (including social security and healthcare), social advantages and access to goods and services (including housing). The directive bans direct and indirect discrimination, harassment and instruction to discriminate. All EU Member States have transposed this directive into national legislation and the European Commission ensures the correct implementation of this instrument.

The Commission also continues to support the fight against racism and xenophobia, including the prevention of these phenomena, by providing financial assistance to stakeholders' activities aimed to this end.

([1]) 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, p. 55.

([2]) 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.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000008/12
aan de Commissie
Barry Madlener (NI)
(11 januari 2012)

Betreft: Turkije pakt wederom tientallen journalisten op

1. Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie de nieuwsberichten „Turkije pakt achttien journalisten op bij „antiterreuractie"' ([1]), „Turkey Arrests Journalists It Ties to Outlawed Group" ([2]) en „A dangerous place to be a journalist"' ([3])?

2. Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie de kwaliteit van de Turkse democratie in het licht van het feit dat Turkije met meer dan 90 opgesloten journalisten tot de meest journalistvijandige landen ter wereld behoort?

3. Is de Commissie bereid om de nieuwe aanslag van het islamitische regime Erdogan op de persvrijheid in Turkije, in de vorm van de arrestaties van afgelopen dinsdag, in scherpe bewoordingen te veroordelen? Zo neen, waarom niet?

4. Deelt de Commissie de mening dat het geen pas geeft om door te gaan met toetredingsonderhandelingen met een regime dat journalisten muilkorft, dat regimeonvriendelijke journalisten oppakt en detineert, en dat Allah-onvriendelijke cartoonisten bedreigt met lange gevangenisstraffen? Zo neen, waarom niet?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(21 februari 2012)

De Commissie heeft herhaaldelijk haar bezorgdheid geuit over het grote aantal rechtszaken tegen journalisten en de buitensporige druk op de media. De vrijheid van meningsuiting wordt daardoor in de praktijk ondermijnd.

De Commissie toetst de ontwikkelingen in Turkije nauwgezet aan de politieke criteria, waarvan de vrijheid van meningsuiting een essentieel onderdeel is. Zij heeft consequent benadrukt dat de huidige wetgeving, in strijd met het Europees Verdrag voor de Rechten van de Mens en de jurisprudentie van het Europees Hof voor de Rechten van de Mens, de vrijheid van meningsuiting niet voldoende waarborgt en een restrictieve uitlegging door de rechterlijke autoriteiten mogelijk maakt. De Commissie heeft Turkije aangespoord om zijn wetgeving en justitiële praktijken te hervormen. De Commissie vraagt regelmatig aandacht voor deze aangelegenheid in het kader van haar lopende contacten met de Turkse autoriteiten. De EU-delegatie in Ankara volgt ook de thans tegen journalisten gevoerde processen nauwlettend.

Voor een gedetailleerde analyse van de persvrijheid in Turkije verwijst de Commissie het geachte Parlementslid naar haar op 12 oktober 2011 vastgestelde voortgangsverslag.

In het in oktober 2005 goedgekeurde onderhandelingskader zijn de beginselen vastgesteld waarop de toetredingsonderhandelingen met Turkije zijn gebaseerd. De vooruitgang wordt onder meer bepaald aan de hand van de stabiliteit van de instellingen die de democratie, de rechtsstaat, de mensenrechten en het respect voor en de bescherming van minderheden garanderen. Daarbij gaat het onder andere om het recht op vrijheid van godsdienst, het recht op vrijheid van meningsuiting en de rechten van vrouwen overeenkomstig het Europese Verdrag voor de Rechten van de Mens (EVRM) en de jurisprudentie van het Europees Hof voor de Rechten van de Mens (EHRM). De Commissie zal blijven controleren of Turkije aan deze criteria voldoet; dit blijft het enige uitgangspunt voor de Commissie.

([1]) http://www.elsevier.nl/web/Nieuws/Buitenland/325611/Turkije-pakt-achttien-journalisten-op-bij-antiterreuractie.htm
([2]) http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204058404577110491968093640.html
([3]) http://www.economist.com/node/18333123.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000008/12
to the Commission
Barry Madlener (NI)
(11 January 2012)

Subject: Turkey arrests dozens of journalists again

1. How does the Commission assess the news featuring in 'Turkije pakt achttien journalisten op bij "antiterreuractie" ["Turkey arrests 18 journalists during 'anti-terrorist operation'"], "Turkey Arrests Journalists It Ties to Outlawed Group" ([1]) and "A dangerous place to be a journalist'"?

2. How does the Commission assess the quality of democracy in Turkey in light of the fact that, with more than 90 journalists imprisoned, Turkey is among the most hostile countries in the world to journalists?

3. Is the Commission prepared to condemn in strong terms the latest attack by Erdoğan's Islamic regime on press freedom in Turkey, in the form of the arrests made last Tuesday? If not, why not?

4. Does the Commission share the view that it is not right to be continuing accession negotiations with a regime which gags journalists, arrests and detains journalists who are hostile to the regime, and threatens cartoonists who are hostile to Allah with lengthy prison sentences? If not, why not?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(21 February 2012)

The Commission has on various occasions expressed concern over the high number of court cases against journalists and undue pressure on the media which undermine freedom of expression in practice.

The Commission closely monitors developments in Turkey under the political criteria, of which freedom of expression is an essential component. It has consistently underlined that the present legislation does not sufficiently guarantee freedom of expression in line with the European Convention on Human Rights and case-law of the European Court of Human Rights and permits restrictive interpretation by the judiciary and urged Turkey to reform its legislation and judicial practices. The Commission regularly raises this matter in its ongoing contacts with the Turkish authorities. The EU Delegation in Ankara also monitors ongoing trials against journalists.

For a detailed analysis of the freedom of press in Turkey, the Commission refers the Honourable Member to its Progress Report adopted on 12 October 2011.

The Negotiating Framework adopted in October 2005 defines the principles governing accession negotiations with Turkey. Progress is measured, amongst other things, against the stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities. These include the rights to freedom of religion, freedom of expression and women's rights in line with the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) and European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) case law. The Commission will continue to monitor Turkey's fulfilment of these criteria and to work exclusively on this basis.

([1]) http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204058404577110491968093640.html

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000009/12
aan de Commissie
Barry Madlener (NI)
(11 januari 2012)

Betreft: Explosieve stijging Polen met uitkering in Nederland

1. Is de Commissie bekend met de schrikbarende cijfers ([1]) dat in Nederland ongeveer 12 000 Polen en andere arbeidsmigranten uit de nieuwere EU-lidstaten nu een uitkering ontvangen?

2. Zo ja, wat zijn de mogelijkheden voor Nederland om het gebruik van sociale voorzieningen door Europese arbeidsmigranten en andere niet-Nederlanders te beperken?

3. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat door toedoen van de EU het Nederlandse sociale stelsel onder enorme druk is komen te staan door het openstellen van de grenzen?

4. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat Nederland zijn sociale stelsel niet bedoeld heeft om werkloze Polen of andere werklozen uit EU-lidstaten te onderhouden?

5. Is de Commissie bereid om de regels zodanig te wijzigen zodat Nederland de mogelijkheid heeft Europese uitkeringsmigratie te voorkomen?

6. Wat is de verwachting van de Commissie voor de werkloosheid in de EU-landen, inclusief Roemenië en Bulgarije, voor 2012?

Antwoord van de heer Andor namens de Commissie
(12 maart 2012)

1. De Commissie was nog niet bekend met de door het geachte Parlementslid genoemde cijfers.

2. Volgens het Unierecht hebben burgers van de Unie die zich naar Nederland begeven, recht op dezelfde behandeling als Nederlanders wat de toegang tot socialezekerheidsvoorzieningen betreft. De lidstaten zijn evenwel in beginsel niet verplicht sociale bijstand toe te kennen aan burgers van de Unie die zich naar hun grondgebied begeven. Onverminderd specifieke, in het Verdrag en het afgeleide recht uitdrukkelijk opgenomen bepalingen, geniet iedere burger van de Unie die op basis van Richtlijn 2004/38/EG op het grondgebied van een gastland verblijft, binnen het toepassingsgebied van het Verdrag dezelfde behandeling als de burgers van dat gastland ([2]).

3. Volgens diverse studies ([3]) zijn er geen aanwijzingen dat recent mobiele burgers binnen de EU onevenredig vaak aanspraak maken op uitkeringen. Mobiliteitsstromen hebben in enkele gevallen op lokaal niveau druk uitgeoefend op de verlening van onderwijs-, huisvestings- en gezondheidsdiensten. Uit de meeste studies ([4]) komt echter naar voren dat het effect van recente mobiliteitsstromen op de overheidsfinanciën op nationaal niveau verwaarloosbaar of positief is, en er zijn geen recente aanwijzingen voor het tegendeel.

4. Het is niet aan de Commissie commentaar te geven op de doelen die Nederland met zijn sociale stelsel nastreeft. Zodra Nederland besluit een bepaalde socialezekerheidsvoorziening aan zijn burgers te verstrekken, moeten andere burgers van de Unie evenwel op niet-discriminerende wijze ook in het genot daarvan worden gesteld.

5. De Commissie is bereid te overwegen om wijzigingen voor te stellen wanneer uit objectieve en betrouwbare gegevens blijkt dat er op grote schaal misbruik plaatsvindt en de huidige wettelijke regels tekortschieten om die gevallen van misbruik te voorkomen.

6. De Commissie verwijst het geachte Parlementslid naar de in de voetnoot opgenomen publicaties ([5]).

([1]) http://www.telegraaf.nl/binnenland/11166380/__Meer_Polen_met_uitkering__.html
([2]) Zie in dit verband artikel 24 van de richtlijn.
([3]) Bv. Barrett en Maître, 2011.
([4]) Bv. D'Auria, Mc Morrow en Pichelmann, 2008.
([5]) EU Employment and Social Situation Quarterly Review van december 2011 en de Europese economische najaarsprognose http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=nl & catId=89&newsId=1157&furtherNews=yes.
http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/2011/pdf/ee-2011-6_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000009/12
to the Commission
Barry Madlener (NI)
(11 January 2012)

Subject: Sharp rise in the number of Poles receiving benefits in the Netherlands

1. Is the Commission aware of the alarming figures ([1]) showing that roughly 12 000 Poles and other migrant workers from the newer EU Member States are currently receiving benefits in the Netherlands?

2. If so, what options does the Netherlands have available to limit European migrant workers and other non-Netherlands nationals from taking advantage of social welfare benefits?

3. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that, due to the EU, the Netherlands' social welfare system has come under huge pressure by opening its borders?

4. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that the Netherlands did not intend its social welfare system to support unemployed Poles or other unemployed persons from EU Member States?

5. Is the Commission prepared to amend the rules so that the Netherlands has the option to prevent benefit migration in Europe?

6. What is the Commission's expectation for 2012 in terms of unemployment in the EU countries, including Romania and Bulgaria?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(12 March 2012)

1. The Commission was not previously aware of the figures cited by the Honourable Member.

2. According to Union law, Union citizens moving to the Netherlands are entitled to equal treatment with Dutch nationals as regards access to social security benefits. The Member States are however in principle not obliged to grant social assistance to Union citizens moving to their territory. However, subject to such specific provisions as are expressly provided for in the Treaty and secondary law, all Union citizens residing on the basis of this directive in the territory of the host Member State shall enjoy equal treatment with the nationals of that Member State within the scope of the Treaty ([2]).

3. According to various studies ([3]), there is no evidence of a disproportionate use of benefits by recent intra-EU mobile citizens. Mobility flows have in some cases created pressure on education, housing and healthcare services at local level. However, most studies ([4]) estimated that the impact of recent mobility flows on public finances is negligible or positive at national level and there is no recent counter evidence.

4. It is not for the Commission to comment on the intentions pursued by the Netherlands with its social welfare system. However, once the Netherlands decide to provide a certain social security benefit to its citizens, such a benefit has to be granted to other Union citizens on a non-discriminatory basis.

5. The Commission would be prepared to envisage proposing amendments if objective and reliable data would show that there are significant practices of abuse and that the current legal framework is not adequate to prevent them.

6. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the referenced publications ([5]).

([1]) http://www.telegraaf.nl/binnenland/11166380/__Meer_Polen_met_uitkering__.html
([2]) See, in that regard, Article 24 of Directive 2004/38/EC.
([3]) e.g. Barrett and Maître, 2011.
([4]) e.g. D'Auria, McMorrow and Pichelmann, 2008.
([5]) EU Employment and Social Situation Quarterly Review — December 2011 and the Autumn European Economic Forecast, http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=89&newsId=1157&furtherNews=yes; http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/2011/pdf/ee-2011-6_en.pdf

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000017/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11. januára 2012)

Vec: Investície do energetickej účinnosti

Spoločnosť Autodesk si dala vypracovať prieskum, ktorý sa zaoberal otázkou investícií do energetickej účinnosti v rôznych členských štátoch Európskej únie. Zúčastnilo sa ho 2000 respondentov z Nemecka, Talianska, Francúzska a Veľkej Británie. 25 % opýtaných tvorili majitelia firiem. Z tohto prieskumu vyplýva, že o investíciách do ekologickejšieho chodu svojich firiem uvažuje 86 % oslovených firemných manažérov. 27 % z nich je dokonca ochotných vynaložiť o 10 a viac percent vyššiu čiastku finančných prostriedkov, ako vynakladajú v súčasnosti. 70 % opýtaných občanov EÚ uviedlo, že by investovalo do „zelených opatrení" vo svojich domácnostiach. Výskum tiež ukázal, že zatiaľ neexistuje zhoda v tom, ako zvyšovať trvalú udržateľnosť miest. Najviac respondentov sa vyjadrilo za nákup miestnych výrobkov na podporu lokálnych firiem a farmárov (37 %), nasledovali investície do úspor energie (29 %) a lokálnej výsadby stromov (19 %). Za najväčšiu výzvu pre udržateľnosť považovalo až 30 % zmenu klímy, 25 % starnutie populácie, 24 % rastúcu populáciu a 21 % nedostatok vody a ďalších kľúčových zdrojov. V súlade s rastúcim dôrazom EÚ na znižovanie emisií skleníkových plynov taktiež respondenti výskumu považujú redukciu CO2 za veľmi dôležitý krok, ktorý musia mestá urobiť kvôli tomu, aby sa stali zelenšie a udržateľnejšie.

Potvrdzujú výsledky tohto prieskumu súčasné poznatky Komisie, alebo má Komisia iné informácie?

Plánuje v najbližšom čase v tomto smere prijať nejaké opatrenia?

Odpoveď pána Oettingera v mene Komisie
(21. februára 2012)

Komisii nie je známy prieskum, o ktorom sa vo svojej otázke zmieňuje vážená pani poslankyňa, Komisia však podporila celý rad prieskumov Eurobarometra o postojoch Európanov k energetike ([1]) ([2]) a zmene klímy ([3]). Najnovší prieskum z roku 2011 ([4]) odhalil, že takmer ôsmi z desiatich občanov EÚ vidia v zlepšení energetickej účinnosti ekonomické prínosy.

([1]) Osobitný prieskum Eurobarometra 247 / Wave 64.2: Postoje k energetike, uverejnené v januári 2006, citované v: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_247_en.pdf
([2]) Bleskový prieskum Eurobarometra 206a: Postoje k problémom energetickej politiky EÚ, uverejnené v apríli 2007, citované v: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl_238_en.pdf
([3]) Osobitný prieskum Eurobarometra 313 / Wave 71.1: Postoje Európanov k zmene klímy, uverejnené v júli 2009, citované v: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_313_en.pdf
([4]) Osobitný prieskum Eurobarometra 372 / Wave EB75.4: ZMENA KLÍMY, uverejnené v októbri 2011, citované v: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_372_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000017/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11 January 2012)

Subject: Investment in energy efficiency

Autodesk, Inc. commissioned a survey that addressed the issue of investments in energy efficiency in the various Member States of the European Union. Two thousand respondents from Germany, Italy, France and Great Britain participated in the survey, of whom 25% were business owners. This survey shows that 86% of company managers approached are considering investment in the more ecological running of their companies, and 27% of them are even willing to spend 10% or more more than they currently spend. 70% of EU citizens who responded said they would invest in 'green measures' in their homes. The survey also showed that so far there is no consensus on how to improve the sustainability of cities. Buying locally to support local businesses and farmers was the most popular option, supported by 37% of the sample, followed by investment in energy efficiency (29 percent) and planting trees in the local area (19 percent). The biggest challenge to sustainability was considered to be climate change by 30% of respondents, 25% chose ageing populations, 24% selected growing populations and 21% identified shortages of water and other key resources. In line with the growing emphasis in the EU on reducing greenhouse gas emissions, survey respondents also considered a reduction in CO_2 to be a very important step that cities must take in order that cities may become greener and more sustainable.

Do the results of this survey confirm the current knowledge of the Commission or does the Commission have other information?

Does it plan in the near future to take any action in this regard?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(21 February 2012)

The Commission is not aware of the survey referred to in the question of the honourable MEP but has supported a number of Eurobarometer surveys on the attitudes of Europeans towards energy ([1]) ([2]) and climate change ([3]). The most recent survey of 2011 ([4]) revealed that nearly eight in ten EU citizens see economic benefits to improving energy efficiency.

([1]) Special Eurobarometer 247/Wave 64.2: Attitudes towards Energy, published January 2006, cited at: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_247_en.pdf
([2]) Flash Eurobarometer 206a: Attitudes on issues related to EU Energy Policy, published April 2007, cited at: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl206a_en.pdf
([3]) Special Eurobarometer 313/Wave 71.1: Europeans' attitudes towards climate change, published July 2009, cited at: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_313_en.pdf
([4]) Special Eurobarometer 372/Wave EB75.4: CLIMATE CHANGE, published October 2011, cited at: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_372_en.pdf

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-000048/12
komissiolle
Liisa Jaakonsaari (S&D)
(12. tammikuuta 2012)

Aihe: Muuttolintujen metsästys lintujen muuton valtaväylillä Välimeren maissa

EU:n lintudirektiivi (79/409/ETY) hyväksyttiin jo vuonna 1979 – tuolloin yksimielisesti. Tämän tahollaan piti olla tehokas keino suojelemaan lintukantoja. Tämä ei kuitenkaan ole toteutunut, vaan lintukannat ovat alati pienenemässä.

Lintujen metsästys kevätmuutto- ja pesimisaikana on kiellettyä. Valitettavasti juuri näinä aikoina harjoitetaan raakaa metsästystä esimerkiksi muuttolintujen valtaväylillä Välimeren maissa. Kyse ei ole tarvemetsästyksestä, vaan suorastaan lintujen lahtaamisesta, sillä muutaman tunnin aikana pienikin joukko metsästäjiä tappaa tuhansia lintuja. Näistä linnuista suuri osa jää kitumaan luontoon.

Mitä komissio on tekemässä sen eteen, että lintu- ja luontodirektiiviä sovellettaisiin täysin kaikissa Euroopan unionin maissa? Onko komissiolla esittää muuttolintujen suojelemiseen suunnitelmaa ja konkreettisia toimia?

Lintudirektiivin (liite II) mukaisesti lintulajeja tulisi suojella suunnitelmallisesti ja toteuttaa tämä suojelusuunnitelma tehokkaasti. Valvontaa ja seurantaa sekä mahdollisia rangaistustoimia pitäisi teroittaa niin EU-tasolla kuin kansallisestikin.

Janez Potočnikin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(20. helmikuuta 2012)

Direktiivillä 2009/147/EY ([1]) (lintudirektiivi) pyritään suojaamaan kaikkia Euroopan unionin luonnonvaraisia lintulajeja. Tiettyjen lajien metsästys on sallittu, kunhan siinä noudatetaan järkevän hyödyntämisen periaatetta ja lintudirektiivin 7 artiklan tiukkoja säännöksiä.

Lintudirektiivin täytäntöönpano ja sen noudattamisen valvonta ovat jäsenvaltioiden vastuulla. Useimmat jäsenvaltiot ovat saaneet nimettyä maanpäälliset erityisten suojelutoimien alueet direktiivin liitteessä I lueteltujen lajien osalta, ja komission ensisijainen tavoite on nyt varmistaa nimettyjen suojelualueiden moitteeton hallinnointi. Tämän vuoksi komissio pyrkii aktiivisesti työskentelemään jäsenvaltioiden kanssa muun muassa hoitosuunnitelmien, ensisijaisten tavoitteiden asettamisen ja suojelutoimenpiteiden rahoituksen aloilla.

Komissio on aloittanut metsästystä koskevia rikkomisesta johtuvia menettelyjä useita jäsenvaltioita vastaan. Osalle määrättiin seuraamuksia. Lisäksi komissio on avannut uusia menettelyjä eräitä Välimeren maita vastaan. Koska joissakin jäsenvaltioissa on raportoitu jatkuvista väärinkäytöksistä, komissio on aloittanut vuoropuhelun BirdLife Internationalin ja EU:n metsästys- ja suojelujärjestöjen liiton kanssa ongelman ratkaisemiseksi. Komissio osallistui äskettäin lintujen laitonta tappamista, ansapyyntiä ja kauppaa käsitelleeseen konferenssiin Kyproksessa. Konferenssin myötä komissio tutkii erilaisia tapoja lisätä tietoisuutta tästä ongelmasta ja tukea jäsenvaltioiden pyrkimyksiä ratkaista se.

([1]) EUVL L 20, 26.1.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000048/12
to the Commission
Liisa Jaakonsaari (S&D)
(12 January 2012)

Subject: Hunting of migratory birds in migratory pathways in the Mediterranean countries

The EU Birds Directive (79/409/EEC) was passed as early as 1979, without controversy at the time. It was intended to constitute an effective measure to protect bird stocks. This has not materialised, however, and bird stocks are continuously diminishing.

The hunting of birds during the spring migration and nesting season is prohibited. Unfortunately in these very seasons a cruel hunt is played out in the migratory pathways in the Mediterranean countries, for example. This is not subsistence hunting but veritable slaughter of birds, where in the space of a few hours even a small party of hunters kills thousands of birds. Some of these birds are left in the wild wounded and suffering.

What is the Commission's response to have the Birds and Natural Habitats Directives fully enforced in all Member States? Does the Commission have a plan and concrete measures to produce for the conservation of migratory birds?

Under the Birds Directive (Annex II) bird species should be protected in a systematic way, and the conservation plan should be effectively implemented. Oversight and monitoring and possible penal measures should be sharpened at both EU level and nationally.

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(20 February 2012)

Directive 2009/147/EC ([1]) ('Birds Directive') aims to protect all bird species occurring in the wild in the European Union. Hunting of certain species is allowed as long as it complies with the principle of wise use and the strict provisions of Article 7 of the directive.

The implementation of the Birds Directive and enforcement of the legislation is the responsibility of Member States. As most of them have completed the designation of terrestrial Special Areas of Conservation for the species listed in Annex I of the directive, the Commission priority is now to ensure a proper management of the designated sites. Therefore the Commission is actively working with Member States on issues such as management plans, setting priorities, and financing conservation measures.

The Commission has initiated infringement procedures against a number of Member States on hunting issues. Some of them were condemned. Moreover the Commission has opened new cases against some Mediterranean countries. Given reports of abusive persistent practices in some Member States the Commission has initiated a dialogue with BirdLife International and the Federation of Associations for Hunting and Conservation of the EU to address the issue. The Commission recently took part in a conference on illegal killing, trapping and trade of birds in Cyprus. Further to this conference the Commission is exploring different routes to raise awareness and support Member States' efforts to tackle the problem.

([1]) OJ L 20, 26.1.2010.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000054/12
προς το Συμβούλιο
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(12 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Ισόρροπη ανάπτυξη και συντονισμός πολιτικών των χωρών εντός και εκτός ευρωζώνης

Την 1η Ιανουαρίου 2011 ο Δανός Υπουργός Εξωτερικών Νίκολα Βάμεν δήλωσε ότι η βασική αποστολή της χώρας του ως προεδρεύουσα της ΕΕ είναι να «ενώσει της χώρες που βρίσκονται στην ευρωζώνη με αυτές που βρίσκονται εκτός αυτής», ενώ η Δανή πρωθυπουργός Χέλε Θόρνινγκ Σμιτ υποστήριξε ότι είναι προς όφελος των χωρών του πυρήνα της ΕΕ «να κρατήσουν τους 27 μαζί» και να συμβουλεύονται όλα τα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ «όταν αυτές οι αποφάσεις τους αφορούν» ([1]). Παράλληλα, ο Ντέιβιντ Κάμερον, πρωθυπουργός της Βρετανίας, τόνισε πως παρ' ότι η κυβέρνησή του έχει σαφή και ισχυρά σχέδια για την μείωση του ελλείμματος, αυτά μπορούν να διασφαλίσουν μόνον «μερική προστασία από τις καταιγίδες του χρέους που τώρα χτυπούν την ευρωζώνη» ([2]).

Το Συμβούλιο ερωτάται:

1. Ποια μέτρα σκοπεύει να λάβει για την βελτίωση του συντονισμού των μακροοικονομικών πολιτικών των δύο περιοχών αυτών καθώς και για την αντιμετώπιση των κινδύνων μετάδοσης της δημοσιονομικής κρίσης σε χώρες εκτός ευρωζώνης;

2. Πώς αξιολογείται η συμμετοχή των κρατών εκτός ευρώ στις διαδικασίες λήψης αποφάσεων που αφορούν την επίλυση της κρίσης χρέους της ευρωζώνης και πώς αναμένεται να προσδιοριστεί στο μέλλον, λαμβάνοντας υπόψη, τόσο την οικονομική αλληλεξάρτηση των χωρών της ευρωζώνης με τα υπόλοιπα κράτη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, όσο και την πορεία πολλών εξ αυτών προς την υιοθέτηση του ενιαίου νομίσματος;

3. Ποια η θέση του σχετικά με την υλοποίηση των αποφάσεων του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου της 9ης Δεκεμβρίου και του ρόλου της Μ. Βρετανίας;

Απάντηση
(5 Μαρτίου 2012)

Το Συμβούλιο, σε συνεργασία με τα λοιπά θεσμικά όργανα της ΕΕ, έχει ήδη αρχίσει να εφαρμόζει τον βελτιωμένο συντονισμό της οικονομικής πολιτικής που προβλέπεται στη δέσμη των έξι νομοθετικών μέτρων που θεσπίστηκαν στα τέλη του 2011 ([3]). Η εφαρμογή αυτών των μέτρων, στα πλαίσια του Ευρωπαϊκού Εξαμήνου, θα είναι αποφασιστική βελτίωση στην ποιότητα του συντονισμού της οικονομικής πολιτικής στην Ένωση. Η δέσμη μέτρων εφαρμόζεται και στα 27 κράτη μέλη, εκτός από δύο κανονισμούς που εφαμόζονται αποκλειστικά στα κράτη μέλη της ζώνης του ευρώ, των οποίων η βαθύτερη οικονομική και νομισματική ολοκλήρωση απαιτεί πρόσθετο συντονισμό. Είναι δε υπό συζήτηση δύο νεες νομοθετικές προτάσεις για την περαιτέρω ενίσχυση του συντονισμού της οικονομικής πολιτικής στη ζώνη του ευρώ.

Τα κράτη μέλη θα πρέπει να θεσπίσουν οικονομικές πολιτικές, σύμφωνες με αυτό το πλαίσιο, προκειμένου να εξασφαλίσουν την εξυγίανση και βιωσιμότητα των δημοσίων οικονομικών τους και προκειμένου να δημιουργηθούν οι συνθήκες για ανανεωμένη ισχυρή και βιώσιμη οικονομική μεγέθυνση.

([1]) http://www.eubusiness.com/news-eu/denmark-presidency.ecg.
([2]) http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/mobile/uk-16378577.
([3]) — Κανονισμός (ΕΕ) αριθ. 1173/2011 του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της 16ης Νοεμβρίου 2011, για την αποτελεσματική επιβολή της δημοσιονομικής εποπτείας στη ζώνη του ευρώ,.
— Κανονισμός (ΕΕ) αριθ. 1174/2011 του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της 16ης Νοεμβρίου 2011, σχετικά με κατασταλτικά μέτρα για τη διόρθωση των υπερβολικών μακροοικονομικών ανισορροπιών στην ευρωζώνη,.
— Κανονισμός (ΕΕ) αριθ. 1175/2011 του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της 16ης Νοεμβρίου 2011, που τροποποιεί τον κανονισμό (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1466/97 του Συμβουλίου για την ενίσχυση της εποπτείας της δημοσιονομικής κατάστασης και την εποπτεία και τον συντονισμό των οικονομικών πολιτικών,.
— Κανονισμός (ΕΕ) αριθ. 1176/2011 του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της 16ης Νοεμβρίου 2011, σχετικά με την πρόληψη και τη διόρθωση των υπερβολικών μακροοικονομικών ανισορροπιών,.
— Κανονισμός (ΕΕ) αριθ. 1177/2011 του Συμβουλίου, της 8ης Νοεμβρίου 2011, που τροποποιεί τον κανονισμό (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1467/97 για την επιτάχυνση και τη διασαφήνιση της εφαρμογής της διαδικασίας υπερβολικού ελλείμματος, και.
— Οδηγία 2011/85/ΕΕ του Συμβουλίου, της 8ης Νοεμβρίου 2011, σχετικά με τις απαιτήσεις για τα δημοσιονομικά πλαίσια των κρατών μελών (ΕΕ L 306 της 23.11.2011).

Στις 9 Δεκεμβρίου, οι αρχηγοί κράτους ή κυβέρνησης των κρατών μελών της ζώνης του ευρώ και η πλειοψηφία των αρχηγών κράτους ή κυβέρνησης των κρατών μελών εκτός της ζώνης του ευρώ συμφώνησαν να καταρτίσουν περαιτέρω δεσμευτικούς κανόνες για τη βελτίωση της οικονομικής διακυβέρνησης και να εξασφαλίσουν ισχυρότερο συντονισμό των οικονομικών πολιτικών σε θέματα κοινού ενδιαφέροντος. Όλα τα κράτη μέλη κλήθηκαν αφενός να συμμετάσχουν στην κατάρτιση αυτών των νέων κανόνων και αφετέρου να υπογράψουν τη συνθήκη περί της θέσπισής τους. Οι συζητήσεις που ξεκίνησαν με την απόφαση της 9ης Δεκεμβρίου συνεχίστηκαν με πλήρη συμμετοχή των εκπροσώπων και των 27 κρατών μελών, καθώς και των λοιπών θεσμικών οργάνων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, περιλαμβανομένου και του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου.

Οι αρχηγοί κράτους ή κυβέρνησης συζήτησαν το θέμα σε άτυπη σύνοδο στις 30 Ιανουαρίου, οπότε και οριστικοποιήθηκε η Συνθήκη για τη σταθερότητα, τον συντονισμό και τη διακυβέρνηση στην Οικονομική και Νομισματική Ένωση, η οποία και θα υπογραφεί τον Μάρτιο.

Οι νέοι κανόνες που καταρτίστηκαν είναι συνεπείς προς το ισχύον νομοθετικό πλαίσιο της Ένωσης, περιλαμβανομένων των κανόνων περί εσωτερικής αγοράς και των διατάξεων για τη θέσπιση του ευρώ, καθώς και των ευθυνών και υποχρεώσεων των κρατών μελών που έχουν ως νόμισμα το ευρώ. Οι κανόνες είναι δεσμευτικοί μόνον για τα συμβαλλόμενα μέρη που έχουν ως νόμισμα το ευρώ. Τα λοιπά συμβαλλόμενα μέρη δεσμεύονται μόνον από τη Συνθήκη από την ημερομηνία κατά την οποία γίνονται μέλη της ζώνης του ευρώ, εκτός εάν ένα συμβαλλόμενο μέρος δηλώσει την πρόθεσή του να δεσμευθεί ενωρίτερα. Ο στόχος των κρατών μελών που δήλωσαν την πρόθεσή τους να υπογράψουν τη νέα συνθήκη είναι να ενσωματωθούν οι διατάξεις της στις συνθήκες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης το συντομότερο.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000054/12
to the Council
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(12 January 2012)

Subject: Balanced development and coordination of country policies in the euro area and out of it

On 1 January 2011, Nicolai Wammen, Denmark's Minister for Foreign Affairs, declared that the primary mission of his country as chair of the EU is to 'unify the countries that are in the eurozone with the ones outside of it', while Helle Thorning-Schmidt, the Prime Minister of Denmark, asserted it would be in the interests of the countries that comprise the core of the EU 'to keep the 27 countries together' and consult with all EU Member States 'when these decisions concern them' ([1]). At the same time David Cameron, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, stressed that, although his government has laid clear and strong plans for reducing the deficit, these can only provide 'some protection from the… debt storms now battering the eurozone' ([2]).

Will the Council answer the following:

1. Which are the measures the Council intends to take to improve the coordination of the macroeconomic policies of both these areas as well as to address the risk of the financial crisis spreading to countries not in the eurozone?

2. What does the Council think about the participation of non-- eurozone countries in the decision-making procedures aiming to resolve the debt crisis in the eurozone? How is this expected to be determined in the future, taking into account both the financial interdependence between euro area countries and the remaining states of the European Union and the path to be followed by many of them towards the adoption of the common currency?

3. What is the position held by the Council with respect to implementing the decisions of the European Council of 9 December and the role of the United Kingdom?

Reply
(5 March 2012)

The Council has already begun, in cooperation with the other EU institutions, to implement the improved economic policy coordination provided for in the package of six legislative measures adopted towards the end of 2011 ([3]). The implementation of these measures, in the context of the European Semester, will represent a step change in the quality of economic policy coordination within the Union. This package applies to all 27 Member States, except two Regulations that apply exclusively to Member States of the euro area, whose deeper economic and monetary integration implies a need for additional coordination. Two new legislative proposals are under discussion to further enhance economic policy coordination within the euro area.

It is essential that all Member States adopt appropriate economic policies, in line with this framework, to ensure the soundness and sustainability of their public finances and to establish the conditions for renewed strong and durable economic growth.

([1]) http://www.eubusiness.com/news-eu/denmark-presidency.ecg.
([2]) http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/mobile/uk-16378577.
([3]) — Regulation (EU) No 1173/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 November 2011 on the effective enforcement of budgetary surveillance in the euro area; .
— Regulation (EU) No 1174/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 November 2011 on enforcement measures to correct excessive macroeconomic imbalances in the euro area;.
— Regulation (EU) No 1175/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 November 2011 amending Council Regulation (EC) No 1466/97 on the strengthening of the surveillance of budgetary positions and the surveillance and coordination of economic policies;.
— Regulation (EU) No 1176/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 November 2011 on the prevention and correction of macroeconomic imbalances;.
— Council Regulation (EU) No 1177/2011 of 8 November 2011 amending Regulation (EC) No 1467/97 on speeding up and clarifying the implementation of the excessive deficit procedure; and.
— Council Directive 2011/85/EU of 8 November 2011 on requirements for budgetary frameworks of the Member States (OJ L 306 of 23 November 2011) .

On 9 December, the Euro Area Heads of State or Government and a majority of the Heads of State or Government of non-euro area Member States agreed to develop further binding rules to improve economic governance and ensure significantly stronger coordination of economic policies in areas of common interest. All Member States were invited both to participate in the development of these new rules and to become signatories to the treaty which establishes them. The discussions launched by the decision of 9 December were pursued with the full involvement of representatives from all 27 Member States, as well as from other European Union Institutions, including the European Parliament.

Heads of State and Government discussed the matter at an informal meeting on 30 January, at which the Treaty on stability, coordination and governance in the Economic and Monetary Union was finalised, with a view to its signature in March.

The new rules which have been developed are consistent with the existing legal framework of the Union, including rules on the internal market and the provisions covering the adoption of the euro and the responsibilities and obligations of Member States whose currency is the euro. They will be binding only on the Contracting Parties whose currency is the euro. The other Contracting Parties will only be bound by the Treaty as from the date they become part of the euro area, unless the Contracting Party concerned declares its intention to be bound at an earlier date. The objective of those Member States which have indicated their intention to be signatories to the new treaty remains to incorporate its provisions in the treaties of the European Union as soon as possible.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000061/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Čierne listiny zamestnancov

Poslanci Európskeho parlamentu sa začali zaoberať problematikou tzv. informátorov. Informátori sú zamestnanci, ktorí v prípade, že majú vedomosť o nemorálnych alebo neetických praktikách, ktoré sa vykonávajú na ich pracovisku, prehovoria o tejto skutočnosti nahlas. To však znamená, že sa ocitnú na tzv. čiernej listine, teda na zozname, ktorý si vytvorí zamestnávateľ o tých zamestnancoch, ktorí prehovorili. V Európe dokonca existujú prípady, keď po tom, ako sa zamestnanec ocitol na čiernej listine a následne dostal od svojho zamestnávateľa výpoveď, ďalšiu prácu už jednoducho nezohnal. Britská organizácia The Consulting Association mala čiernu listinu robotníkov, ktorí boli v minulosti aktívnymi odborármi až do roku 2008, kedy bola táto jej činnosť ukončená kvôli tlaku z médií.

Plánuje komisia prijať opatrenia zamerané na ukončenie takýchto nekalých praktík zamestnávateľov v členských štátoch Európskej únie?

Odpoveď pani Redingovej v mene Komisie
(6. marca 2012)

Komisia sa odvoláva na svoju odpoveď na otázku E-4144/10 ([1]), v ktorej sa uvádza, že smernica 95/46/ES ([2]) sa vzťahuje aj na oblasť zamestnanosti. Podľa článku 8 ods. 1 smernice o ochrane údajov sú členské štáty povinné zabrániť spracovaniu osobných údajov týkajúcich sa členstva v odborových zväzoch, ak sa neuplatňuje výnimka podľa článku 8 (ods. 2 až 5). Vytváranie zoznamov členov odborových zväzov, o ktorom sa vážená pani poslankyňa vo svojej otázke zmieňuje, podľa všetkého nie je v súlade so smernicou 95/46/ES. Pokiaľ ide o tzv. informátorov, treba poznamenať, že vytváranie zoznamov s ich menami takisto predstavuje spracovanie osobných údajov podľa smernice 95/46/ES.

Bez toho, aby boli dotknuté právomoci Komisie ako strážkyne zmlúv, dohľad nad právnymi predpismi týkajúcimi sa ochrany údajov v členských štátoch a ich presadzovanie patrí do pôsobnosti príslušných vnútroštátnych orgánov, a to najmä dozorných orgánov pre ochranu údajov.

Komisia 25. januára 2012 predložila legislatívne návrhy s cieľom ďalej posilniť práva dotknutých osôb ([3]). Návrh nového nariadenia o ochrane údajov [COM(2012) 11 final] okrem iného opätovne zdôrazňuje význam ochrany citlivých údajov, ako je napr. členstvo v odborovom zväze, a je zameraný na uľahčenie uplatňovania práv fyzických osôb.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=SK.
([2]) Smernica Európskeho parlamentu a Rady 95/46/ES z 24. októbra 1995 o ochrane fyzických osôb pri spracovaní osobných údajov a voľnom pohybe týchto údajov (Ú. v. ES L 281, 23.11.1995).
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/newsroom/data-protection/news/120125_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000061/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(13 January 2012)

Subject: Employee blacklists

Members of the European Parliament have started to deal with the issue of what are known as 'whistleblowers'. Whistleblowers are employees who, if they are aware of immoral or unethical practices that are carried in their place of work, speak out about this fact. This however means that they find themselves on the so-called blacklist, which an employer creates for those employees who have spoken out. In Europe there are even cases where, after an employee has found himself blacklisted and subsequently received notice of dismissal from his employer, he has found it difficult to find further work. The British organisation The Consulting Association had a blacklist of workers who were previously active in trade unions until 2008, when its activities were terminated due to pressure from the media.

Does the Commission plan to adopt measures to end such unfair practices by employers in the Member States of the European Union?

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

The Commission refers to its answer to the Question E-4144/10 ([1]), which recalls that directive 95/46/EC ([2]) applies also to the field of employment. Article 8(1) of the data protection Directive obliges Member States to prohibit the processing of personal data regarding trade union membership, unless an exemption or derogation applies under Article 8 (paragraphs 2-5). The establishment of lists of trade union members referred to in the Honourable Member's question does not seem to be in line with Directive 95/46/EC. With regard to whistleblowers is should be noted that the listing of their names is processing of personal data according to Directive 95/46/EC as well.

Without prejudice to the powers of the Commission as the guardian of the Treaties, the supervision and enforcement of data protection laws in the Member States falls under the competence of their national authorities, in particular of the data protection supervisory authorities.

In order to further strengthen the rights of data subjects, the Commission has submitted legislative proposals on 25 January 2012 ([3]). The proposal for a new Data Protection Regulation (COM(2012) 11 final) *inter alia* reaffirms the importance of protection of sensitive data, such as the membership to a trade union, and aims to facilitate the exercise of individuals' rights.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB.
([2]) Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 1995 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, OJ L 281, 23.11.1995.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/newsroom/data-protection/news/120125_en.htm

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000073/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Klimatickí utečenci

Európsky parlament nedávno analyzoval politický rámec Európskej únie v súvislosti s fenoménom problematiky klimatických utečencov. Oddeliť dôsledky klimatických zmien od ostatných faktorov, ktoré ovplyvňujú migráciu, je náročné. Zmena podnebia podľa vedcov vyvolá prírodné úkazy ako rozširovanie púšte či zvyšovanie hladiny svetového oceánu, zvýšený počet prírodných katastrof, ako sú cyklóny alebo povodne, ale i boj o prírodné zdroje. Tieto faktory spôsobujú migráciu ľudí, ktorí žijú v takto postihnutých oblastiach, stávajú sa z nich tzv. klimatickí utečenci. Predmetná štúdia Európskeho parlamentu skúma, či súčasný politický rámec EÚ v oblasti migrácie a azylu ponúka adekvátnu reakciu na danú problematiku. Len veľmi málo členských štátov zatiaľ upravilo svoje azylové predpisy s ohľadom na klimatických utečencov.

Pripravuje komisia návrhy a odporúčania v súvislosti s otázkou klimatických utečencov?

Odpoveď pani Malmströmovej v mene Komisie
(16. februára 2012)

Ako sa uvádza v dokumente „Smerom k obnovenej a posilnenej diplomacii EÚ v oblasti zmeny klímy“ ([1]), môže zmena klímy pôsobiť ako „násobiteľ hrozieb“, ktorý vyostruje napätie, pokiaľ ide o ceny pôdy, vody, potravín a energie, a tým vytvára migračné tlaky. Ako sa však uvádza v štúdii Európskeho parlamentu, stanoviť priamu spojitosť s migráciou je náročné. Jednotlivé rozhodnutia migrovať môžu byť výsledkom komplexných úvah. Doteraz existujú metodologické a terminologické ťažkosti pri stanovení počtu osôb vysídlených z dôvodu zmeny klímy.

Komisia si uvedomuje rastúci význam tejto otázky a k preskúmaniu tohto problému už prispela napríklad prostredníctvom vedeckého projektu „Environmentálna zmena a scenáre nútenej migrácie“ (EACH-FOR) ([2]). Nedávno sa na stretnutí odborníkov diskutovalo o spojitosti medzi migráciou a zmenou klímy. V Štokholmskom programe bola zmena klímy uznaná za celosvetovú výzvu, ktorá čoraz viac stimuluje migráciu a presídľovanie. Komisia bola vyzvaná, aby predložila analýzu tohto javu. Komisia sa mieni zaoberať touto problematikou ďalej v roku 2012, ako to požaduje Európska rada, pričom sa bude sústreďovať na niekoľko politík, najmä rozvoj, humanitárnu pomoc, azyl a migráciu. V nedávnom oznámení „Globálny prístup EÚ k migrácii a mobilite“ Komisia uznala, že za súčasť tohto globálneho prístupu by sa malo považovať riešenie otázky migrácie vyvolanej zmenou životného prostredia, a to aj prostredníctvom prispôsobenia sa nepriaznivým vplyvom zmeny klímy ([3]).

([1]) Spoločný diskusný dokument pripravený ESVČ a Európskou komisiou 9. júla 2011, dostupný na:. http://eeas.europa.eu/environment/docs/2011_joint_paper_euclimate_diplomacy_en.pdf
([2]) http://www.each-for.eu/index.php?module=main.
([3]) KOM(2011) 743 v konečnom znení.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000073/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(13 January 2012)

Subject: Climate refugees

The European Parliament recently analysed the policy framework of the European Union in connection with the phenomenon of climate refugees. It is difficult to separate the effects of climate change from other factors that influence migration. According to scientists, climate change causes natural phenomena such as desertification and increases in the global ocean level, an increased number of natural disasters such as cyclones and floods, and competition for natural resources. These factors cause the migration of people living in affected areas so they become 'climate refugees'. The European Parliament study in question examines whether the current EU policy framework on migration and asylum offers an adequate response to the issue. Only very few Member States have yet adjusted their asylum legislation with regard to climate refugees.

Is the Commission preparing proposals and recommendations in relation to the issue of climate refugees?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(16 February 2012)

As the paper 'Towards a renewed and strengthened EU climate diplomacy' ([1]) pointed out, climate change may act as a 'threat-multiplier', exacerbating tensions over land, water, food and energy prices, thus creating migratory pressures. However, as stated in the European Parliament's study, it is difficult to establish a direct link with migration. Individual decisions to migrate can result from complex considerations. To date there are methodological and terminological difficulties in determining numbers of displaced people due to climate change.

The Commission acknowledges the increasing importance of this issue, and contributed to the examination of the problem, for example through the research project on Environmental Change and Forced Migration Scenarios (EACH-FOR) ([2]). Recently, an expert meeting discussed links between migration and climate change. The Stockholm Programme recognised climate change as a global challenge increasingly driving migration and displacement and invited the Commission to present an analysis. The Commission intends to reflect further in 2012 as requested by the European Council, focusing on a range of policies, in particular development, humanitarian aid, asylum and migration. In its recent Communication on the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility (GAMM), the Commission recognised that addressing environmentally induced migration, also by means of adaptation to the adverse effects of climate change, should be considered part of the GAMM ([3]).

([1]) Joint reflection paper prepared by the EEAS and the European Commission of 9 July 2011, available at: http://eeas.europa.eu/environment/docs/2011_joint_paper_euclimate_diplomacy_en.pdf
([2]) http://www.each-for.eu/index.php?module=main.
([3]) COM(2011) 743 final.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000085/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Ochrana zdravia ľudí v práci

Miesta práce a pracovné postupy sa dynamicky menia. Európa má navyše ambíciu čoraz viac zahŕňať do pracovného postupu staršie ročníky a ďalšie zraniteľnejšie skupiny obyvateľstva. Najčastejšími zdravotnými rizikami sú muskuloskeletárne ochorenia, pracovný stres či pracovné nehody. Samostatnou kategóriou rizík sú tie, ktoré môžu mať vplyv na reprodukčnú schopnosť ženy. Európska stratégia v oblasti zdravia a bezpečnosti pri práci (2007 – 2012) má svoje rezervy najmä v úsilí krajín mapovať nové riziká a sústrediť sa na už identifikované najvypuklejšie problémy – stres, pocit vyhorenia v práci a muskuloskeletárne problémy. Ak majú byť politiky prevencie pracovných úrazov a chorôb efektívne vyhodnotené, treba mať k dispozícii dôveryhodné štatistiky zohľadňujúce rodové hľadisko a vek.

— Disponuje Komisia v súčasnosti údajmi takýchto štatistík?

— Mieni Komisia členským štátom odporučiť, aby vypracovali národné programy monitoringu pracovných rizík?

Odpoveď pána Andora v mene Komisie
(16. februára 2012)

Komisia si uvedomuje význam spoľahlivej, aktuálnej štatistiky o zdraví a bezpečnosti pri práci pre politiku monitorovania a určenie oblastí, kde je potrebná prevencia.

Nariadenie (ES) č. 1338/2008 ([1]) stanovuje právny základ pre tvorbu štatistiky v oblasti zdravia a bezpečnosti pri práci. Európsky štatistický úrad (Eurostat) zbiera, analyzuje a uverejňuje európsku štatistiku o pracovných úrazoch ([2]), ktorá sa člení podľa vekových skupín a rodu. S cieľom doplniť administratívne údaje, Eurostat uskutočňuje výsledky ad hoc modulov zisťovania pracovných síl v oblasti zdravia a bezpečnosti pri práci.

Komisia v roku 2011 prijala nariadenie (EÚ) č. 349/2011 ([3]) o štatistike pracovných úrazov a pripravila modul zisťovania pracovných síl na rok 2013 s cieľom zozbierať údaje o takých zdravotných problémoch súvisiacich s prácou, akými sú napr. muskuloskeletárne problémy a stres ([4]). Európska agentúra pre bezpečnosť a ochranu zdravia pri práci monitoruje trendy a nové riziká, a zistenia uverejňuje v európskom prieskume nových a vznikajúcich rizík pre podniky.

Súčasná európska stratégia v oblasti zdravia a bezpečnosti pri práci na obdobie rokov 2007 – 2012 ([5]) sa usiluje o zníženie výskytu pracovných úrazov o 25 %. Národné stratégie, ktoré členské štáty majú prijať na základe európskej stratégie, by mali poskytnúť vnútroštátnym orgánom usmernenie, aby svoje úsilie v oblasti prevencie zamerali na tie oblasti, v ktorých je najväčší výskyt úrazov.

([1]) Nariadenie Európskeho parlamentu a Rady (ES) č. 1338/2008 zo 16. decembra 2008 o štatistikách Spoločenstva v oblasti verejného zdravia a bezpečnosti a ochrany zdravia pri práci, Ú. v. EÚ L 354, 31.12.2008.

([2]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/health/health_safety_work/data.

([3]) Nariadenie Komisie (EÚ) č. 349/2011 z 11. apríla 2011, ktorým sa vykonáva nariadenie Európskeho parlamentu a Rady (ES) č. 1338/2008 o štatistikách Spoločenstva v oblasti verejného zdravia a bezpečnosti a ochrany zdravia pri práci, pokiaľ ide o štatistiku pracovných úrazov, Ú. v. EÚ L 97, 12.4.2011, nájdete na: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:097:0003:0008:SK:PDF.

([4]) Ad hoc modul zisťovania pracovných síl na rok 2013 vrátane zoznamu premenných bol predložený Európskemu výboru pre štatistiku v novembri 2011.

([5]) Oznámenie Komisie Európskemu parlamentu, Rade, Európskemu hospodárskemu a sociálnemu výboru a Výboru regiónov nazvané „Zlepšenie kvality a produktivity práce: stratégia Spoločenstva v oblasti zdravia a bezpečnosti pri práci na obdobie rokov 2007 – 2012“ (KOM(2007) 62 v konečnom znení).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000085/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(13 January 2012)

Subject: Protection of human health at work

Work places and working practices are changing dynamically. Moreover, Europe has the ambition to increasingly include older persons and other vulnerable groups in the working process. The most common health risks are musculoskeletal disorders, work-related stress and occupational accidents. Hazards that may affect the reproductive capacity of women form a separate category. The European strategy 2007-12 on health and safety at work could do better, especially in the effort by countries to map the new hazards and focus on the already identified most prominent issues — stress, feeling of burnout at work and musculoskeletal problems. If the policies for the prevention of occupational accidents and diseases are to be effectively evaluated, reliable statistics, taking into account gender and age, should be available.

— Does the Commission currently have details of these statistics available?

— Does the Commission intend to recommend to the Member States to develop national programmes for the monitoring of occupational risks?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(16 February 2012)

The Commission is aware of the importance of reliable, up-to-date statistics on health and safety at work for monitoring policy and identifying areas where prevention is needed.

Regulation (EC) No 1338/2008 ([1]) lays down the legal basis for the production of statistics in the field of health and safety at work. The European Statistical Office (Eurostat) collects, analyses and publishes European Statistics on Accidents at Work ([2]), broken down by age group and gender. To supplement the administrative data, Eurostat carries out Labour Force Survey ad-hoc modules on health and safety at work outcomes.

In 2011 the Commission adopted Regulation (EU) No 349/2011 ([3]) on statistics on accidents at work and prepared the Labour Force Survey 2013 module with a view to collecting data on such work-related health problems as musculoskeletal problems and stress ([4]). The European Agency for Safety and Health at Work monitors trends and new risks and publishes the findings in the European Survey of Enterprises on New and Emerging Risks.

The current European Strategy on health and safety at work for 2007-2012 ([5]) seeks to reduce the incidence of accidents at work by 25%. The national strategies which the Member States are to adopt under the European Strategy should provide direction for national authorities to channel their prevention efforts into areas where most accidents occur.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1338/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2008 on Community statistics on public health and health and safety at work, OJ L 354, 31.12.2008.

([2]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/health/health_safety_work/data.

([3]) Commission Regulation (EU) No 349/2011 of 11 April 2011 implementing Regulation (EC) No 1338/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council on Community statistics on public health and health and safety at work, as regards statistics on accidents at work, OJ L 97, 12.4.2011, at: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:097:0003:0008:EN:PDF.

([4]) The Labour Force Survey ad-hoc module 2013, including the list of variables, was presented to the European Statistical Committee in November 2011.

([5]) Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions 'Improving quality and productivity at work: Community strategy 2007-2012 on health and safety at work' (COM(2007) 62 final).

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000108/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(13. januára 2012)

Vec: Zdroje pre financovanie opatrení energetickej účinnosti

Smernica o energetickej účinnosti je problematická z viacerých hľadísk. Rokovania o záväzných opatreniach na dosiahnutie vyššej energetickej účinnosti sú momentálne na bode mrazu. Európska komisia v energetickej cestovnej mape do roku 2050 síce uviedla, že energetická účinnosť musí nadviazať na svoj hospodársky potenciál, politická vôľa uviesť tento potenciál do chodu však stále chýba. Rokovania sa zastavili hlavne pre neschopnosť dohodnúť sa na zdrojoch pre financovanie opatrení energetickej účinnosti. Doteraz nie je jasná otázka, ako sa majú úspory energie financovať spôsobom, ktorý zároveň v konečnom dôsledku nebude brániť rastu.

— Z akých zdrojov sa majú podľa názoru Komisie opatrenia energetickej účinnosti financovať?

Odpoveď pána Oettingera v mene Komisie
(20. februára 2012)

Ako potvrdili štúdie ([1]), investície do energetickej účinnosti predstavujú významný hospodársky prínos (t. j. znižovanie nákladov, nárast trhovej hodnoty príslušného majetku, vytváranie pracovných miest, pozitívny vplyv na HDP) a hodnotia sa skôr ako faktor hospodárskeho rastu než ako jeho prekážka.

S ohľadom na výzvy súvisiace s financovaním, verejné prostriedky by sa mali použiť ako spúšťací mechanizmus pre mobilizáciu súkromného kapitálu, najmä v segmentoch trhu s vysokým potenciálom úspor energie. Financovanie len prostredníctvom grantov nebude dostatočné. Preto v balíku opatrení týkajúcich sa súdržnosti na roky 2014 – 2020 Komisia kladie väčší dôraz na vytváranie takýchto nástrojov, aby sa vhodne štruktúrovaným financovaním z prostriedkov EÚ pomocou pákového efektu rozšírili zdroje na opatrenia, ktorých cieľ je zvyšovať energetickú účinnosť.

([1]) Program európskej hospodárskej obnovy KOM(2008) 800 v konečnom znení, opatrenie č. 6 – Francúzsko, Sociálna únia pre bývanie (Union Sociale pour l'Habitat), máj 2011; Wirkungen der Förderprogramme im Bereich „Energieeffizientes Bauen und Sanieren" der KfW auf öffentliche Haushalte, Forschungszentrum Jülich, október 2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000108/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(13 January 2012)

Subject: Sources of funding for energy efficiency measures

The Energy Efficiency Directive is problematic in several respects. Negotiations on binding measures to achieve greater energy efficiency are currently at stalemate. The European Commission's energy roadmap for 2050 stated that energy efficiency must build on its economic potential; however political will to put this potential into operation is still missing. Negotiations came to a halt mainly because of the inability to agree on funding sources for energy efficiency measures. The question of how to finance energy savings in a manner which will not ultimately hinder growth is not yet clear.

— In the opinion of the Commission from what sources should energy efficiency measures be financed?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(20 February 2012)

As confirmed by studies ([1]), energy efficiency investments bring important economic benefits (i.e. cost reduction, market value increase of related assets, creation of jobs, positive GDP impacts) and feature as a vector of economic growth, rather than an obstacle to it.

To meet the financing challenge, public funds should be used as a trigger for mobilisation of private capital, especially on market segments with high energy saving potential. Pure grant financing will not suffice. Thus in the 2014-2020 Cohesion package, the Commission puts greater emphasis on setting up of such instruments so that well structured EU funding could leverage significant resources for energy efficiency measures.

([1]) Plan européen pour la relance économique COM(2008) 800 final Mesure n° 6 — France, 'Union Social pour l'Habitat', May 2011; Wirkungen der Förderprogramme im Bereich 'Energieeffizientes Bauen und Sanieren' der KfW auf öffentliche Haushalte, Forschungszentrum Jülich, October 2011.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000114/12
an die Kommission
Takis Hadjigeorgiou (GUE/NGL)
(16. Januar 2012)

Betrifft: Fünfunddreißig Tote nach Bombardement von Zivilisten in der Türkei

Am 28. Dezember 2011 flog die türkische Luftwaffe einen Angriff gegen die südöstlichen Provinzen Hakkari und Sirnak in der Türkei, wodurch 35 kurdische zivile Dorfbewohner, die meisten von ihnen Jugendliche, ums Leben kamen. Das Gebiet, in dem der tödliche Schlag stattfand, liegt sehr dicht an der türkisch-irakischen Grenze und ist als Handelskreuz für kurdische Dorfbewohner bekannt, die Handel zwischen den beiden Ländern betreiben.

Jetzt hat die türkische Regierung auf operative Fehler verwiesen und betont, dass die Luftwaffe irrtümlich die Zivilisten als Terroristen eingestuft hat. Jedoch wurden die Opfer des Bombardements laut dem Führer der prokurdischen Partei BDP, Selahattin Demirtas, „auf ihrem Heimweg, als sie an einem Armeeposten ankamen von den Soldaten nicht durchgelassen, sondern auf einen anderen Weg geschickt, dem sie dann folgten und auf dem sie später bombardiert wurden". Zwei Nichtregierungsorganisationen, die sich für den Schutz der Menschenrechte in der Türkei einsetzen (IHD und Mazlumder) haben bereits eine Untersuchung unter Aufsicht der Vereinten Nationen gefordert.

Sind der Kommission diese Fakten bekannt und wie kann sie gewährleisten, dass eine unabhängige Untersuchung des gewalttätigen Vorfalls durchgeführt wird? Welche Maßnahmen beabsichtigt die EU zu ergreifen, damit die Türkei, ein Kandidatenstaat für den Beitritt, die brutalste Verletzung der Menschenrechte ihrer eigenen Bürger beendet?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000424/12
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(23. Januar 2012)

Betrifft: Untersuchung eines türkischen Luftangriffs auf Schmuggler

Ende Dezember 2011 führte die türkische Armee einen Luftangriff im Kurdengebiet an der türkisch-irakischen Grenze durch, bei dem Schmuggler irrtümlich für PKK-Rebellen gehalten und getötet wurden. Die Türkei hat bereits ein „Versehen", basierend auf falschen Geheimdienstinformationen, bei dem tödlichen Luftangriff auf ein Dorf eingestanden. Türkische Menschenrechtsorganisationen forderten eine von der VN unterstützte Untersuchung des Falls. Die türkische Regierung plant, den Familien der Opfer Entschädigungen zu zahlen. Der Angriff, bei dem 35 Zivilisten irrtümlich getötet wurden, kommt gerade zu der Zeit, in der Ministerpräsident Erdoğan die Kurden in Gespräche über eine neue Verfassung einzubeziehen versucht.

Wie steht die EU zu der Forderung nach einer Unterstützung der VN bei der Untersuchung dieses Vorfalls?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000520/12
an die Kommission
Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE)
(25. Januar 2012)

Betrifft: Aggressive türkische Aktionen gegen Kurden

Die Menschenrechtsbesorgnisse in Bezug auf die Türkei werden größer. Hinsichtlich der kurdischen Bevölkerung wurde im Fortschrittsbericht 2011 über die Türkei der Kommission festgestellt, dass Pläne des türkischen Staates, das Thema der Kurden als Teil seiner „demokratischen Öffnung" anzugehen, nicht erfüllt wurden. Anstatt durch eine politische Lösung nach Frieden zu streben, hat der türkische Staat aggressive Aktionen gegen das kurdische Volk unternommen, beispielsweise:

wurden am 28. Dezember 2011 bei einem Luftangriff der türkischen Streitkräfte in der südöstlichen kurdischen Region der Türkei 35 Zivilisten getötet: einer der tödlichsten Angriffe in der Geschichte des kurdischen Konflikts in der Türkei, von dem davon ausgegangen wird, dass er als Vergeltung für die Tötung von türkischen Soldaten, angeblich durch militante Kurden, bei Angriffen im Sommer und Herbst 2011 durchgeführt wurde;

in den vergangenen zwei Jahren wurden Tausende kurdische Politiker - einschließlich gewählter Bürgermeister, Juristen, Journalisten und Aktivisten, und vor Kurzem der Sacharow-Preisträgerin und Parlamentsabgeordneten der Demokratischen Partei (BDP), Leyla Zana - inhaftiert oder sie wurden Opfer von Razzien in ihren Häusern. Außerdem verhafteten die deutschen Behörden offensichtlich auf Drängen der Türkei im Dezember 2011 den Europa-Vertreter der DBP, Eyyüp Doru.

Hat die Kommission gegenüber den türkischen Stellen das seitens ihrer Regierung besorgniserregende Verlassen des friedlichen Weges durch Verhandlungen mit den Kurden und speziell die Tötung von 35 Zivilisten angesprochen?

Kann die Kommission darlegen, wie sie im Namen der EU die Suche nach einer Lösung für den türkisch-kurdischen Konflikt fördert und versucht, alle Parteien von Gewaltanwendung abzubringen?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000779/12
an die Kommission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(31. Januar 2012)

Betrifft: Bombenangriffe auf kurdische Gemeinden in der Türkei

Ein Wähler meines Wahlkreises hat mich kontaktiert, da er besorgt darüber ist, dass Kurden in der Türkei durch das türkische Militär ihr Leben lassen müssen.

Hat die Kommission die neuen Bombenangriffe auf kurdische Zivilisten untersucht? Wie ist sie in dieser Angelegenheit bei den türkischen Behörden vorstellig geworden und welche Antworten hat sie erhalten?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Herrn Füle im Namen der Kommission
(16. Februar 2012)

Die Kommission bedauert zutiefst, dass es im Südosten der Türkei immer wieder zu Zwischenfällen kommt, die zahlreiche Todesopfer fordern.

Was den schrecklichen Vorfall vom 28. Dezember 2011 anbetrifft, so stellt die Kommission fest, dass, wie von den türkischen Behörden angekündigt, eine Untersuchung eingeleitet wurde, und dringt auf eine zügige Aufklärung. Die Kommission wird in jedem Fall die Entwicklungen weiter verfolgen und das Thema bei geeigneter Gelegenheit zur Sprache bringen.

In diesem Zusammenhang möchte die Kommission betonen, dass sich alle beteiligten Parteien nachdrücklich dafür einsetzen müssen, allen Bürgern der Türkei ein Leben in Frieden und Wohlstand zu ermöglichen. Im Südosten der Türkei müssen Frieden, Demokratie und Stabilität geschaffen werden, um die soziale, wirtschaftliche und kulturelle Entwicklung voranzubringen. Dies kann nur über die einvernehmliche Umsetzung konkreter Maßnahmen zur Stärkung der sozialen, wirtschaftlichen und kulturellen Rechte der Bevölkerung in dieser Region erreicht werden.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000114/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Takis Hadjigeorgiou (GUE/NGL)
(16 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Τριάντα πέντε νεκροί από βομβαρδισμό εναντίον αμάχων στην Τουρκία

Στις 28 Δεκεμβρίου 2011 η τουρκική αεροπορία διενήργησε επιδρομή στις επαρχίες Χακάρι και Σιρνάκ στην νοτιοανατολική Τουρκία που είχε ως αποτέλεσμα το θάνατο 35 αμάχων κούρδων χωρικών, η πλειοψηφία των οποίων ήταν έφηβοι. Η περιοχή στην οποία έγινε η φονική επιδρομή είναι πολύ κοντά στα σύνορα Τουρκίας — Ιράκ και είναι γνωστή ως σημείο διέλευσης κούρδων χωρικών οι οποίοι διενεργούν εμπόριο ανάμεσα στις δύο χώρες.

Μέχρι στιγμή η τουρκική κυβέρνηση έχει κάνει λόγο περί επιχειρησιακού λάθους, τονίζοντας ότι η αεροπορία λανθασμένα εξέλαβε τους άμαχους σαν τρομοκράτες. Σύμφωνα με τον ηγέτη του φιλοκουρδικού κόμματος BDP, Σελαχαντίν Ντεμιρτάς, όμως, τα θύματα του βομβαρδισμού «επιστρέφοντας στα χωριά τους πέρασαν από στρατιωτικό φυλάκιο στο οποίο οι στρατιώτες δεν τους άφησαν να περάσουν, αλλά τους υπόδειξαν άλλο δρόμο, όπου και κατευθύνθηκαν για να ακολουθήσει ο βομβαρδισμός». Ήδη δύο μη κυβερνητικές οργανώσεις προάσπισης των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων στην Τουρκία (οι IHD και Mazlumder, αντίστοιχα) έχουν ζητήσει να υπάρξει έρευνα υπό την αιγίδα του ΟΗΕ.

Είναι εις γνώση της Επιτροπής τα γεγονότα αυτά και πώς μπορεί να διασφαλίσει ότι θα διενεργηθεί μια ανεξάρτητη έρευνα για το αιματηρό συμβάν; Επιπλέον, σε ποιες ενέργειες προτίθεται να προχωρήσει η ΕΕ έτσι ώστε η Τουρκία, μια υποψήφια προς ένταξη χώρα, θα σταματήσει να καταπατά με τον πιο βάναυσο τρόπο τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα των ίδιων των πολιτών της;

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000424/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(23 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Έρευνα για τουρκικές αεροπορικές επιδρομές σε λαθρεμπόρους

Στα τέλη του Δεκεμβρίου 2011 ο τουρκικός στρατός προέβη σε αεροπορικές επιδρομές στην κουρδική περιοχή στα σύνορα Τουρκίας-Ιράκ, στην οποία σκοτώθηκαν λαθρέμποροι οι οποίοι θεωρήθηκαν από λάθος ότι ήταν αντάρτες του PKK (Εργατικό Κόμμα του Κουρδιστάν). Η Τουρκία έχει ήδη παραδεχθεί ότι η θανατηφόρα αεροπορική επιδρομή σε ένα χωριό ήταν λάθος που προέκυψε από λανθασμένες πληροφορίες. Οι τουρκικές οργανώσεις ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων ζήτησαν να διεξαχθεί έρευνα για το εν λόγω θέμα με τη βοήθεια του ΟΗΕ. Η τουρκική κυβέρνηση προγραμματίζει να αποζημιώσει τις οικογένειες των θυμάτων. Η επίθεση, κατά την οποία 35 πολίτες απώλεσαν λόγω λάθους τη ζωή τους, συνέβη τη στιγμή που ο Τούρκος πρωθυπουργός Ερντογκάν καταβάλει προσπάθειες για να επιτύχει τη συμμετοχή των Κούρδων σε συνομιλίες για ένα νέο Σύνταγμα.

Ποια είναι η θέση της ΕΕ όσον αφορά το αίτημα για παροχή βοήθειας εκ μέρους του ΟΗΕ στη διερεύνηση αυτού του συμβάντος;

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000520/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE)
(25 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Επιθέσεις των Τούρκων κατά των Κούρδων

Οι ανησυχίες για τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα όσον αφορά την Τουρκία εντείνονται. Σε σχέση με τον κουρδικό λαό, η έκθεση προόδου για το 2011 της Επιτροπής για την Τουρκία επισημαίνει ότι τα σχέδια του τουρκικού κράτους για την αντιμετώπιση του κουρδικού ζητήματος ως μέρος του «δημοκρατικού ανοίγματος» δεν έχουν εφαρμοστεί. Αντί να αναζητηθεί η ειρήνη μέσα από μια πολιτική λύση, το τουρκικό κράτος εφαρμόζει επιθετική πολιτική εναντίον του κουρδικού λαού, για παράδειγμα:

στις 28 Δεκεμβρίου 2011 αεροπορική επίθεση των τουρκικών δυνάμεων σκότωσε 35 αμάχους στη νότιο-ανατολική περιοχή των Κούρδων: μία από τις πλέον θανατηφόρες επιθέσεις στην ιστορία της αντιπαράθεσης με τους Κούρδους στην Τουρκία, η οποία πιστεύεται ότι έγινε σε αντίποινα για τη εικαζόμενη δολοφονία από Κούρδους τούρκων στρατιωτών, κατά τη διάρκεια του καλοκαιριού και του φθινοπώρου του 2011·

κατά τα τελευταία δύο χρόνια, χιλιάδες Κούρδοι πολιτικοί — συμπεριλαμβανομένων εκλεγμένων δήμαρχων, δικηγόρων, δημοσιογράφων και ακτιβιστών, και πιο πρόσφατα η βραβευθείσα με το βραβείο Ζαχάρωφ και μέλος του Κόμματος Ειρήνης και Δημοκρατίας (BDP) του Κοινοβουλίου, Λεϊλά Ζάνα — έχουν συλληφθεί ή υπήρξαν θύματα εισβολών στα σπίτια τους· επιπλέον, το Δεκέμβριο του 2011 οι γερμανικές αρχές συνέλαβαν τον εκπρόσωπο του BDP Ευρώπης Eyyüp Doru, προφανώς με προτροπή της Τουρκίας.

Έχει η Επιτροπή αναφέρει στις τουρκικές αρχές αυτήν την εκ μέρους της τουρκικής κυβέρνησης ανησυχητική παράκαμψη των ειρηνευτικών διαπραγματεύσεων με τους Κούρδους, και ειδικότερα τη δολοφονία των 35 αμάχων;

Μπορεί η Επιτροπή να αναφέρει πώς, εξ ονόματος της ΕΕ, προωθεί την αναζήτηση μιας λύσης για την τουρκο-κουρδική σύγκρουση και με ποιόν τρόπο προσπαθεί να αποτρέψει και τα δύο μέρη από τη χρήση βίας;

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000779/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(31 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Βομβαρδισμοί κουρδικών κοινήτων στην Τουρκία

Ένας πολίτης της εκλογικής μου περιφέρειας επικοινώνησε μαζί μου, εκφράζοντας τις ανησυχίες του για την απώλεια ζώων Κούρδων στην Τουρκία από τον τουρκικό στρατό.

Έχει ερευνήσει η Επιτροπή τα πρόσφατα νέα για βομβαρδισμούς σε κούρδους πολίτες; Σε τι διαβήματα έχει προβεί προς τις τουρκικές αρχές για το εν λόγω θέμα, και τι απάντηση έχει λάβει;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(16 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή εκφράζει τη βαθιά της λύπη για τη συνεχιζόμενη απώλεια ανθρώπινων ζωών στη νοτιοανατολική Τουρκία.

Όσον αφορά το φοβερό γεγονός που συνέβη στις 28 Δεκεμβρίου 2011, η Επιτροπή σημειώνει την έναρξη έρευνας, όπως ανακοινώθηκε από τις τουρκικές αρχές, και ενθαρρύνει την ταχεία αποσαφήνιση του ζητήματος. Σαφώς, η Επιτροπή θα εξακολουθήσει να παρακολουθεί τις εξελίξεις και να θίγει το θέμα όποτε το κρίνει σκόπιμο.

Στο πλαίσιο αυτό, η Επιτροπή επιθυμεί να υπογραμμίσει ότι όλα τα μέρη πρέπει να μεριμνήσουν για την εξασφάλιση της ειρήνης και της ευημερίας όλων των πολιτών της Τουρκίας. Το νοτιοανατολικό τμήμα της Τουρκίας έχει ανάγκη από ειρήνη, δημοκρατία και σταθερότητα, καθώς και από κοινωνική, οικονομική και πολιτιστική ανάπτυξη. Τούτο μπορεί να επιτευχθεί μόνο με συναίνεση για τη λήψη συγκεκριμένων μέτρων τα οποία επεκτείνουν τα κοινωνικά, οικονομικά και πολιτιστικά δικαιώματα των λαών που ζουν στην περιοχή.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000114/12
alla Commissione
Takis Hadjigeorgiou (GUE/NGL)
(16 gennaio 2012)

Oggetto: Trentacinque morti dopo i bombardamenti di civili in Turchia

In data 28 dicembre 2011, l'aviazione militare ha effettuato un raid sulle province Hakkari e Sirnak nel sud-est della Turchia, causando la morte di 35 civili curdi, la maggior parte dei quali erano adolescenti. La zona in cui si è verificato l'attacco letale è molto vicina al confine Turchia-Iraq, ed è nota per essere un punto di attraversamento per gli abitanti dei villaggi curdi che commerciano tra i due paesi.

Ad oggi, il governo turco ha fatto riferimento a errori operativi, sottolineando che l'aviazione ha erroneamente identificato i civili come terroristi. Tuttavia, secondo il leader del partito filocurdo BDP, Selahattin Demirtas, le vittime del «bombardamento ritornando ai loro villaggi, sono arrivate a una postazione militare dove i soldati non li hanno lasciati passare, bensì hanno indicato loro un altro percorso che hanno preso, e i bombardamenti sono seguiti». Due organizzazioni non governative per la tutela dei diritti umani in Turchia (IHD e Mazlumder rispettivamente) hanno già chiesto un'inchiesta sotto l'egida delle Nazioni Unite.

La Commissione è a conoscenza di questi fatti e come può garantire che un'indagine indipendente sul violento incidente sarà effettivamente svolta? Inoltre, quali azioni intende intraprendere l'Unione europea in modo che la Turchia, paese candidato all'adesione, cessi di violare i diritti umani dei propri cittadini nel modo più brutale?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000424/12
alla Commissione
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(23 gennaio 2012)

Oggetto: Indagine su un attacco aereo turco contro trafficanti

Alla fine del dicembre 2011, l'esercito turco ha condotto un attacco aereo sul territorio curdo al confine tra Turchia e Iraq, in cui dei trafficanti sono stati erroneamente scambiati per ribelli del PKK (Partito dei lavoratori del Kurdistan) e sono stati uccisi. La Turchia ha già ammesso che l'attacco aereo mortale contro un villaggio è stato un errore commesso sulla base di informazioni di intelligence errate. Le organizzazioni per la difesa dei diritti umani turche hanno chiesto che venisse condotta un'indagine sul caso con il sostegno dell'ONU. Il governo turco intende versare un risarcimento alle famiglie delle vittime. L'attacco, nel quale sono stati uccisi per errore 35 civili, si è verificato proprio nel momento in cui il Primo ministro Erdogan stava cercando di coinvolgere i curdi in colloqui su una nuova costituzione.

Ciò premesso, può la Commissione far sapere qual è la posizione dell'Unione europea sulla richiesta di sostegno alle Nazioni Unite per l'indagine su questo incidente?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000520/12
alla Commissione
Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE)
(25 gennaio 2012)

Oggetto: Azione aggressiva turca contro i curdi

Le preoccupazioni in materia di diritti umani in Turchia si stanno intensificando. La relazione 2011 della Commissione sui progressi compiuti dal paese afferma che i piani dello Stato turco per affrontare la questione curda come parte della sua «apertura democratica» non sono stati portati a compimento. Anziché cercare la pace attraverso una soluzione politica, lo Stato turco ha intrapreso un'azione aggressiva contro il popolo curdo. Ad esempio:

il 28 dicembre 2011 un attacco aereo delle forze turche ha ucciso 35 civili nelle regioni curde della Turchia sudorientale. Si tratta a quanto pare di un attacco di rappresaglia, fra i più micidiali nella storia del conflitto curdo in Turchia, per l'uccisione di soldati turchi, presumibilmente per opera di militanti curdi, in attacchi durante l'estate e l'autunno 2011;

nel corso degli ultimi due anni, migliaia di politici curdi fra cui sindaci eletti, avvocati, giornalisti e attivisti e, più recentemente, Leyla Zana, vincitrice del premio Sakharov, membro del Partito pace e democrazia (Bpd) e deputata al parlamento, sono stati arrestati o le loro case hanno subito incursioni. Inoltre, nel dicembre 2011 le autorità tedesche hanno arrestato Eyyüp Doru, rappresentante del Bpd in Europa, a quanto pare su incitamento della Turchia.

Ha la Commissione sollevato dinanzi alle autorità turche la preoccupante questione del ritiro del loro governo dalla via verso una pace ottenuta mediante negoziati politici con i curdi, e in particolare l'uccisione di 35 civili?

Può la Commissione far sapere come, a nome dell'Unione europea, sostiene la ricerca di una soluzione al conflitto turco-curdo e dissuade tutte le parti dall'uso della forza?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000779/12
alla Commissione
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(31 gennaio 2012)

Oggetto: I bombardamenti delle comunità curde in Turchia

Sono stato contattato da un elettore che è preoccupato per la perdita di vite curde in Turchia per mano dei militari turchi.

La Commissione ha esaminato le recenti notizie di bombardamenti di civili curdi? Quali rimostranze ha presentato alle autorità turche in materia, e che risposta ha ricevuto?

Risposta congiunta data da Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(16 febbraio 2012)

La Commissione esprime profondo rammarico per i ripetuti episodi che hanno comportato la perdita di vite umane nella zona sudorientale della Turchia.

Per quanto riguarda il terribile incidente che ha avuto luogo il 28 dicembre 2011, la Commissione prende atto del fatto che è stata aperta un'indagine secondo quanto annunciato dalle autorità turche ed esorta a far luce rapidamente sui fatti. Ovviamente, la Commissione continuerà a seguire gli sviluppi e ad affrontare il problema nelle sedi adeguate.

In questo contesto la Commissione desidera sottolineare la necessità che tutte le parti collaborino incessantemente al fine di garantire pace e prosperità per tutti i cittadini della Turchia. Il sud-est della Turchia ha bisogno di pace, democrazia e stabilità nonché di sviluppo sociale, economico e culturale. Tali obiettivi possono essere raggiunti solo con il consenso su misure concrete che aumentino i diritti sociali, economici e culturali degli abitanti della regione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000114/12
to the Commission
Takis Hadjigeorgiou (GUE/NGL)
(16 January 2012)

Subject: Thirty-five dead after bombing of civilians in Turkey

On 28 December 2011, the Turkish Air Force carried out a raid on the Hakkari and Sirnak provinces in southeast Turkey, resulting in the death of 35 Kurdish civilian villagers, the majority of whom were adolescents. The area where the lethal strike occurred is very close to the Turkey-Iraq border and is known to be a crossing point for Kurdish villagers who trade between the two countries.

To date, the Turkish Government has referred to operational errors, stressing that the air force wrongly identified the civilians as terrorists. However, according to the leader of the pro-Kurdish BDP party, Selahattin Demirtas, the victims of the bombing 'returning to their villages, came to an army post where the soldiers did not let them through but showed them another route which they took and the bombings followed.' Two non-governmental organisations for the protection of human rights in Turkey (IHD and Mazlumder respectively) have already asked for an investigation under the auspices of the UN.

Is the Commission of aware of these facts and how can it guarantee that an independent investigation into the violent incident will be carried out? Furthermore, what actions does the EU intend to take so that Turkey, a candidate country for accession, will stop violating the human rights of its own citizens in the most brutal way?

Question for written answer E-000424/12
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(23 January 2012)

Subject: Investigation of a Turkish airstrike on smugglers

At the end of December 2011 the Turkish army conducted an airstrike in Kurdish territory on the Turkish-Iraqi border, in which smugglers were mistaken for PKK (Kurdistan Workers' Party) rebels and were killed. Turkey has already admitted that the deadly air strike on a village was an error based on false intelligence information. Turkish human rights organisations have demanded a UN-supported investigation of the case. The Turkish Government plans to pay compensation to the families of the victims. The attack, in which 35 civilians were mistakenly killed, comes just as Prime Minister Erdoğan has been attempting to involve the Kurds in talks about a new constitution.

What is the EU's position on the demand for UN support in investigating this incident?

Question for written answer E-000520/12
to the Commission
Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE)
(25 January 2012)

Subject: Aggressive Turkish action against Kurds

Human rights worries about Turkey are intensifying. In relation to the Kurdish people, the Commission's 2011 progress report on Turkey noted that plans by the Turkish state to address the Kurdish issue as part of its 'democratic opening' have not been followed through. Instead of seeking peace through a political solution, the Turkish state has taken aggressive action against Kurdish people, for example:

on 28 December 2011 an air strike by Turkish forces killed 35 civilians in Turkey's south-eastern Kurdish region: one of the deadliest attacks in the history of the Kurdish conflict in Turkey, it is believed to have been in retaliation for the killing of Turkish soldiers, allegedly by Kurdish militants, in attacks during summer and autumn 2011;

over the past two years, thousands of Kurdish politicians — including elected mayors, lawyers, journalists and activists, and most recently Sakharov prize winner and Peace and Democracy Party (BDP) member of parliament Leyla Zana — have been arrested or have had their homes raided; in addition, in December 2011 the German authorities arrested the BDP Europe representative Eyyüp Doru, apparently at Turkey's instigation.

Has the Commission raised with the Turkish authorities their Government's worrying retreat from the path of peace through political negotiation with Kurds, and in particular the killing of the 35 civilians?

Can the Commission outline how, on behalf of the EU, it is promoting the search for a solution to the Turkish-Kurdish conflict and dissuading all parties from the use of force?

Question for written answer E-000779/12
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(31 January 2012)

Subject: Bombings of Kurdish communities in Turkey

I have been contacted by a constituent who is concerned about the loss of Kurdish lives in Turkey at the hands of the Turkish military.

Has the Commission investigated recent news of bombings of Kurdish civilians? What representations has it made to the Turkish authorities on this matter, and what response did it receive?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(16 February 2012)

The Commission deeply regrets the continued loss of life in the South-East of Turkey.

As regards the terrible incident that occurred on 28 December 2011, the Commission takes note of the launch of an investigation as announced by the Turkish authorities and encourages a swift clarification of the matter. Clearly, the Commission will continue to monitor developments and raise the issue whenever appropriate.

In this context the Commission would like to underline that all parties need to work unremittingly to bring peace and prosperity for all the citizens of Turkey. The south-east of Turkey needs peace, democracy and stability as well as social, economic and cultural development. This can only be achieved via consensus over concrete measures expanding the social, economic and cultural rights of the people living in the region.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000221/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(24 gennaio 2012)

Oggetto: Crisi delle piccole e medie imprese e degli artigiani

Un numero sempre maggiore di piccoli imprenditori e artigiani italiani si trovano ad oggi, nel momento forse più difficile dall'inizio della crisi finanziaria, a fare i conti con un giro di affari sempre più in declino, commisurato a una riduzione del prestito e dell'attenzione delle banche nazionali, che invece di dimostrarsi solidali e comprensive con situazioni critiche, richiedono il rientro di capitali, del fido bancario e delle carte di credito nel più breve tempo possibile.

Tutto ciò fa sì che l'andamento delle piccole attività, in gran parte in passivo e molte già chiuse per fallimento, non dipenda più dall'entusiasmo del padrone, dalle idee originali, dal carattere o dalla capacità di affrontare i problemi, ma dallo Stato italiano che impone e pretende il rispetto delle mille burocrazie, dalle banche che ostacolano il credito e dall'immobilismo dell'economia e della circolazione del denaro.

Può la Commissione far sapere:

1. Quali sono le iniziative volte al sostenimento delle piccole e medie imprese, che sono il cuore dell'economia di molti Stati membri?

2. In che modo si può facilitare l'accesso al credito delle PMI e degli artigiani, e a quali fondi europei possono accedere questi ultimi?

Risposta data da Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(5 marzo 2012)

1. La Commissione è impegnata a ridurre al minimo gli oneri regolamentari che gravano sulle PMI ([1]) e ha pubblicato di recente una relazione per porre in atto tale impegno ([2]). Uno degli obiettivi chiave della relazione è rafforzare l'applicazione del «test PMI» ([3]) nel contesto del processo di valutazione d'impatto della Commissione. La relazione suggerisce inoltre che le microimprese andrebbero escluse dal campo di applicazione della legislazione proposta a meno che non possa essere dimostrata la proporzionalità della loro copertura. La Commissione incoraggia gli Stati membri ad applicare il «test PMI» e l'approccio «pensare prima in piccolo» nei processi legislativi nazionali.

2. Nel quadro del forum sul finanziamento delle PMI (SME Finance Forum) la Commissione si adopera per identificare e promuovere le buone pratiche per quanto concerne i prestiti alle PMI come ad esempio la funzione di mediatore del credito (che ha dato buoni risultati in Stati membri quali l'Italia) e l'uso della valutazione qualitativa al fine di evitare che i prestiti alle PMI risentano negativamente della revisione dei requisiti in tema di capitale bancario ([4]). Inoltre, per evitare che i prestiti alle PMI risentano negativamente della revisione dei requisiti patrimoniali delle banche ([5]), la Commissione ha introdotto nella sua proposta una clausola di riesame che consente di rivedere al ribasso, se necessario, la ponderazione di rischio delle PMI. L'Autorità bancaria europea conduce attualmente un'analisi in merito alla possibilità di ridurre le ponderazioni del rischio relative alle PMI e dovrebbe presentare una relazione alla Commissione entro il 1º settembre 2012.

([1]) Cfr. lo «Small Business Act» per l'Europa (SBA), COM(2008)394 definitivo, 25.6.2008 e il riesame dello SBA , COM(2011)78 definitivo, 23.2.2011.
([2]) Relazione «Ridurre al minimo indispensabile gli oneri normativi che gravano sulle PMI — Adeguare la normativa dell'UE alle esigenze delle microimprese.» COM(2011)803 definitivo, 23.11.2011.
([3]) Obiettivo del 'test PMI" è analizzare gli effetti che le proposte legislative hanno sulle PMI e proporre misure di mitigazione ove opportuno.
([4]) Queste misure sono state prospettate nel piano d'azione per migliorare l'accesso delle PMI ai finanziamenti (COM(2011)870 definitivo) pubblicato dalla Commissione il 7.12.2011.
([5]) La proposta di direttiva del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio COM(2011)453 definitivo e la proposta di regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio COM(2011)452 che sostituiscono le attuali direttive relative all'accesso all'attività degli enti creditizi (2006/48 e 2006/49) impongono requisiti patrimoniali più elevati e di migliore qualità per le banche e prevedono regole di gestione potenziate per quanto concerne il rischio di liquidità.

Diversi strumenti dell'UE ([6]) sono attualmente disponibili per le PMI: gli strumenti di capitale proprio e di garanzia dei prestiti nell'ambito del programma quadro «Competitività e innovazione» ([7]), il programma «Loans for SMEs» (prestiti alle PMI) della Banca europea per gli investimenti ([8]) e gli strumenti finanziari dei Fondi strutturali ([9]). Per quanto concerne questi ultimi, la Commissione ha recentemente allargato il campo d'intervento di tali strumenti fornendo un sostegno estremamente necessario alle PMI in un periodo di crisi economica ([10]).

([6]) I finanziamenti dell'UE sono convogliati per il tramite di intermediari finanziari come le banche commerciali o i fondi di capitale di rischio al fine di mobilitare ulteriori finanziamenti del settore privato a sostegno delle PMI.

([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/finance/cip-financial-instruments/.

([8]) http://www.eib.org/projects/topics/sme/index.htm

([9]) http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/thefunds/instruments/jeremie_en.cfm.

([10]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/11/853&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000221/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(24 January 2012)

Subject: Crisis affecting SMEs and craft firms

A steadily growing number of Italian small entrepreneurs and craft firms are currently going through the most difficult period since the beginning of the financial crisis, having to deal with ever decreasing turnover combined with a reduction in lending by and support from national banks, which instead of showing their solidarity and understanding in the face of the crisis, are asking for loans, overdrafts and credit cards to be repaid as soon as possible.

As a result, the fate of small businesses, most of which are already in the red and many of which have already gone bankrupt, no longer depends on their owners' enthusiasm, original ideas, character and ability to tackle problems, but rather on the Italian state, which requires firms to comply with a myriad of bureaucratic rules and regulations, on the banks, which are refusing to grant loans, and on the impact of the recession and the credit squeeze.

1. What measures are being taken to support SMEs, which are at the heart of the economies of many Member States?

2. How can access to credit be facilitated for SMEs and craft firms, and what forms of European funding are available to them?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(5 March 2012)

1. The Commission is committed to minimise the regulatory burden on SMEs ([1]) and has recently published a report to put this commitment ([2]) into practice. One of the key objectives of the report is to strengthen the application of the 'SME Test' ([3]) as part of the Commission's impact assessment process. Moreover, the report suggests that micro enterprises should be excluded from the scope of proposed legislation unless the proportionality of them being covered can be demonstrated. The Commission encourages Member States to apply the "SME test" and the "Think Small First" approach in the national legislative processes.

2. In the framework of the SME Finance Forum the Commission has been striving to identify and promote best practices regarding lending to SMEs such as the credit mediator function (which has yielded good results in member states such as Italy) and the use of qualitative ratings to complement the quantitative assessment of SMEs' creditworthiness ([4]). In addition, with a view to avoiding SME lending being impacted negatively by the revision of the bank capital requirements ([5]), the Commission introduced in its proposal a review clause allowing for the SME risk weighting to be revised downward if necessary. The European Banking Authority is currently conducting an analysis on the possibility to reduce SME risk weights and should report to the Commission by 1 September 2012.

Numerous EU instruments ([6]) are currently available to SMEs: the equity and loan guarantee facilities of the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme ([7]), the European Investment Bank's 'Loans for SMEs' programme ([8]) and the financial instruments under the Structural Funds ([9]). As to the latter, the Commission recently expanded the scope of interventions of these instruments, providing much needed relief to SMEs in a period of economic crisis ([10].)

([1]) See the 'Small Business Act' for Europe (SBA), COM(2008) 394 final, 25.6.2008 and the Review of the SBA , COM(2011) 78 final, 23.2.2011.
([2]) Report on Minimising regulatory burden for SMEs — Adapting EU regulation to the needs of micro-enterprises. COM(2011) 803 final, 23.11.2011.
([3]) The purpose of the 'SME Test' is to analyse the effects of legislative proposals on SMEs and to propose mitigating measures if appropriate.
([4]) These measures have been put forward in the action plan to improve access to finance for SMEs (COM(2011) 870 final) released by the Commission on 7.12.2011.
([5]) The proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council COM(2011) 453 final and the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council COM(2011) 452, replacing the current Capital Requirements Directives (2006/48 and 2006/49), impose higher and better quality capital charges for banks and enhanced rules on managing liquidity risk.
([6]) EU funding is channelled through financial intermediaries such as commercial banks or venture capital funds in order to mobilise additional private sector finance in support of SMEs.
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/finance/cip-financial-instruments/.
([8]) http://www.eib.org/projects/topics/sme/index.htm
([9]) http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/thefunds/instruments/jeremie_en.cfm.
([10]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/11/853&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000223/12
to the Commission
Elizabeth Lynne (ALDE)
(18 January 2012)

Subject: Commercial diving in the EU

It has been brought to my attention that dozens of commercial divers are killed in EU waters because of inadequate safety standards, particularly in relation to equipment, training and job risk assessments. The UK's Diving at Work Regulations 1997 have helped reduce the number of diving deaths in UK waters, but standards vary across Member States.

Does the Commission have any plans to improve safety standards across the EU and address the risks commercial divers face?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(22 February 2012)

At EU level, occupational health and safety is governed by around 27 EU directives. The 'Framework' Directive 89/391/EEC of 12 June 1989 on the introduction of measures to encourage improvements in the safety and health of workers at work ([1]) lays down general principles on the prevention of occupational risks that require the employer to evaluate all risks relating to the health and safety of workers, to put in place preventive measures and to provide appropriate protection. Moreover, the employer has general obligation to ensure the safety and health of workers in every aspect relating to work. That directive applies to all sectors of activity, both public and private. It applies to any person employed by an employer. The working environment of commercial divers, provided that they are employed by an employer, is therefore fully covered and their employers have an obligation, depending on the outcome of the risk assessment, to put in place adequate prevention and protection measures to avoid or reduce the risk factors relating to their work activities.

The Member States are required to transpose those directives into their national law; thereafter, it is the responsibility of the relevant national authorities (normally the labour inspectorates) to enforce the national provisions transposing the EU health and safety at work legislation.

If correctly implemented by Member States, the abovementioned legislation provides for sufficient and effective protection of commercial divers. Consequently, the Commission has at present no intention to adopt additional specific health and safety at work standards for commercial diving.

([1]) OJ L 183, 29.6.1989.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-000226/12
to the Commission
John Stuart Agnew (EFD)
(16 January 2012)

Subject: Legal basis for use of EU resources by external entities

Under what articles of the Treaty on European Union and/or the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union is the expenditure of European taxpayers' money and the use of EU resources and institutions permitted for the purpose of preparing and negotiating a proposed international agreement/treaty (which will not be a European Union treaty) on reinforced economic union?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(16 February 2012)

The draft Treaty on Stability, Coordination and Governance in the Economic and Monetary Union finalised on 30 January 2012 falls under the scope of the provision on Economic and Monetary Policy of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and in particular its Articles 120, 121, 126 and 136.

Consequently administrative expenditure of the EU institutions in particular the Council and the Commission could be used for the preparation and negotiation of this international agreement.

Work on this international agreement on reinforced economic union took place in the framework of an enlarged Eurogroup Working Group (EWG), which is part of the Economic and Financial Committee provided for in Article 134 TFEU.

The Commission recalls that it was not the initiator of the work on the international agreement. It has participated in this work, in a constructive spirit, as guardian of the EU Treaties and taking into account its responsibilities in the coordination and surveillance of the economic policies of the Member States.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000247/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(11 gennaio 2012)

Oggetto: Smart drugs

Il consumo di «smart drugs» — droghe offerte soprattutto via web come simili alla cannabis, ma in realtà prodotte da scarti di laboratorio — ha provocato in Italia 30 ricoveri per intossicazione in tredici mesi.

Nei giorni scorsi un'operazione dei Carabinieri del Nas contro l'ennesima catena di smart shop — alcuni dei quali con annessi sportelli automatici — tra Torino, Campobasso, Roma e Frosinone ha scoperto negozi con prodotti di erboristeria o fertilizzanti che, sotto la veste ingannevole di profumatori ambientali, distribuivano cannabinoidi sintetici, per il cui acquisto al distributore automatico non era richiesto neppure il documento d'identità.

Dodici negozi sono stati sequestrati, per un valore commerciale complessivo di circa un milione e mezzo di euro. Ma l'operazione denominata «Oro e incenso», dopo aver oscurato il sito Internet dell'impresa capofila, un'azienda torinese (con sede fittizia nella Repubblica Ceca) che provvedeva a distribuire il prodotto, sta procedendo alla valutazione del materiale rinvenuto durante le perquisizioni che hanno interessato anche Latina, Lecco, Ravenna, Trieste, Udine e Venezia.

Tutto ciò premesso, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. è a conoscenza della grave e pericolosa diffusione di queste droghe, soprattutto tra i più giovani e nelle scuole?

2. Quali concrete iniziative intenda porre in essere con la massima urgenza per verificare l'entità del fenomeno e per contrastarlo?

3. Non intende accogliere la proposta avanzata dal governo italiano di cambiare il nome e la classificazione delle «smart drugs» in «trash drugs», per evitare equivoci che ne favoriscano il consumo?

Risposta data da Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(15 febbraio 2012)

La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-010409/2011 ([1]), in cui viene illustrata la situazione delle nuove sostanze psicoattive e precisata la posizione della Commissione al riguardo.

La Commissione è informata sui diversi metodi di diffusione delle nuove sostanze psicoattive; l'indagine Eurobarometro del 2011 ([2]) prevedeva una domanda a questo proposito.

La decisione 2005/387/GAI del Consiglio sulle nuove sostanze psicoattive ([3]) utilizza l'espressione generica «nuove sostanze psicoattive» per definire le nuove sostanze stupefacenti o psicotrope, comparse soltanto di recente sul mercato e non ancora vietate, che possono costituire un pericolo per la salute pubblica al pari delle droghe illecite. Tuttavia, gli Stati membri possono realizzare una serie di attività per informare i cittadini sui potenziali rischi e per mettere in atto strategie di prevenzione che scoraggino l'assunzione di stupefacenti.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2011-010409&language=EN.
([2]) Commissione europea, Flash Eurobarometro n. 330 sul rapporto tra i giovani e gli stupefacenti (Youth attitudes on Drugs), http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/flash_arch_344_330_en.htm#330.
([3]) Decisione del Consiglio 2005/387/GAI del 10 maggio 2005 relativa allo scambio di informazioni, alla valutazione dei rischi e al controllo delle nuove sostanze psicoattive, GU L 127 del 20.5.2005.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000247/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(11 January 2012)

Subject: Smart drugs

Over the last 13 months in Italy 30 people have been admitted to hospital with food poisoning after taking 'smart drugs', drugs which are offered for sale primarily on the web as alternatives to cannabis, but which are in fact produced from laboratory waste.

In the last few days an operation by special Carabinieri units against yet another chain of smart shops, some equipped with their own automatic vending machines, in Turin, Campobasso, Rome and Frosinone has uncovered shops which appeared to be selling plant products and fertilisers, which were in fact distributing synthetic cannabis products under the guise of air fresheners. Even very young children could obtain the products in question from the vending machines.

The contents of 12 shops were seized, with a total commercial value of roughly EUR 1.5 million. After shutting down the Internet site of the company behind the scheme, which is based in Turin (with bogus head offices in the Czech Republic), the officers involved in the operation, named 'Gold and Incense' (Oro e Incenso), are assessing the material seized during the raids, which were also carried out in Latina, Lecco, Ravenna, Trieste, Udine and Venice.

1. Is the Commission aware of the serious and dangerous problems linked to the availability of these drugs, above all to young people and in schools?

2. What immediate practical steps does it plan to take to determine the extent of this phenomenon and combat it?

3. Does it welcome the Italian Government's proposal that these drugs should be classified and referred to as 'trash drugs', and not as 'smart drugs', a misnomer which merely encourages their consumption?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(15 February 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-010409/2011 ([1]), in which the situation with new psychoactive substances was explained and the Commission's response outlined.

The Commission is aware of various methods of distribution of new psychoactive substances; a question on distribution methods was also part of the 2011 Eurobarometer ([2]) survey.

The Council Decision 2005/387/JHA on new psychoactive substances ([3]) uses the generic term 'new psychoactive substances'. New psychoactive substances are new narcotic or psychotropic drugs which may pose a threat to public health comparable to illicit drugs, and which emerged only recently on the market and are not banned. Member States can undertake a variety of activities to inform citizens of potential risks and deploy prevention strategies that discourage the use of psychoactive substances.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2011-010409&language=EN.
([2]) European Commission, Flash Eurobarometer Nr. 330, Youth attitudes on Drugs, . http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/flash_arch_344_330_en.htm#330.
([3]) Council Decision 2005/387/JHA of 10 May 2005 on the information exchange, risk-assessment and control of new psychoactive substances, OJ L 127, 20.5.2005.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000253/12
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 de enero de 2012)

Asunto: Incumplimiento de la Directiva de impacto ambiental

El pasado mes de noviembre, el Gobierno del Estado español, mediante la Resolución de 21 de noviembre de 2011, de la Secretaría de Estado de Cambio Climático, sobre la evaluación de impacto ambiental del proyecto Perforación de un pozo para exploración de hidrocarburos, sondeo ENARA-4, permiso ENARA, término municipal de Vitoria-Gasteiz, Araba/Álava anunciaba lo siguiente: «No es previsible que el proyecto Perforación de un pozo para exploración de hidrocarburos, sondeo ENARA-4, permiso ENARA, término municipal Vitoria-Gasteiz (Araba/Álava), cumpliendo los requisitos ambientales que se desprenden de la presente resolución, vaya a producir impactos adversos significativos, por lo que no se considera necesaria la tramitación prevista en la sección 1a de dicha Ley», en referencia al Real Decreto Legislativo 1/2008, de 11 de enero, por el que se aprueba el texto refundido de la Ley de Evaluación de Impacto Ambiental de proyectos. Es decir, que se aprobó no someter a evaluación de impacto ambiental un proyecto que consiste en un pozo de 4 864 metros para la extracción de hidrocarburos. Recientemente, en la respuesta a la pregunta E-007627/2011, la Comisión afirmaba que «los proyectos de prospección y explotación de gas de esquisto están regulados por la Directiva de Impacto Ambiental (EIA), que impone a los Estados miembros la responsabilidad de someter ese tipo de proyectos (sean públicos o privados) a evaluación antes de autorizar su ejecución, aplicando, si resulta necesario, el principio de cautela».

¿Considera la Comisión que, de acuerdo con la Directiva relativa a la evaluación de las repercusiones sobre el medio ambiente, se necesita una evaluación de impacto ambiental para realizar una perforación de casi 5 000 metros para extraer hidrocarburos? ¿Va a tomar alguna medida sobre el posible incumplimiento por parte del Gobierno de dicha Directiva a raíz de la Resolución de 21 de noviembre de 2011, de la Secretaría de Estado de Cambio Climático?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(24 de febrero de 2012)

La Comisión considera que la Directiva 85/337/CEE ([1]), en su versión modificada (denominada Directiva de evaluación de impacto ambiental o Directiva EIA), es aplicable a este proyecto de prospección de gas de esquisto en Álava (España). Los proyectos de perforación a gran profundidad se contemplan en el anexo II.2.d de la Directiva EIA. Los proyectos del anexo II están sujetos a un examen por parte de las autoridades competentes a fin de determinar si es necesaria una EIA, de conformidad con el artículo 4, apartados 2 a 4, y sobre la base de los criterios establecidos en el anexo III de la Directiva.

Las autoridades medioambientales españolas han llevado a cabo un análisis de este proyecto, que se resume en la Resolución de 21 de noviembre de 2011 de la Secretaría de Estado de Cambio Climático del Ministerio de Medio Ambiente, publicada en el *Boletín Oficial del Estado* (BOE) n° 295, de 8 de diciembre de 2011 (páginas 130225-130232). Las autoridades medioambientales españolas, teniendo en cuenta los criterios del anexo III mencionado, llegan a la conclusión, motivándola, de que un procedimiento de EIA no es necesario para este proyecto.

Según la información disponible, no se detecta un incumplimiento de la Directiva EIA en este caso. Por lo tanto, la Comisión no tiene previsto tomar ninguna medida.

([1]) Directiva 85/337/CEE del Consejo, relativa a la evaluación de las repercusiones de determinados proyectos públicos y privados sobre el medio ambiente (DO L 175 de 5.7.1985), modificada por las Directivas 97/11/CE (DO L 73 de 14.3.1997), 2003/35/CE (DO L 156 de 25.6.2003) y 2009/31/CE (DO L 140 de 5.6.2009).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000253/12
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 January 2012)

Subject: Non-compliance with the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Directive

Last November, the Spanish Government, in its resolution of 21 November 2011 issued by the Secretary of State for Climate Change on the environmental impact assessment of the ENARA-4 well-drilling project for hydrocarbon exploration, under the ENARA permit, municipal district of Vitoria-Gasteiz, Araba/Álava, made the following announcement: 'It is not expected that the ENARA-4 well-drilling project for hydrocarbon exploration, under the ENARA permit, municipal district of Vitoria-Gasteiz (Araba/Álava), meeting the environmental requirements arising from this resolution, will produce significant adverse effects, and therefore the procedures provided for in section 1 of this law are not considered necessary', referring to the Royal Legislative Decree 1/2008, of 11 January, adopting the revised text of the law on the environmental impact assessment of projects. In other words, it was decided that no environmental impact assessment will be carried out on a project that consists of a well 4 864 metres deep that is to be used for the extraction of hydrocarbons. Recently, in its answer to Written Question E-007627/2011, the Commission stated, 'all shale gas exploration and exploitation projects should be covered by the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Directive, under which Member States are responsible for assessing private and public projects before granting development consent, taking into account the precautionary principle, as necessary'.

Does the Commission consider that, in accordance with the EIA Directive, it is necessary to carry out an environmental impact assessment before drilling to a depth of almost 5 000 metres in order to extract hydrocarbons? Is the Commission going to take any action as regards possible non-compliance with the directive by the Spanish Government, as a result of the resolution of 21 November 2011 issued by the Secretary of State for Climate Change?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(24 February 2012)

The Commission considers that directive 85/337/EEC ([1]) as amended (known as the Environmental Impact Assessment or EIA Directive) is applicable to this shale gas exploration project in Alava, Spain. Deep drilling projects are covered by Annex II.2.d of the EIA Directive. Annex II projects are subject to a screening by the competent authorities to determine whether an EIA is required, in accordance with Article 4(2)-(4) and on the basis of the criteria listed in Annex III of the directive.

The Spanish environmental authorities have carried out such a screening for this project, which is summarised in the Statement of 21 November 2011 issued by the Secretary of State for Climate Change of the Ministry for the Environment, published in the Official Journal (BOE) No 295 of 8 December 2011 (pages 130225-130232). The Spanish environmental authorities, taking into account the abovementioned Annex III criteria, concluded and justified that a complete EIA procedure is not necessary for this project.

According to the available information, no breach of the EIA Directive can be identified in this case. Therefore, the Commission does not intend to take further action.

([1]) Directive 85/337/EEC on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment, OJ L 175, 5.7.1985, as amended by Directive 97/11/EC, OJ L 073, 14.3.1997, Directive 2003/35/EC, OJ L 156, 25.6.2003 and Directive 2009/31/EC, OJ L 140, 5.6.2009.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000254/12
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 de enero de 2012)

Asunto: Vida útil de las centrales nucleares en el Estado español

A raíz del accidente nuclear de Fukushima se abrió un profundo debate sobre la energía nuclear en el seno de la UE. Ello llevó a que países como Alemania hayan adelantado el cierre de sus centrales nucleares. El informe post-Fukushima de la Autoridad de Seguridad Nuclear Francesa (ASN) concluye que van a ser necesarias inversiones de miles de millones de euros para obtener garantías de seguridad en las centrales nucleares francesas. Esta situación contrasta con el anuncio realizado por el nuevo gobierno del Estado español en el que se anuncia una prórroga de la central nuclear más antigua, la de Santa María de Garoña, construida en 1970 y cuyo cierre estaba previsto en un principio para 2009, plazo que fue prorrogado hasta 2013 por el anterior gobierno. Ahora, el plazo de cierre de la central —que, por cierto, es idéntica a la de Fukushima— quedará fijado para 2019.

¿Estaba al corriente la Comisión de la prórroga de la vida útil de Garoña?

¿Qué opinión tiene respecto la prórroga de la vida útil de dicha central?

Respuesta del Sr. Oettinger en nombre de la Comisión
(30 de marzo de 2012)

La Comisión está al corriente de la reciente revocación por el nuevo Gobierno español de una Orden Ministerial de 2009, por la que se disponía el cese de la actividad de Santa María de Garoña (Burgos) en 2013, así como de sus intenciones de solicitar al Consejo de Seguridad Nuclear (CSN) que estudie las opciones técnicas para prolongar su funcionamiento.

Sin embargo, la Comisión no tiene un mandato específico para determinar ni la combinación de fuentes de energía de los Estados miembros ni la posible prórroga de la licencia de explotación vigente de cualquiera de sus centrales nucleares. Con arreglo a la Directiva 2009/71/Euratom del Consejo, de 25 de junio de 2009 ([1]), es obligatorio para los Estados miembros velar por que su normativa nacional vigente exija a los titulares de licencias evaluar y verificar y mejorar constantemente, en la medida de lo razonablemente posible, la seguridad de sus instalaciones nucleares, bajo la supervisión de la autoridad nacional competente.

([1]) Directiva 2009/71/Euratom del Consejo, de 25 de junio de 2009, por la que se establece un marco comunitario para la seguridad nuclear de las instalaciones nucleares (DO L 172 de 2.7.2009).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000254/12
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 January 2012)

Subject: Useful life of nuclear power plants in Spain

In the wake of the Fukushima nuclear accident, an intense debate has arisen about nuclear energy in the EU. The events led countries like Germany to bring forward the closure of their nuclear power plants. The report issued by the French Nuclear Safety Authority (ASN) post-Fukushima concludes that billions of euros in investments will be needed to ensure the safety of French nuclear power plants. This situation contrasts with the announcement made by the new Spanish Government, announcing that the life of Spain's oldest nuclear power plant, the Santa María de Garoña plant, will be extended. The plant, which was built in 1970, was initially scheduled for closure by 2009; the previous administration pushed back this timeframe to 2013. Now, the power plant — which, incidentally, is identical to the Fukushima plant — will be set to close by 2019.

Was the Commission informed about the extension of Garoña's life?

What is its opinion on the extension of this plant's life?

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

The Commission is aware of the recent revocation, by the Spanish new Government, of a previous Ministry Order of 2009 establishing the cessation of operation of Santa Maria de Garoña (Burgos) in 2013 and its intentions to request the Consejo de Seguridad Nuclear (CSN) to consider technical options for longer operation.

However, the Commission has not a specific mandate to determine neither the Member States' internal energy mix nor the possible extension of any of their nuclear plants' current operating licence. According to Council Directive 2009/71/Euratom of 25 June 2009 ([1]), it is an obligation of the Member States to ensure that their national framework in place requires licence holders, under the supervision of the competent national regulatory authority, to assess and verify, and continuously improve, as far as reasonably achievable, the nuclear safety of their nuclear installations.

([1]) Council Directive 2009/71/Euratom of 25 June 2009 establishing a Community framework for the nuclear safety of nuclear installations, OJ L 172, 2.7.2009.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-000306/12
do Komisji
Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE)
(19 stycznia 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Inicjatywa „Szanse dla młodzieży"

W perspektywie finansowej Unii Europejskiej na lata 2007-2013 na Europejski Fundusz Społeczny EFS przypadło 76 mld euro, z czego około 2/3 tych środków przeznaczonych jest na kwestie związane z edukacją i zatrudnieniem.

Pod koniec grudnia ubiegłego roku Komisja Europejska opublikowała Komunikat w sprawie inicjatywy „Szanse dla młodzieży", w którym zwrócono uwagę na bezrobocie wśród młodych ludzi i sposoby walki z tym problemem.

Chciałabym zauważyć, że 30 mld euro z EFS pozostało niewykorzystanych, dlatego zwracam się z zapytaniem do Komisji:

Czy istnieje priorytet, w ramach którego możliwe jest finansowanie, zarekomendowanych w odniesieniu do wszystkich państw członkowskich UE, płatnych praktyk i staży dla młodych ludzi, które niosłyby za sobą większą szansę późniejszego zatrudnienia oraz czy przy braku takiej możliwości Komisja rozważa jego wprowadzenie w nowej perspektywie finansowej UE na lata 2014-2020?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza László Andora w imieniu Komisji
(28 lutego 2012 r.)

Jak słusznie zauważyła Szanowna Pani Poseł, Europejski Fundusz Społeczny (EFS) ma na celu wspieranie kształcenia, szkolenia i zatrudnienia młodych ludzi. Przykładowo, w 2010 r. liczba młodych ludzi (w wieku od 15 do 24 lat) korzystających z programów EFS wynosiła 4,5 mln, co stanowiło 28 % beneficjentów.

Biorąc jednak pod uwagę poważny wpływ kryzysu na zatrudnienie wśród młodych ludzi, pozostaje jeszcze wiele do zrobienia, zarówno w zakresie polityki, jak i finansowania. To właśnie jest celem inicjatywy Komisji „Szanse dla młodzieży", przedstawionej w grudniu 2011 r. ([1]), która musi zostać teraz sprawnie wdrożona we współpracy z państwami członkowskimi i wszystkimi zainteresowanymi stronami. Jako pierwszy krok w tym kierunku Komisja, wraz z państwami członkowskimi, rozważy możliwości pozwalające przyspieszyć wdrażanie projektów dla młodzieży, poszerzyć ich zasięg poprzez zapoczątkowanie zakrojonych na szeroką skalę programów wsparcia dla młodych ludzi, oraz przeprogramować programy operacyjne EFS, tak aby koncentrowały się na środkach na rzecz zatrudnienia wśród młodzieży. Środki te mogą obejmować praktyki i staże, które kwalifikują się w ramach priorytetów inwestycyjnych „Zdolności adaptacyjne" i „Kapitał ludzki" w obecnym okresie programowania oraz w ramach priorytetów inwestycyjnych „Poprawa dostępności uczenia się przez całe życie" oraz „Integracja młodych ludzi na rynku pracy" ([2]) w kolejnym okresie programowania.

([1]) Zob. komunikat Komisji „Inicjatywa »Szanse dla młodzieży«" (COM(2011) 933 wersja ostateczna z 20 grudnia 2011 r.).
([2]) COM(2011) 607 wersja ostateczna.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000306/12
to the Commission
Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE)
(19 January 2012)

Subject: Youth Opportunities Initiative

Under the European Union's multiannual financial framework for the period 2007-2013, the European Social Fund (ESF) was allocated EUR 76 billion, some two-thirds of which is earmarked for issues relating to education and employment.

Towards the end of December last year the Commission published a communication on the Youth Opportunities Initiative which focused on the issue of unemployment among young people and ways of combating this problem.

Given that EUR 30 billion of the funds available under the ESF is still unused, are there any priority measures under which it is possible to finance paid apprenticeships and traineeships for young people, as recommended for all the Member States, in order to improve their chances of subsequently finding employment? If this is not possible, is the Commission considering making it so under the new multiannual financial framework for the period 2014-2020?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(28 February 2012)

As the Honourable Member points out, the European Social Fund (ESF) supports young people's education, training and employment. In 2010 for example, young people (aged 15-24) benefiting under ESF programmes numbered 4.5 million and accounted for 28% of the beneficiaries.

However, given the serious effects of the crisis on youth employment, more needs to be done in both policy and funding terms. That is the aim of the Commission's Youth Opportunities Initiative ([1]) presented in December 2011, and which must now be implemented swiftly in cooperation with the Member States and all stakeholders. As a first step, the Commission will explore with the Member States the possibilities for speeding up the implementation of youth projects, extending outreach through the launching of large-scale support schemes for young people, and reprogramming ESF operational programmes focusing on youth employment measures. These can include apprenticeships and traineeships, which qualify under the Adaptability and Human Capital investment priorities in the current programming period, and the ESF's 'Enhancing access to lifelong learning' and 'Integration of young people into the labour market' investment priorities ([2]) in the forthcoming programming period.

([1]) See Commission communication 'Youth Opportunities Initiative' (COM(2011)933 final of 20 December 2011).
([2]) COM(2011)607 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000336/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(19 gennaio 2012)

Oggetto: Chiusura di uno stabilimento Alcoa, in Sardegna

L'Alcoa di Portovesme chiuderà entro l'estate. Lo ha annunciato il colosso americano dell'alluminio, sancendo così la fine dello stabilimento sardo, insieme al ridimensionamento di altri due impianti in Spagna a La Coruna e a Aviles, in cui oggi sono occupati complessivamente 1 500 lavoratori.

A fronte del crollo del prezzo dell'alluminio, nei piani della multinazionale c'è l'obiettivo di ridurre del 12 % la produzione complessiva. Per quanto riguarda lo stabilimento di Portovesme il colosso americano poteva beneficiare di una legge ad hoc che ha introdotto per tre anni, dal 2010 al 2012, tariffe elettriche incentivanti per scongiurare la chiusura. Adesso per i lavoratori sardi si tratterà dell'ultimo inverno di lavoro visto che la chiusura dello stabilimento è stata annunciata per l'inizio dell'estate.

Alla luce dei fatti sopraesposti, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se è a conoscenza della chiusura dello stabilimento Alcoa di Portovesme,

2. se ha intenzione di attivare il Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione per aiutare i lavoratori a trovare un nuovo impiego e a riqualificarsi?

Risposta data da Laszlo Andor a nome della Commissione
(22 febbraio 2012)

La Commissione è profondamente preoccupata per le conseguenze socioeconomiche della chiusura dell'impianto Alcoa a Portovesme (Sardegna).

Se risulterà impossibile mantenere l'occupazione presso la società e i suoi fornitori o i venditori ai livelli attuali e se si dovranno licenziare i lavoratori l'Italia può chiedere il sostegno del Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione (FEG). Il FEG può cofinanziare misure attive di politica del mercato del lavoro per aiutare i lavoratori licenziati in conseguenza dei mutamenti intervenuti nella struttura del commercio mondiale a rientrare quanto prima nel mondo del lavoro. La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole deputato al regolamento del FEG ([1]) per ulteriori dettagli sulle regole che disciplinano il Fondo. È da tener presente che a causa del mancato accordo in seno al Consiglio su una proposta della Commissione volta a prolungare la cosiddetta deroga di crisi che scadeva alla fine del 2011, non è più possibile monitorare il FEG in caso di licenziamenti determinati dalla crisi economica e finanziaria in quanto tale.

Per accertare se sia prevista la presentazione di una domanda l'onorevole deputato può rivolgersi al referente del FEG per l'Italia ([2]).

([1]) Regolamento (CE) n. 1927/2006 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 20 dicembre 2006, che istituisce un Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione, GU L 406 del 30.12.2006.

([2]) Gli estremi dei referenti sono disponibili sul sito web del FEG: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=it.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000336/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(19 January 2012)

Subject: Closure of an Alcoa plant in Sardinia

The Alcoa plant in Portovesme will close by next summer. The closure was announced by the American aluminium giant, thus confirming the end for the Sardinian plant, along with plans to restructure two other plants at La Coruna and Aviles in Spain, where a total of 1500 people are currently employed.

In the light of the slump in aluminium prices, the multinational is aiming to reduce its total production by 12%. With regard to the Portovesme plant, it could have taken advantage of an ad hoc law which in the three years from 2010 to 2012 provided for special electricity rates as an incentive to prevent the closure. The Sardinian workers are now facing their last winter in work, since the plant is due to close early next summer.

1. Is the Commission aware of the closure of the Portovesme Alcoa plant?

2. Does it intend to use the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund in order to help the workers find alternative employment or retrain?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(22 February 2012)

The Commission is deeply concerned at the social and economic consequences that the closure of the Alcoa plant in Portovesme (Sardinia) may bring.

Where it proves impossible to maintain employment at the company and its suppliers or sellers at the current level and workers have to be made redundant, Italy can apply for support from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF). The EGF can co-finance active labour market policy measures to help workers made redundant as a result of changing world trade patterns to get back into employment as quickly as possible. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the EGF Regulation ([1]) for more details of the rules governing the Fund. It is noteworthy that following the failure of the Council to agree on a Commission proposal to prolong the so-called crisis derogation which expired at the end of 2011, it is no more possible to monitor the EGF in cases of redundancies caused by the economic and financial crisis as such.

To find out whether there are plans to submit an application, the Honourable Member could get in touch with the EGF contact person for Italy ([2]).

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1927/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 December 2006 on establishing the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund, OJ L 406, 30.12.2006.

([2]) Contact details are available on the EGF website at http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=it.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-000357/12
komissiolle
Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE)
(20. tammikuuta 2012)

Aihe: Sähköinen tunnistautuminen

Tietomurtoja on tapahtunut viimeisten vuosien aikana lisääntyvässä määrin niin EU:n sisällä kun globaalistikin. Asiaa on osaltaan edesauttanut erinäisten salasanojen tarve niin työpaikan järjestelmiin kuin henkilökohtaisiin sähköposteihin ja sosiaaliseen mediaan. Näiden lisäksi muistettavana ovat ainakin pankki- ja luottokorttien tunnusluvut. Houkutus käyttää samaa salasanaa onkin suuri, vaikka juuri näin ei saisi tehdä, sillä yhdellä varastetulla salasanalla voi helposti päästä saman tien niin sähköpostiin, työasioihin kuin sosiaaliseen mediaankin. Tapahtuneet tietomurrot osoittavat selvästi, että salasanoista on päästävä eroon. Mm. teknologiajätti IBM julisti joulukuussa ennustuksissaan, että salasanat alkavat kadota seuraavan viiden vuoden aikana. Niiden tilalle yhtiö visioi lukijoita, jotka tunnistavat ihmiset esimerkiksi äänen, kasvojen, silmän iiriksen kuvan tai näiden yhdistelmän avulla. Vaihtoehdoksi on myös kaavailtu esimerkiksi Facebookin ja Googlen kehittyvän eräänlaisiksi internetin yleisavaimiksi. Käyttäjä voi jo nyt kirjautua kerran Facebookiin ja tunnistautua tämän jälkeen sivuston kautta muihinkin nettipalveluihin, joissa voi olla hyvinkin arkaluontoista tietoa. Epävarmaa kuitenkin on, haluavatko netin käyttäjät antaa tällaisen vallan ylikansallisille yhtiöille. On siis todennäköistä, että laajat tietomurrot saavat varsinkin yritykset ja valtiot hylkäämään loputkin salasanansa ja siirtymään vahvempaan tunnistukseen, kenties IBM:n maalailemiin biotunnisteisiin.

Onko komissiossa seurattu tapahtuneita tietomurtoja ja tehty mahdollisia suunnitelmia tulevaisuuden varalle siitä, että EU:n alueella tavallinenkin netinkäyttäjä saa käyttöönsä oikeasti turvallisia ja kenties myös valtioiden rajat ylittäviä tunnistautumisen keinoja?

Nellie Kroesin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(10. helmikuuta 2012)

Komissio viittaa vastauksiinsa kirjallisiin kysymyksiin E-007985/2011 ja E-008086/2011 ([1]), jotka liittyvät viimeaikaisiin tietomurtoihin ja suunnitteilla olevaan internetin turvallisuutta koskevaan kattavaan EU:n strategiaan, jolla pyritään parantamaan internetin turvallisuutta EU:n internetinkäyttäjien luottamuksen lisäämiseksi. Sähköisten tunnistamiskeinojen vastavuoroinen tunnustaminen ja hyväksyminen kaikkialla EU:ssa on tärkeä osa tulevia sähköisen tunnistamisen ja todentamisen sekä sähköisten allekirjoitusten tunnistamisen Euroopan laajuisia kehyksiä, joita valmistellaan parhaillaan osana 15.11.2011 hyväksyttyä komission lainsäädäntö- ja työohjelmaa vuodeksi 2012 ([2]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB.
([2]) KOM(2011)777.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000357/12
to the Commission
Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE)
(20 January 2012)

Subject: Electronic identification

In the past several years, information security breaches have been on the increase within the EU as well as globally. The matter has in part been exacerbated by the requirement to use passwords to access workplace systems as well as private emails and social media. On top of these, individuals need to memorise at least the pin codes of their bank and credit cards. The temptation to use the same password on several sites is great although this is precisely what should not be done, as a single stolen password can then easily be exploited to access the person's email, business details and social media. Recent information breaches clearly indicate that there is a pressing need to get rid of passwords altogether. The technology giant IBM stated in its December forecast that passwords will begin to disappear within the next five years. Instead the company envisions readers which will identify individuals based on voice, facial features, the iris of the eye or a combination thereof. An alternative scenario is having sites such as Facebook or Google developed into what might be called general keys to the web. Users can already sign in to Facebook and from there log into other online services which may contain strictly private information. It is uncertain, though, whether Internet users are willing to hand this power to multinational companies. It is therefore likely that extensive information security breaches will persuade companies and governments in particular to abandon the use of passwords and adopt stronger identification instead, possibly along the lines of the biometric recognition envisaged by IBM.

Has the Commission kept an eye on the recent information security breaches and made any plans for the future regarding access by ordinary Internet users in the EU to truly secure and possibly cross-border means of identification?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(10 February 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honorable Member to its answer to Written Questions E-007985/2011 and E-008086/2011 ([1]) regarding recent information security breaches and on a comprehensive European Internet Security Strategy which is currently being devised with the aim to increase Internet security to boost the confidence of EU Internet users. The mutual recognition and acceptance of electronic identification means across the EU is an essential element of the forthcoming 'Pan European framework for electronic identification, authentication and signature' which is currently under development as indicated in the Commission Legislative Work Pogramme 2012 of 15.11.2011 ([2]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB.
([2]) COM(2011)777.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000394/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(23 de janeiro de 2012)

Assunto: Clareza jurídica nos Agrupamentos Europeus de Cooperação Territorial

Desde 2006 que os parceiros locais e regionais têm a possibilidade de estabelecer Agrupamentos Europeus de Cooperação Territorial (AECT), com um quadro legal comum que os ajuda a ultrapassar diferentes regras e regulamentações nacionais.

O Regulamento que estabelece os Agrupamentos Europeus de Cooperação Territorial (COM(2011)0610 final, de 6.10.2011) introduz alterações que visam, por um lado, respeitar a terminologia introduzida pelo Tratado sobre o Funcionamento da União Europeia e, por outro lado, colmatar as lacunas e os pontos identificados e que são suscetíveis de melhorias;

Os AECT podem ser compostos por membros provenientes do território de, pelo menos, dois Estados-Membros e de um ou mais países terceiros ou territórios ultramarinos. Assim, os AECT operam, normalmente, em mais do que um Estado-Membro e visam facilitar a constituição e consequente desenvolvimento de projetos de cooperação territorial.

A proposta de regulamento refere que, no caso da participação de vários Estados-Membros e de um ou mais países terceiros ou territórios ultramarinos, a celebração de um acordo desse tipo entre o respetivo país terceiro ou território ultramarino e um Estado-membro participante deve ser suficiente.

No entanto, salienta-se que não existe uma clareza jurídica devidamente justificada, podendo a Comissão Europeia estar perante uma dualidade de critérios e falta de informação para a constituição desta tipologia de estruturas que envolvam países fora da União Europeia.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Será possível constituir um AECT com entidades de Estados-Membros que possuem estatuto e dimensão diferenciada? Ou seja, será possível congregar num AECT entidades nacionais de um Estado-membro/país terceiro e entidades regionais de outro Estado-Membro/país terceiro?

2. No caso da participação de Estados-Membros da União Europeia e países terceiros na constituição de um AECT, qual o princípio jurídico que irá vigorar para o normal funcionamento do Agrupamento, nomeadamente no que diz respeito ao regime fiscal e segurança social dos trabalhadores?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(23 de fevereiro de 2012)

1. Já é possível proceder à criação de um agrupamento europeu de cooperação territorial (AECT) com entidades dos Estados-Membros de estatuto e dimensão diferentes. O «Hospital transfronteiriço Cerdanya» é um exemplo de um AECT entre o Ministério francês da saúde e do desporto e o Governo da Catalunha. Neste caso, as diferenças respeitam ao estatuto e à dimensão.

Atualmente, o Regulamento (CE) n.° 1082/2006 («Regulamento AECT») aplica-se essencialmente ao território da União Europeia. No entanto, pode ser possível a participação de entidades de países terceiros num AECT, caso o país terceiro adote legislação nacional para criar um instrumento semelhante ou aproximado ao AECT, ou assine acordos com os Estados-Membros da União Europeia que permitam a participação das suas autoridades em AECT. Na sua proposta de alteração do Regulamento AECT ([1]), a Comissão inclui explicitamente a opção que permite às entidades de dimensão e estatuto jurídico diferentes de países terceiros tornar-se membros de um AECT (mediante o cumprimento de certas condições). Além disso, a Comissão propõe que entidades de apenas um Estado-Membro e de um país terceiro possam constituir um AECT.

([1]) COM(2011)0610 final.

2. No que respeita às regras aplicáveis ao pessoal de um AECT, e no âmbito das disposições atualmente em vigor, os estatutos de um AECT devem contemplar as modalidades da «natureza dos contratos de pessoal». A proposta prevê as seguintes opções:

— que sejam aplicadas as normas do Estado-Membro em que o AECT tem a sua sede estatutária;

— que sejam aplicadas as normas do Estado-Membro em que o pessoal do AECT está efetivamente localizado; ou

— que sejam aplicadas as normas do Estado-Membro da nacionalidade do membro do pessoal em causa.

A fim de permitir a igualdade de tratamento, as legislações nacionais podem ser objeto da aplicação de regras *ad hoc* suplementares fixadas pelo próprio AECT.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000394/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(23 January 2012)

Subject: Legal clarity regarding the European Groupings of Territorial Cooperation

Since 2006, local and regional partners have been able to set up European Groupings of Territorial Cooperation (EGTC) with a common legal framework that helps them overcome differing national rules and regulations.

The regulation creating the European Groupings of Territorial Cooperation (COM(2011) 0610 final, 6.10.2011) introduces amendments aimed, on the one hand, at complying with the terminology introduced by the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and, on the other, respond to the weaknesses and points identified as requiring improvements.

An EGTC may be made up of members from the territory of at least two Member States and one or more third countries or overseas territories. Consequently, EGTCs normally operate in more than one Member State and aim to facilitate the setting-up and subsequent development of territorial cooperation projects.

The proposed regulation states that, in the event of the participation of various Member States and of one or more third countries or overseas territories, an agreement of this nature between the relevant third country or overseas territory and a participating Member State should suffice.

However, it must be emphasised that there is no duly substantiated legal clarity, and the Commission may be facing double standards and a lack of information in relation to the setting-up of this type of structure involving countries outside the European Union.

What is the Commission's view:

1. Will it be possible to set up an EGTC with entities from Member States that have a different status and size? Or rather, will it be possible to bring together in an EGTC national entities from one Member State/third country and regional entities from another Member State/third country?

2. In the case of the participation of European Union Member States and third countries in the constitution of an EGTC, what is the legal principle that will be applicable to the normal functioning of the Grouping, particularly with respect to tax and social security arrangements for workers?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(23 February 2012)

1. It is already possible to set up a European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation (EGTC) with entities from Member States having a different status and size. One example is the 'Cerdanya cross-border Hospital' EGTC between the French Ministry for Health and Sports and the Government of Catalonia. In this case, differences refer to both status and size.

At present, Regulation (EC) No 1082/2006 (the 'EGTC Regulation') primarily applies to the territory of the European Union. However, the participation of entities from third countries in an EGTC may be possible where the third country adopts national legislation to create an instrument similar or close to the EGTC or the third country signs agreements with EU Member States in order to enable its authorities to participate in EGTCs. In its proposal for amending the EGTC Regulation (COM 2011 610 final), the Commission explicitly includes the option that entities of different size and legal status from third countries may become members of an EGTC (subject to certain conditions). Furthermore, it proposes that entities from only one Member State and one third country could form an EGTC.

2. Concerning the rules applying to an EGTC's staff under the current provisions, the statutes of an EGTC shall contain the arrangements for 'the nature of personnel contracts'. The proposal provides the following options:

— apply the rules of the Member State where the EGTC has its registered office;

— apply the rules of the Member State where the EGTC's staff is actually located; or

— apply the rules of the Member State of the nationality of the staff member concerned.

To allow equal treatment, the national laws may be subject to additional ad hoc rules fixed by the EGTC itself.

(Eestikeelne versioon)

Kirjalikult vastatav küsimus E-000400/12
komisjonile (Asepresident / kõrge esindaja)
Kristiina Ojuland (ALDE), Leonidas Donskis (ALDE), Sir Graham Watson (ALDE) ja Sonia Alfano (ALDE)
(23. jaanuar 2012)

Teema: VP/HR — Sergei Magnitski juhtum

ELi ja Venemaa inimõiguste dialoog toimus 29. novembril 2011. aastal. Kahe aasta jooksul pärast seda, kui Sergei Magnitski suri Venemaal vangistuses, on Venemaa valitsus vältinud vastamist mõnele väga tähtsale küsimusele, mis puudutab Magnitski juhtumit ja surma.

1. President Medvedevile alluv inimõiguste nõukogu avaldas oma aruande Sergei Magnitski surma kohta augustis 2011. aastal. Kas komisjoni asepresident ning välisasjade ja julgeolekupoliitika kõrge esindaja on küsinud Venemaa valitsuselt, miks ei ole algatatud kriminaaluurimist seoses kuritegudega, mille valitsusametnikud sooritasid Magnitski vastu ning mis on välja toodud inimõiguste nõukogu aruandes?

2. Sergei Magnitski ema esitas kaebuse, milles on nimetatud kõrged ametnikud, prokurörid ja kohtunikud, kes olid kaasosalised Sergei Magnitski alusetus vahistamises, piinamises ja surmas. Kas komisjoni asepresident ning välisasjade ja julgeolekupoliitika kõrge esindaja on esitanud Venemaa valitsusele küsimused, miks Venemaa uurimiskomisjon ei nõustu algatama uurimist seoses nimetatud süüdistustega?

3. Sergei Magnitski surmast on möödunud peaaegu kaks aastat, kuid tema perekonnale ei ole senini antud luba tutvuda tema koeproovide ja haiguslooga. Kas komisjoni asepresident ning välisasjade ja julgeolekupoliitika kõrge esindaja on küsinud Venemaa valitsuselt, miks Venemaa uurimiskomisjon keeldub seda tegemast?

4. Kas komisjoni asepresident ning välisasjade ja julgeolekupoliitika kõrge esindaja on küsinud Venemaa valitsuselt, miks ei ole esitatud süüdistust ühelegi valitsusametnikule, kelle Sergei Magnitski tõi välja vastutavana maksutulude kõrvaldamises 230 miljoni USA dollari väärtuses ning samuti osalistena kriminaalkuritegudes?

5. Kas komisjoni asepresident ning välisasjade ja julgeolekupoliitika kõrge esindaja on esitanud Venemaa valitsusele küsimuse, miks saadeti Magnitski juhtum kaks aastat pärast tema surma uuesti uurimisele? Juhtumiga tegelevad samad uurijad, keda Magnitski süüdistas maksutulude kõrvaldamises ja tema vastu sooritatud kuritegudes. Kas komisjoni asepresident ning välisasjade ja julgeolekupoliitika kõrge esindaja on esitanud Venemaa valitsusele küsimuse, kuidas on selline olukord tohutut huvide konflikti arvestades võimalik?

Komisjoni nimel vastanud asepresidendi Ashtoni vastus
(8. märts 2012)

Euroopa välisteenistus ja komisjon on seda juhtumit väga tähelepanelikult jälginud ja seda teemat aktiivselt käsitlenud nii Brüsseli peakontoris kui ka ELi delegatsioonis Moskvas.

Sergei Magnitskiga seotud küsimusi on esitatud Venemaa ametiasutustele korduvalt, sealhulgas kõrgeimal tasemel. Viimasel korral väljendas EL president Medvedevile tõsist muret uurimise vähese tulemuslikkuse pärast 15. detsembril 2011 toimunud ELi-Venemaa tippkohtumisel. EL rõhutas, kui vajalik on, et Venemaa ametiasutused seda küsimust usaldusväärselt ja põhjalikult uuriksid.

Kõik parlamendiliikmete esitatud asjaomased küsimused tõstatati Venemaaga 29. novembril 2011 toimunud inimõigustealase konsultatsioonikohtumise viimases voorus. Venemaalt ei saadud selget vastust. Mõned nendest küsimustest on juba varem esitatud kirjalikult seoses konkreetsete juhtumite nimekirjade vahetamisega.

Venemaa on teatanud Euroopa välisteenistusele, et sellel teemal on toimunud arutelu presidendi juures tegutseva kodanikuühiskonna ja inimõiguste nõukogu ning uurimiskomisjoni vahel. ELile on ka teatatud, et uurimiskomisjon on sõlminud presidendinõukoguga ulatusliku koostöölepingu, mille kohaselt inimõiguste kaitsjad võivad jälgida kõikide tähelepanu äratanud juhtumite uurimist.

EL on väljendanud heameelt president Medvedevi nõudmisel korraldatud sõltumatu uurimise üle ja tutvunud põhjalikult selle esialgsete järeldustega. Pettumust valmistab siiski asjaolu, et seni on selle juhtumi eest määratud süüdistus üksnes kahele vanglaarstile. Mitu küsimust on seni vastuseta jäänud. EL meenutab Venemaale jätkuvalt, et ametlik uurimine tuleb lõpule viia. EL nõuab Venemaa valitsuselt tungivalt, et kõnealust juhtumit uuritaks nõuetekohaselt ja täielikult ning et õigusrikkumise eest vastutavad isikud võetaks viivitamata vastutusele.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000400/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Kristiina Ojuland (ALDE), Leonidas Donskis (ALDE), Sir Graham Watson (ALDE) e Sonia Alfano (ALDE)
(23 gennaio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Caso di Sergei Magnitsky

Il dialogo UE-Russia sui diritti umani è avvenuto il 29 novembre 2011. Nei due anni successivi alla morte di Sergei Magnitsky sotto la custodia russa, il governo russo ha evitato di rispondere ad alcune delle più importanti domande riguardanti il caso Magnitsky e la sua morte.

1. Il Consiglio dei diritti umani del presidente Medvedev ha pubblicato la propria relazione sulla morte di Sergei Magnitsky ad agosto 2011. Il Vicepresidente della Commissione/Alto Rappresentante ha chiesto al governo russo il motivo per cui non è stata aperta un'indagine penale per i crimini commessi dai funzionari statali ai danni di Magnitsky e successivamente non è stata citata nella relazione del Consiglio dei diritti umani?

2. La madre di Sergei Magnitsky ha presentato un'istanza in cui citava funzionari d'alto rango, pubblici ministeri e giudici quali complici dell'arresto arbitrario, della tortura e della morte di Sergei Magnitsky. Il Vicepresidente della Commissione/Alto Rappresentante ha chiesto al governo russo il motivo per cui la commissione d'inchiesta russa rifiuta di aprire un'inchiesta sulle accuse?

3. Dopo circa due anni dalla morte di Sergei Magnitsky, alla sua famiglia non è ancora stato accordato l'accesso ai campioni di tessuto e alle cartelle cliniche. Il Vicepresidente della Commissione/Alto Rappresentante ha chiesto al governo russo il motivo per cui la commissione d'inchiesta russa rifiuta di concedere tale accesso?

4. Il Vicepresidente della Commissione/Alto Rappresentante ha chiesto al governo russo il motivo per cui nessuno dei funzionari statali citati da Sergei Magnitsky quali responsabili per la frode fiscale di 230 milioni di USD nonché per il loro comportamento criminale, sia stato processato?

5. Il Vicepresidente della Commissione/Alto Rappresentante ha chiesto al governo russo il motivo per cui il processo contro Magnitsky sia stato riaperto a due anni dalla sua morte? Gli investigatori che si occupano di questa causa sono gli stessi funzionari indicati da Magnitsky come colpevoli di frode fiscale e di crimini contro lui stesso. Il Vicepresidente della Commissione/Alto Rappresentante ha chiesto al governo russo come sia possibile che questo sia permesso visto l'enorme conflitto di interessi?

Risposta data dall'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(8 marzo 2012)

Il servizio europeo per l'azione esterna (SEAE) e la Commissione hanno seguito attentamente questo caso e sono intervenuti attivamente sulla questione, sia a Bruxelles che nella delegazione dell'UE a Mosca.

Il caso di Sergei Magnitsky è stato più volte sollevato con le autorità russe, anche al massimo livello. Recentemente, al vertice UE-Russia del 15 dicembre 2011, l'Unione ha manifestato al presidente Medvedev viva preoccupazione per la mancanza di progressi in relazione a questo caso, sottolineando la necessità che le autorità russe svolgano indagini credibili ed esaustive.

Tutte le domande poste dagli onorevoli parlamentari su questo caso sono state sollevate nell'ultima riunione di consultazione con la Russia sui diritti umani il 29 novembre 2011, senza peraltro ottenere una risposta chiara da parte russa. Recentemente, alcune di queste domande sono state formulate anche per iscritto, nel contesto dello scambio degli elenchi di singoli casi sensibili.

La controparte russa ha informato lo SEAE sullo svolgimento di una discussione in merito tra il Consiglio presidenziale per la società civile e i diritti umani e la commissione d'inchiesta. L'UE è stata altresì informata sulla firma da parte della commissione d'inchiesta di un accordo generale di cooperazione con il Consiglio presidenziale, in base al quale, in tutti i casi di grande risonanza, i difensori dei diritti umani possono essere presenti durante le indagini.

In generale, l'UE ha accolto con favore l'indagine indipendente sul caso disposta dal presidente Medvedev, di cui ha attentamente esaminato le conclusioni preliminari. Tuttavia, resta delusa dal fatto che finora solo i due medici della prigione siano stati incriminati nel caso e molte questioni rimangono senza risposta. L'UE continua a esortare la Russia a portare a pieno compimento l'indagine ufficiale e invita il governo russo a indagare in maniera corretta ed esaustiva su questo caso al fine di assicurare i responsabili alla giustizia senza ulteriori indugi.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-000400/12
Komisijai (Komisijos pirmininko pavaduotojai-vyriausiajai įgaliotinei)
Kristiina Ojuland (ALDE), Leonidas Donskis (ALDE), Sir Graham Watson (ALDE) ir Sonia Alfano (ALDE)
(2012 m. sausio 23 d.)

Tema: VP/HR – Sergejaus Magnickio byla

2011 m. lapkričio 29 d. įvyko ES ir Rusijos dialogas žmogaus teisių klausimais. Nuo tada, kai prieš dvejus metus mirė Rusijos kalintas Sergejus Magnickis, Rusijos vyriausybė vengia atsakinėti į kai kuriuos svarbiausius klausimus dėl S. Magnickio bylos ir jo mirties.

1. 2011 m. rugpjūčio mėn. prezidento D. Medvedevo Žmogaus teisių taryba paskelbė ataskaitą dėl Sergejaus Magnickio mirties. Ar Komisijos pirmininko pavaduotoja-vyriausioji įgaliotinė paklausė Rusijos vyriausybės, kodėl nebuvo pradėtas baudžiamosios veikos tyrimas dėl nusikaltimų, kuriuos vyriausybės pareigūnai padarė prieš S. Magnickį ir kurie vėliau nurodyti Žmogaus teisių tarybos ataskaitoje?

2. Sergejaus Magnickio motina pateikė skundą, kuriame aukšto lygio pareigūnai, prokurorai ir teisėjai įvardyti kaip bendrininkai, prisidėję prie neteisėto Sergejaus Magnickio suėmimo, kankinimo ir mirties. Ar Komisijos pirmininko pavaduotoja-vyriausioji įgaliotinė paklausė Rusijos vyriausybės, kodėl Rusijos tyrimo komitetas atsisako pradėti tyrimą dėl minėtų įtarimų?

3. Praėjus beveik dvejiems metams po Sergejaus Magnickio mirties, jo šeimai vis dar nesuteikta galimybė gauti jo audinių ėminius ir susipažinti su jo sveikatos istorija. Ar Komisijos pirmininko pavaduotoja-vyriausioji įgaliotinė paklausė Rusijos vyriausybės, kodėl Rusijos tyrimo komitetas atsisako tai padaryti?

4. Ar Komisijos pirmininko pavaduotoja-vyriausioji įgaliotinė paklausė Rusijos vyriausybės, kodėl nė vienas valdžios pareigūnas, kuriuos Sergejus Magnickis įvardijo kaip atsakingus už 230 mln. USD mokesčių vagystę, taip pat už jų nusikalstamą veiklą, nepatrauktas baudžiamojon atsakomybėn?

5. Ar Komisijos pirmininko pavaduotoja-vyriausioji įgaliotinė paklausė Rusijos vyriausybės, kodėl praėjus dvejiems metams po S. Magnickio mirties jo byla pradėta nagrinėti iš naujo? Šios bylos tyrėjai yra tie patys pareigūnai, kuriuos S. Magnickis įvardijo kaip kaltus dėl mokesčių vagystės ir nusikaltimų prieš jį. Ar Komisijos pirmininko pavaduotoja-vyriausioji įgaliotinė paklausė Rusijos vyriausybės, kaip tai gali būti leidžiama, atsižvelgiant į milžinišką interesų konfliktą?

Sąjungos vyriausiosios įgaliotinės ir Komisijos pirmininko pavaduotojos Catherine Ashton atsakymas
Komisijos vardu
(2012 m. kovo 8 d.)

Europos išorės veiksmų tarnyba (EIVT) ir Komisija labai atidžiai stebėjo šią bylą ir aktyviai ja domėjosi tiek savo būstinėje Briuselyje, tiek ES delegacijoje Maskvoje.

Sergejaus Magnickio bylos klausimas Rusijos valdžios institucijoms buvo keliamas ne kartą, taip pat ir aukščiausiu lygmeniu. Pastarąjį kartą rimtas ES susirūpinimas dėl to, kad minėtoje byloje nedaroma pažangos, prezidentui D. Medvedevui pareikštas 2011 m. gruodžio 15 d. ES ir Rusijos aukščiausiojo lygio susitikime, pabrėžiant būtinybę, kad Rusijos valdžios institucijos vykdytų patikimą ir išsamų šio klausimo tyrimą.

Visi susiję klausimai, kuriuos pateikė gerbiamieji nariai, iškelti per pastarąjį konsultacijų žmogaus teisių klausimais su Rusija raundą 2011 m. lapkričio 29 d., tačiau Rusijos atstovai nepateikė aiškaus atsakymo. Be to, neseniai kai kurie minėti klausimai pateikti raštu, pasikeičiant atskirų susirūpinimą keliančių atvejų sąrašais.

Rusijos atstovai informavo EIVT, kad šį klausimą svarstė Prezidentinė taryba pilietinės visuomenės ir žmogaus teisių klausimais ir tyrimo komitetas. ES taip pat buvo informuota, kad tyrimo komitetas pasirašė plataus bendradarbiavimo susitarimą su Prezidentine taryba, kuriuo remiantis visų didelio atgarsio susilaukusių bylų tyrimo procese galės dalyvauti žmogaus teisių gynėjai.

ES teigiamai įvertino prezidento D. Medvedevo įsakymu atliktą nepriklausomą tyrimą ir atidžiai susipažino su preliminariomis išvadomis. Tačiau nusivylimą vis dar kelia tai, kad kol kas šioje byloje kaltinimai pateikti tik dviem kalėjimo gydytojams ir tebėra daug spręstinų klausimų. ES toliau ragina Rusiją visiškai užbaigti oficialų tyrimą. ES ir toliau ragins Rusijos vyriausybę tinkamai iki galo ištirti šią bylą ir nedelsiant perduoti teismui už nusikaltimus atsakingus asmenis.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000400/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Kristiina Ojuland (ALDE), Leonidas Donskis (ALDE), Sir Graham Watson (ALDE) and Sonia Alfano (ALDE)
(23 January 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Sergei Magnitsky case

The EU-Russia Human Rights Dialogue took place on 29 November 2011. In the two years since Sergei Magnitsky died in Russian custody, the Russian Government has avoided answering some of the most important questions regarding the Magnitsky case and his death.

1. President Medvedev's Human Rights Council published its report into the death of Sergei Magnitsky in August 2011. Has the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative asked the Russian Government why no criminal investigation has been opened into the crimes committed by government officials against Magnitsky and subsequently named in the Human Rights Council Report?

2. Sergei Magnitsky's mother filed a petition which named high level officials, prosecutors and judges as complicit in the false arrest, torture and death of Sergei Magnitsky. Has the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative asked the Russian Government why the Russian Investigative Committee is refusing to open an inquiry into the allegations?

3. Nearly two years after his death, Sergei Magnitsky's family is still not being granted access to his tissue samples and medical records. Has the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative asked the Russian Government why the Russian Investigative Committee is refusing to do so?

4. Has the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative asked the Russian Government why none of the government officials named by Sergei Magnitsky as being responsible for the theft of USD 230 million of taxes as well as their criminal conduct, have been prosecuted?

5. Has the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative asked the Russian Government why the case against Magnitsky has been reopened two years after his death? The investigators looking into this case are the same officials named by Magnitsky as guilty of committing the tax theft and of crimes against him. Has the VP/HR asked the Russian Government how it is possible that this is allowed given the massive conflict of interest?

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

The European External Action Service (EEAS) and the Commission have been following this case very closely, and have actively pursued this issue, both here at headquarters in Brussels as well as in the EU Delegation in Moscow.

The case of Sergei Magnitsky has been raised with the Russian authorities many times, including at the highest level. Most recently the EU has expressed its serious concerns with regard to lack of progress in this case to President Medvedev at the EU-Russia Summit on 15 December 2011, stressing the necessity of a credible and comprehensive investigation by the Russian authorities into this matter.

All the pertinent questions raised by the Honourable Members have been raised during the last round of the human rights consultations with Russia on 29 November 2011, with no clear response from the Russian side. Some of these questions were also asked in written in the recent past, as part of the exchange of lists of individual cases of concern.

The Russian side has informed the EEAS that discussions on this issue were taking place between the Presidential Council for Civil Society and Human Rights and the investigative committee. The EU has also been informed that the investigative committee has signed a broad cooperation agreement with the Presidential Council, whereby for all high profile cases, human rights defenders would be able to be present during the investigation of such cases.

Overall, the EU has welcomed the independent examination of the case ordered by President Medvedev and looked closely at the preliminary conclusions. However, it remains disappointing that only two prison doctors have so far been charged in this case, and many questions remain to be addressed. The EU keeps calling on Russia to bring the official investigation to a full conclusion. The EU will continue urging the Russian Government to investigate this case properly and fully and bringing those responsible for wrongdoings to justice with no further delay.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000419/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(23 de enero de 2012)

Asunto: Pruebas de control del límite máximo de residuos (LMR)

El 31 de octubre de 2011 se formuló por escrito una pregunta parlamentaria a la Comisión (E-009846/2011) sobre la necesidad de adoptar medidas y controles para que las avellanas turcas importadas en los países de la Unión Europea, respeten la normativa fitosanitaria comunitaria en la fase de producción.

En la respuesta a la Comisión, de fecha 22 de noviembre de 2011, se reconoce, en lo referente al uso de productos fitosanitarios, que los productores de terceros países únicamente tienen la obligación de cumplir las normas y los procedimientos que autorizan el uso de productos fitosanitarios en sus propios países. Y respecto a las importaciones, la Comisión señala que las avellanas de terceros países deben respetar los límites máximos de residuos establecidos/impuestos en el Reglamento (CE) n° 396/2005.

Se ha de tener en cuenta la importancia que tiene para algunas regiones europeas y, en especial, para Catalunya, donde, del total de la producción avellanera española, se concentra prácticamente en dicha región el 95 % de la superficie total y el 90 % de la producción total.

1. Puede indicar la Comisión ¿cuál ha sido el número total de envíos comerciales de avellana de Turquía que han tenido como destino final el territorio de la Unión durante los ejercicios 2009 y 2010?

2. Puede indicar la Comisión ¿cuál ha sido el número total de estos envíos que se ha sometido a pruebas de control del límite máximo de residuos (LMR) para verificar la ausencia de plaguicidas prohibidos en la UE habida cuenta que dicho país permite la utilización de insecticidas prohibidos por la UE?

3. Puede indicar la Comisión ¿por cuántos puntos de entrada al territorio de la Unión puede acceder la mercancía «avellana procedente de Turquía» y si todos ellos cuentan con mecanismos para la verificación de los LMR establecidos/impuestos en el Reglamento (CE) n° 396/2005?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000420/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(24 de enero de 2012)

Asunto: Fitosanitarios

El 31 de octubre de 2011 se formuló por escrito una pregunta parlamentaria a la Comisión (E-009846/2011) sobre la necesidad de adoptar medidas y controles para que las avellanas turcas importadas en los países de la Unión Europea respeten la normativa fitosanitaria comunitaria en la fase de producción.

En la respuesta a la Comisión, de fecha 22 de noviembre de 2011, se reconoce, en lo referente al uso de productos fitosanitarios, que los productores de terceros países únicamente tienen la obligación de cumplir las normas y los procedimientos que autorizan el uso de productos fitosanitarios en sus propios países. Y respecto a las importaciones, la Comisión señala que las avellanas de terceros países deben respetar los límites máximos de residuos establecidos/impuestos en el Reglamento (CE) n° 396/2005.

Se entiende, pues, por el Parlamento, que un instrumento esencial para asegurar una libre competencia entre los productores comunitarios y los productores de terceros países es la fijación del límite máximo de residuos (LMR) de plaguicidas acorde con la legislación europea que también resulta de aplicación a los productores europeos.

1. ¿Puede indicar la Comisión cuántos controles sobre el LMR se han realizado en los distintos puntos de entrada de avellana de Turquía en el territorio de la Unión durante los años 2009 y 2010?

3. ¿Puede indicar la Comisión en cuántos de estos controles los resultados de los mismos han revelado presencia de Carbaril, Metidation, Azinfos Metil, productos insecticidas prohibidos a los productores europeos y autorizados en Turquía?

Respuesta conjunta del Sr. Dalli en nombre de la Comisión
(28 de febrero de 2012)

1. La UE importó 83 952 toneladas de avellanas de Turquía en 2009 y 95 250 toneladas en 2010. La Comisión no dispone de datos relativos al número de envíos.

2. De conformidad con el artículo 30 del Reglamento n° 396/2005 ([1]), los Estados miembros deben establecer programas nacionales de control plurianuales para los residuos de plaguicidas. Corresponde a los Estados miembros decidir sobre los productos que tienen que muestrearse. En 2009, se analizaron 14 muestras de avellanas originarias de Turquía en busca de 635 plaguicidas; en 2010, se analizaron 14 muestras más de avellanas originarias de Turquía en busca de 355 plaguicidas. En ninguna de estas muestras se detectaron niveles por encima del límite de cuantificación analítica. Entre los plaguicidas buscados figuraban sustancias prohibidas en la UE como el carbaril, el metidatión y el azinfós-metilo.

3. El Reglamento n° 1152/2009 de la Comisión ([2]) establece que las avellanas originarias de Turquía pueden importarse solamente a través de puntos de importación designados. Los Estados miembros deben mantener y publicar una lista actualizada de los puntos de importación designados. La lista completa de dichos puntos de importación está disponible en el Anexo V del «Documento de orientación para las autoridades competentes en materia de control del cumplimiento de la legislación de la UE sobre aflatoxinas» ([3]). Se considera que los mismos puntos de importación designados que tienen instalaciones para muestrear las avellanas en busca de aflatoxinas, también pueden llevar a cabo muestras para detectar la presencia de residuos de plaguicidas.

([1]) DO L 70 de 16.3.2005.
([2]) Reglamento (CE) n° 1152/2009 de la Comisión, de 27 de noviembre de 2009, por el que se establecen condiciones específicas para la importación de determinados productos alimenticios de algunos terceros países debido al riesgo de contaminación de dichos productos por aflatoxinas y se deroga la Decisión 2006/504/CE (DO L 313 de 28.11.2009, p. 40).
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/chemicalsafety/contaminants/guidance-2010_es.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000419/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(23 January 2012)

Subject: Control tests of the maximum residues levels (MRL)

On 31 October 2011, a written parliamentary question to the Commission was tabled (E-009846/2011) regarding the need to adopt measures and controls to ensure that Turkish hazelnuts imported into European Union countries conform to Community plant protection rules during the production phase.

The Commission's answer, dated 22 November 2011, recognises, with regard to the use of plant protection products, that producers in non-EU countries are only obliged to comply with the rules and procedures authorising the use of plant protection products in their own country. With regard to imports, the Commission points out that hazelnuts from non-EU countries must respect the maximum residue levels established/imposed by Regulation (EC) No 396/2005.

Account must be taken of the importance of this for certain EU regions, and especially Catalonia, where virtually 95% of the total growing area for hazelnuts in Spain and 90% of total Spanish production is concentrated.

1. Can the Commission say how many commercial shipments of hazelnuts from Turkey, with a final destination in the European Union's territory, were made (in total) during the financial years 2009 and 2010?

2. Can the Commission say how many in total of these shipments were tested for maximum residue levels (MRL) to verify the absence of pesticides that are banned in the EU, given that Turkey allows the use of insecticides prohibited by the EU?

3. Can the Commission say how many points of entry to European Union territory are accessible to freight labelled as 'hazelnuts from Turkey' and whether all of these have mechanisms for MRL verification, as established/imposed in Regulation (EC) No 396/2005?

Question for written answer E-000420/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(24 January 2012)

Subject: Plant protection products

On 31 October 2011, a written parliamentary question was submitted to the Commission (E-009846/2011) regarding the need to adopt measures and controls to ensure that Turkish hazelnuts imported into European Union countries comply with Community phytosanitary legislation during the production phase.

The Commission's answer, dated 22 November 2011, recognises, with regard to the use of plant protection products, that growers outside the EU only have to comply with the rules and procedures authorising the use of plant protection products in their own country. With regard to imports, the Commission points out that hazelnuts from countries outside the EU must respect the maximum residue levels established/imposed in Regulation (EC) No 396/2005.

Parliament, therefore, accepts that an essential instrument for ensuring free competition between Community growers and growers outside the EU is the fixing of the maximum residue level (MRL) for pesticides at a level that is in line with the European legislation that is also applicable to European growers.

1. Can the Commission indicate how many MRL controls were carried out in 2009 and 2010 at the different points at which hazelnuts from Turkey enter European Union territory?

2. Can the Commission indicate how many of these controls revealed the presence of Carbaryl, Methidathion or Azinphos-methyl, insecticides that are banned for European growers but authorised in Turkey?

Joint answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(28 February 2012)

1. The EU imported 83 952 tonnes of Turkish hazelnuts in 2009 and 95 250 tonnes in 2010. The Commission is not in the possession of data related to the number of consignments.

2. According to Article 30 of Regulation (EC) No 396/2005 ([1]), Member States shall establish Multiannual National Control Programmes for pesticide residues. It is up to the Member States to decide on the commodities to be sampled. In 2009, 14 hazelnut samples from Turkey were analysed for 635 pesticides; in 2010 another 14 hazelnut samples from Turkey were analysed for 355 pesticides. None of them were found with levels above the limit of analytical quantification. Carbaryl, Methidiathion and Azinphos Methyl, substances which are banned in the EU, were among the pesticides sought.

3. Commission Regulation (EC) No 1152/2009 ([2]) provides that hazelnuts from Turkey can only be imported through designated points of import. The Member States have to maintain and make publicly available the list of designated points of import. The complete list of designated points of imports is available in Annex V of the 'Guidance document for competent authorities for the control of compliance with EU legislation on aflatoxins' ([3]) The same designated points of import that have facilities to sample hazelnuts for aflatoxins are considered to be in a position to sample for pesticide residues.

([1]) OJ L 70, 16.3.2005.
([2]) Commission Regulation (EC) No 1152/2009 of 27 November 2009 imposing special conditions governing the import of certain foodstuffs from certain third countries due to contamination risk by aflatoxins and repealing Decision 2006/504/EC (OJ L 313, 28.11.2009, p. 40).
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/chemicalsafety/contaminants/guidance-2010.pdf

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000421/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(24 de enero de 2012)

Asunto: Sistema basado en la superficie de producción

El 31 de octubre de 2011 se formuló por escrito una pregunta parlamentaria a la Comisión (E-009846/2011) sobre la necesidad de adoptar medidas y controles para que las avellanas turcas importadas en los países de la Unión Europea respeten la normativa fitosanitaria comunitaria en la fase de producción.

En respuesta a la pregunta E-009846/2011, la Comisión Europea dijo que las ayudas al sector de las avellanas en Turquía pasaron en 2009 de un sistema de apoyo a los precios a un sistema basado en la superficie de producción que finalizará el 31 de diciembre de 2011. Las autoridades turcas todavía no han informado a la Comisión de la posible sustitución de dicho sistema por otro, pero la Comisión seguirá supervisando el marco reglamentario turco.

A la luz de lo anterior y teniendo en cuenta el acuerdo comercial bilateral entre Turquía y la UE sobre productos agrícolas (Decisión 2/2006 del Consejo de asociación CE-Turquía de 17 de octubre de 2006), en el cual Turquía se beneficia de una preferencia arancelaria reducida para las avellanas, que pueden ser exportadas con un derecho *ad valorem* del 3 % en vez del 3,2 %,

¿Puede indicar la Comisión si las autoridades turcas la han informado de la posible sustitución de dicho sistema, que la Comisión dice seguir supervisando?

Respuesta provisional del Sr. Cioloş en nombre de la Comisión
(24 de febrero de 2012)

Las autoridades turcas aún no han informado a la Comisión acerca del posible régimen sucesor de apoyo a su sector de las avellanas. La Comisión está investigando este asunto y proporcionará más información a Su Señoría lo antes posible.

Respuesta complementaria del Sr. Cioloş en nombre de la Comisión
(30 de marzo de 2012)

La Comisión no está al corriente de la aplicación por las autoridades turcas de un nuevo régimen de ayudas a su sector de las avellanas tras el final de las ayudas por superficie en el período 2009-2011. La Comisión va a examinar el asunto y facilitará más información pertinente a Su Señoría cuando la consiga.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000421/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(24 January 2012)

Subject: System based on production area

On 31 October 2011, a written parliamentary question was submitted to the Commission (E-009846/2011) regarding the need to adopt measures and controls to ensure that Turkish hazelnuts imported into European Union countries comply with Community phytosanitary legislation during the production phase.

In reply to Question E-009846/2011, the Commission said that support to the hazelnuts sector in Turkey moved, in 2009, from a price support system to a system based on the production area, which will end on 31 December 2011. The Turkish authorities have not yet informed the Commission about any possible successor scheme, but the Commission will continue to monitor the Turkish regulatory framework.

In light of the above, and taking into account the bilateral trade agreement between Turkey and the EU on agricultural products (Decision 2/2006 of the EC-Turkey Association Council of 17 October 2006), by which Turkey benefits from a reduced tariff preference on hazelnuts, which can be exported with an *ad valorem* duty of 3% instead of 3.2%:

Can the Commission say whether the Turkish authorities have informed it about the possible successor scheme, which the Commission says it is continuing to monitor?

Preliminary answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(24 February 2012)

The Turkish authorities have not yet informed the Commission about the possible successor scheme to support their hazelnuts sector. The Commission is investigating this issue and will provide further information to the Honourable Member as soon as possible.

Supplementary answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(30 March 2012)

The Commission is not informed that the Turkish authorities have implemented a successor scheme to support their hazelnuts sector after the end of the 2009-2011 area-based support. The Commission is monitoring the issue and will provide further relevant information to the Honourable Member when available.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000426/12
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(23. Januar 2012)

Betrifft: Resistente Keime in Hühnerfleisch

Stichproben in deutschen Supermärkten ergaben, dass das dort verkaufte Hühnerfleisch oft antibiotikaresistente Keime enthält, die auch für den Menschen schädlich sein können. Der massive Einsatz von Antibiotika in der Tiermast kann dazu führen, dass Medikamente (z. B. Penicillin) bei Menschen, die resistente Keime über die Nahrung aufnehmen, nicht mehr wirken. Theoretisch sollen Tieren nur bei akuten Krankheiten Antibiotika verabreicht werden. Studien in Nordrhein-Westfalen haben jedoch ergeben, dass Antibiotika oft illegal zur Wachstumsförderung eingesetzt werden.

1. Wie ist die EU-Rechtslage zur Verabreichung von Antibiotika in der Tiermast?

2. In welchem Umfang wird auf EU-Ebene zusammengearbeitet, um zu verhindern, dass illegal mit Antibiotika behandelte Tiere bzw. Hühnerfleisch von einem EU-Land in ein anderes verschoben werden, um Kontrollen zu entgehen?

Antwort von Herrn Dalli im Namen der Kommission
(22. Februar 2012)

Die Verwendung von Antibiotika zur Wachstumsförderung wurde 2006 in der EU verboten. Deshalb dürfen Antibiotika in der EU nur nach Verschreibung durch einen Tierarzt zur Behandlung oder Vorbeugung von Krankheiten an Tiere verabreicht werden. Die EU-Vorschriften über Medizinalfutter und Tierarzneimittel werden derzeit überarbeitet. Wie im Aktionsplan zur Abwehr der steigenden Gefahr der Antibiotikaresistenz ([1]) angekündigt, beabsichtigt die Kommission, sich des Themas des Antibiotikamissbrauchs und der Antibiotikaresistenz anzunehmen.

In der Richtlinie 96/23/EG ([2]) über Kontrollmaßnahmen hinsichtlich bestimmter Stoffe und ihrer Rückstände in lebenden Tieren und tierischen Erzeugnissen sind Maßnahmen zur amtlichen Kontrolle zwecks Aufdeckung rechtswidriger Behandlung festgelegt. In Fällen, in denen sich bei den Kontrollen die Notwendigkeit einer Ermittlung in einem oder mehreren der Mitgliedstaaten erweist, trifft die zuständige Behörde dieser Mitgliedstaaten alle erforderlichen Maßnahmen gemäß der Richtlinie 89/608/EWG ([3]) betreffend die gegenseitige Unterstützung der Verwaltungsbehörden der Mitgliedstaaten und die Zusammenarbeit dieser Behörden mit der Kommission, um die ordnungsgemäße Anwendung der tierärztlichen und tierzuchtrechtlichen Vorschriften zu gewährleisten. Ein wichtiger Bestandteil der Inspektionen durch die Kommission ist die Prüfung, ob die Maßnahmen der Mitgliedstaaten zur Kontrolle auf rechtswidrige Behandlung ordnungsgemäß durchgeführt werden.

([1]) KOM(2011)748 endg. vom 15.11.2011.
([2]) ABl. L 125 vom 23.5.1996.
([3]) ABl. L 351 vom 2.12.1989.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000426/12
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(23 January 2012)

Subject: Resistant bacteria in chicken

Spot checks carried out in German supermarkets have shown that the chicken sold there often contains antibiotic-resistant bacteria that can also damage human health. The widespread use of antibiotics in animal feed can mean that some medicines (such as penicillin) no longer have any effect on people who consume resistant bacteria in their food. In theory, antibiotics should only be administered to animals with acute illnesses. Studies in North-Rhine-Westphalia have shown, however, that antibiotics are often illegally used as growth promoters.

1. What is the legal position in the EU with regard to the administration of doses of antibiotics in animal feed?

2. How much cooperation is taking place at EU level to prevent meat from animals, including chickens, that have been illegally treated with antibiotics from being moved from one EU Member State to another to avoid inspections?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(22 February 2012)

In 2006 the EU prohibited the use of antimicrobial growth promoters in feed. Thus, antibiotics can only be administered in the EU upon prescription of a veterinarian for treating or preventing disease in animals. The EU legislation on medicated feed and veterinary medicinal products is currently under review, and as announced in the action plan on Antimicrobial Resistance ([1]), the Commission intends to address the issues of misuse of antibiotics and antimicrobial resistance.

Directive 96/23/EC ([2]) on measures to monitor certain substances, including veterinary medicinal products and residues thereof, in live animals and animal products lays down official control measures regarding illegal treatment. In cases where controls demonstrate the need for an investigation in one or more other Member States, the competent authority of those Member States shall take all necessary measures in accordance with Directive 89/608/EEC ([3]) on mutual assistance between the administrative authorities of the Member States and the cooperation between the latter and the Commission to ensure the correct application of the legislation on veterinary and zootechnical matters. The proper implementation of the Member States' control measures regarding illegal treatment is an important element of the inspections performed by the Commission.

([1]) COM(2011) 748 final of 15.11.2011.
([2]) OJ L 125, 23.5.1996.
([3]) OJ L 351, 2.12.1989.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-000477/12
Tarybai
Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D)
(2012 m. sausio 24 d.)

Tema: EP vaidmens užtikrinimas, priimant ir įgyvendinant ekonominės ir pinigų sąjungos stabilumo, koordinavimo ir valdysenos sutartį

Per 2011 m. gruodžio 9 d. susitikimą Europos Vadovų Taryba sutarė dėl ekonominės ir pinigų sąjungos sustiprinimo ir atskiro sutarties teksto, kuris būtų paremtas Europos Sąjungos sutartimis ir galiotų tik euro zonos šalims, parengimo.

Toks sutarties dėl ekonominės ir pinigų sąjungos stabilumo, koordinavimo ir valdysenos tekstas buvo parengtas ir pastarąjį mėnesį dėl jo vyko intensyvios derybos.

Ar Taryba mano, kad Europos Parlamentas buvo pakankamai įtrauktas į šių derybų eigą ir jo pozicija bus pakankamai atspindėta galutiniame šios sutarties tekste?

Kaip Taryba ruošiasi užtikrinti, kad Europos Parlamento galios ir vaidmuo būtų tinkamai įgyvendinami ateityje priimant sprendimus dėl ekonominės ir pinigų sąjungos valdysenos?

Atsakymas
(2012 m. balandžio 12 d.)

2012 m. kovo 2 d. valstybių ar vyriausybių vadovai pasirašė Sutartį dėl stabilumo, koordinavimo ir valdysenos ekonominėje ir pinigų sąjungoje. Europos Parlamento paskirti atstovai (E. Brok, G. Verhofstadt ir R. Gualtieri) dalyvavo derybose dėl sutarties, kurios vyko 2011 m. gruodžio mėn.–2012 m. sausio mėn. Sutarties 16 straipsnyje numatyta, kad ne vėliau kaip per penkerius metus nuo jos įsigaliojimo dienos turi būti imamasi būtinų priemonių, kad jos esminės nuostatos būtų įtrauktos į ES teisinę sistemą.

Taryba tebėra įsipareigojusi tinkamai propaguoti Europos Parlamento vaidmenį ES ekonominės politikos srityje, laikantis Sutarties dėl ES veikimo (SESV) nuostatų. SESV 121 straipsnyje nustatyta, kad Europos Parlamentui turi būti pranešta apie Tarybos rekomendaciją, kuria išdėstomos valstybių narių ir Sąjungos ekonominės politikos bendros gairės. Vadovaujantis ta pačia sutarties nuostata Tarybos pirmininkas turi Europos Parlamentui pranešti apie daugiašalės priežiūros rezultatus.

Be to, bendradarbiaudama su kitomis ES institucijomis, Taryba jau pradėjo įgyvendinti geresnį ekonominės politikos koordinavimą, numatytą šešių teisėkūros procedūra priimtų aktų rinkinyje, priimtame 2011 m. pabaigoje ([1]).

([1]) — 2011 m. lapkričio 16 d. Europos Parlamento ir Tarybos reglamentas (ES) Nr. 1173/2011 dėl veiksmingo biudžeto priežiūros vykdymo užtikrinimo euro zonoje; .
— 2011 m. lapkričio 16 d. Europos Parlamento ir Tarybos reglamentas (ES) Nr. 1174/2011 dėl vykdymo užtikrinimo priemonių, skirtų perviršiniams makroekonominiams disbalansams naikinti euro zonoje;.
— 2011 m. lapkričio 16 d. Europos Parlamento ir Tarybos reglamentas (ES) Nr. 1175/2011, kuriuo iš dalies keičiamas Tarybos reglamentas (EB) Nr. 1466/97 dėl biudžeto būklės priežiūros stiprinimo ir ekonominės politikos priežiūros bei koordinavimo;.
— 2011 m. lapkričio 16 d. Europos Parlamento ir Tarybos reglamentas (ES) Nr. 1176/2011 dėl makroekonominių disbalansų prevencijos ir naikinimo;.
— 2011 m. lapkričio 8 d. Tarybos reglamentas (ES) Nr. 1177/2011, kuriuo iš dalies keičiamas Reglamentas (EB) Nr. 1467/97 dėl perviršinio deficito procedūros įgyvendinimo paspartinimo ir paaiškinimo; ir.
— 2011 m. lapkričio 8 d. Tarybos direktyva 2011/85/ES dėl reikalavimų valstybių narių biudžeto sistemoms (OL L 306, 2011 11 23).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000477/12
to the Council
Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D)
(24 January 2012)

Subject: Ensuring the European Parliament's role in adopting and implementing the Treaty on stability, coordination and governance in the Economic and Monetary Union

During its meeting on 9 December 2011, the European Council adopted measures to strengthen the Economic and Monetary Union and agreed to the drafting of a separate Treaty text based on the Treaty on European Union which would be applicable solely to the countries of the euro area.

This Treaty on stability, coordination and governance in the Economic and Monetary Union has now been drafted and was subject last month to intensive negotiations.

Does the Council consider that the European Parliament was sufficiently involved in those negotiations, and will its position be adequately reflected in the final text of this Treaty?

How is the Council going to ensure that the European Parliament's powers and role are duly put into effect in future when decisions are adopted on governance in the Economic and Monetary Union?

Reply
(12 April 2012)

Heads of State or Government signed the Treaty on stability, coordination and governance in the Economic and Monetary Union on March 2nd 2012. The designated representatives of the European Parliament (Mr Brok, Mr Verhofstadt and Mr Gualtieri) participated in the negotiations of the Treaty which took place between December 2011 and January 2012. Article 16 of the Treaty provides for the necessary steps to be taken with the aim of incorporating its substance into the EU legal framework within at most five years of its entry into force.

The Council remains committed to duly promoting the role of the European Parliament in the area of EU economic policy in line with the provisions of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU (TFEU). Article 121 TFEU stipulates that the European Parliament must be informed of a Council recommendation setting out the broad guidelines of the economic policies of the Member States and of the Union. Pursuant to the same treaty provision, the President of the Council must report to the European Parliament on the results of multilateral surveillance.

Moreover, the Council has already begun, in cooperation with the other EU institutions, to implement the improved economic policy coordination provided for in the package of six legislative measures adopted towards the end of 2011 ([1]).

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 1173/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 November 2011 on the effective enforcement of budgetary surveillance in the euro area;
Regulation (EU) No 1174/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 November 2011 on enforcement measures to correct excessive macroeconomic imbalances in the euro area;
Regulation (EU) No 1175/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 November 2011 amending Council Regulation (EC) No 1466/97 on the strengthening of the surveillance of budgetary positions and the surveillance and coordination of economic policies;
Regulation (EU) No 1176/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 November 2011 on the prevention and correction of macroeconomic imbalances;
Council Regulation (EU) No 1177/2011 of 8 November 2011 amending Regulation (EC) No 1467/97 on speeding up and clarifying the implementation of the excessive deficit procedure; and
Council Directive 2011/85/EU of 8 November 2011 on requirements for budgetary frameworks of the Member States (OJ L 306, 23 November 2011).

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-000478/12
till kommissionen
Olle Schmidt (ALDE)
(24 januari 2012)

Angående: Fördjupad diskussion om ett europeiskt förbud mot khat efter ett nederländskt initiativ

Den 10 januari 2012 lade Nederländernas regering fram ett förslag inför det nederländska parlamentet om att kriminalisera den amfetaminliknande drogen khat. Nederländerna har genom detta tagit ett första steg mot att införa ett förbud mot khat. Storbritannien skulle därmed bli det enda EU-land som ännu inte klassat khat som narkotika.

Jag har vid flera tillfällen påtalat värdet av en harmonisering mellan EU:s medlemsländer när det gäller synen på khat. En harmonisering vore värdefull för att stoppa flödet av khat till exempelvis Sverige.

Kommissionen har genom kommissionsledamot Viviane Reding hänvisat till subsidiaritetsprincipen och att medlemsstaterna själva beslutar om sin narkotikapolitik.

Samtidigt har EU en gemensam narkotikastrategi och enligt kommissionens egen hemsida har de 27 medlemsländerna enats om att nära samarbeta om att ”förebygga narkotikarelaterad brottslighet och narkotikahandel”.

Khatsmugglingen från Storbritannien vidare till exempelvis Sverige är brottslig i sig, men ger också upphov till annan brottslighet. Denna smuggling skulle kunna hindras genom att den lagliga inkörsporten till brittiska flygplatser stroppades. Vore det inte i EU:s intresse och i linje med de ambitioner kommissionen satt upp för det narkotikapolitiska området att aktivt arbeta för att påverka Storbritannien att ändra landets lagstiftning när det gäller khat?

Svar från Viviane Reding på kommissionens vägnar
(22 februari 2012)

Kommissionen hänvisar parlamentsledamoten till sitt svar på de skriftliga frågorna E-011377/2011 och E-012250/2011 ([1]), i vilket den förklarar situationen i fråga om drogen khat.

Enligt subsidiaritets- och proportionalitetsprincipen kan kommissionen vidta åtgärder på EU-nivå endast om vissa villkor är uppfyllda. Dessa villkor, som föreskrivs i rådets beslut 2005/387/RIF om nya psykoaktiva ämnen ([2]), uppfylls inte när det gäller khat. Detta är således ett problem som ska lösas av de berörda medlemsstaterna, som kan använda sin nationella lagstiftning för att få den aktuella drogen under kontroll.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2011-011377&language=EN.
([2]) Rådets beslut 2005/387/RIF av den 10 maj 2005 om informationsutbyte, riskbedömning och kontroll avseende nya psykoaktiva ämnen, EUT L 127, 20.5.2005, s. 32.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000478/12
to the Commission
Olle Schmidt (ALDE)
(24 January 2012)

Subject: In-depth discussion about a European ban on khat following a Dutch initiative

On 10 January 2012 the government of the Netherlands put forward a proposal to the Dutch parliament with a view to criminalising the amphetamine-like narcotic drug khat. In doing so, the Netherlands has taken a first step towards imposing a ban on khat. The United Kingdom would thus be the only EU country that has not yet classified khat as a narcotic.

I have called attention on several occasions to the value of harmonisation between EU Member States in their approach to khat, with a view to stemming the flow of khat to the Swedish market among others.

In response the Commission has, through Commissioner Viviane Reding, referred to the subsidiarity principle and to the fact that Member States determine their own narcotics policies.

At the same time, the EU does have a common narcotics strategy and, according to the Commission's own website, the 27 Member State have agreed to close collaboration with a view to fighting narcotics-related crime and drugs trafficking.

The smuggling of khat on from the UK to, for example, Sweden, is not only a crime in itself, but also gives rise to other crimes. This could be prevented by stopping the legal gateway to British airports. Would it not be in the interest of the EU and in line with the ambitions set out by the Commission on the subject of narcotics policy, to work actively towards influencing the legislators of the UK and other countries to amend their laws?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(22 February 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Questions E-011377/2011 and E-012250/2011 ([1]), which explained the situation with khat.

In accordance with the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality, the Commission can take action at the EU level only if certain conditions are met. However, these conditions, set out under the Council Decision 2005/387/JHA on new psychoactive substances ([2]), are not met for khat. This issue remains solely a matter for the Member States concerned, which can use national legislation for placing the substance under control.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2011-011377&language=EN.
([2]) Council Decision 2005/387/JHA of 10 May 2005 on the information exchange, risk-assessment and control of new psychoactive substances, OJ L 127, 20.5.2005, pp 32-37.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000497/12
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(25 de enero de 2012)

Asunto: Lamentable situación carcelaria en varios Estados miembros de la Unión Europea: violación de derechos básicos en las cárceles europeas

Tal y como han evidenciado una serie de reportajes en diversos medios de comunicación, la situación actual en las cárceles de muchos Estados miembros de la Unión Europea, como la República Checa, Polonia, España, Holanda o Bélgica, es alarmante y se caracteriza por el hacinamiento, la saturación, la falta de regulación laboral del trabajo de los internos, el difícil acceso a los servicios sanitarios básicos en las cárceles o la insuficiencia e ineficacia de los servicios de psicología y rehabilitación.

Así, en la República Checa existen 8 000 presos más de la capacidad de las prisiones checas; en Polonia hay 83 000 reclusos cuando existen solo 60 000 plazas; en España las cárceles están desbordadas, y 20 de ellas presentan una ocupación cercana al 200 % de su capacidad y con peores perspectivas, al ser Grecia el único país que tiene un incremento mayor que España en reclusos nuevos; el Estado belga, encubriendo el fracaso de la política penitenciaria y al hacinamiento actual, está «exportando» presos a Holanda, que ha visto en este acuerdo la manera de evitar el cierre de varios centros de penales y el desempleo de cientos de funcionarios de prisiones inútiles por el descenso progresivo de internos los últimos años.

Es necesario tener en cuenta que este hacinamiento conlleva en la mayoría de los casos el deterioro e incluso la violación de los derechos humanos más básicos de las personas privadas de libertad recluidas en condiciones humanamente inaceptables.

Por otro lado, en todos los Estados miembros de la Unión Europea, un alto porcentaje de las personas encarceladas son migrantes extranjeros hecho que, junto a la actual tendencia comunitaria de criminalización de las personas que carecen de permiso de residencia, demuestra que la actual política migratoria y, sobre todo, de integración de la Unión Europea y sus Estados miembros ha fracasado por completo. Ante la gravedad de la situación detallada en las cárceles, a la que hay que sumar la lamentable realidad de los «Centros de Internamiento de Extranjeros» donde se priva de su libertad a las personas sin permiso de residencia en peores condiciones de vida que en éstas,

¿Con qué instrumentos y/o mecanismos cuenta la Comisión para garantizar y controlar el cumplimiento de los derechos humanos en las cárceles en territorio europeo? ¿Piensa aplicar la Comisión medidas para mejorar las lamentables condiciones a las que son condenadas las personas privadas de libertad? ¿Piensa la Comisión regular unos estándares comunitarios mínimos de vida en las cárceles y CIE que garanticen y aseguren el respeto de los derechos más básicos de los recluidos?

Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión
(16 de febrero de 2012)

La Comisión publicó el Libro Verde «*Reforzar la confianza mutua en el espacio judicial europeo — Libro Verde relativo a la aplicación de la legislación de justicia penal de la UE en el ámbito de la detención*» ([1]) en junio de 2011, como parte de un plan de trabajo destinado a reforzar los derechos procesales de los sospechosos o acusados en los procesos penales. El objetivo era lograr unas normas mínimas a escala de la UE y estudiar el grado en que las cuestiones relacionadas con la detención afectan a la confianza recíproca entre los sistemas judiciales y, en consecuencia, al reconocimiento mutuo y a la cooperación judicial en términos amplios en la Unión Europea.

La Comisión, que ha recibido muchas respuestas de los Estados miembros y de otras partes interesadas, analizará cuidadosamente todas ellas antes de decidir sobre la conveniencia de adoptar alguna medida a nivel europeo. No obstante, por lo que respecta a las condiciones de detención, la responsabilidad incumbe a los Estados miembros.

La cuestión de las condiciones de detención puede afectar a varios instrumentos ([2]) de reconocimiento mutuo, que pueden utilizarse para reducir problemas tales como el hacinamiento en las cárceles y mejorar la reintegración social de los antiguos reclusos.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/policies/criminal/procedural/docs/com_2011_327_en.pdf
([2]) Decisión marco sobre traslado de condenados (2008/909/JAI);
Decisión marco relativa a la orden europea de vigilancia (2008/829/JAI);
Decisión marco sobre libertad condicional y sanciones alternativas (2008/947/JAI).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000497/12
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(25 January 2012)

Subject: Deplorable prison situation in several EU Member States — violation of basic rights in European prisons

As a series of media reports have shown, the current situation in prisons in many EU Member States, such as the Czech Republic, Poland, Spain, Holland and Belgium, is alarming, being characterised by overcrowding, congestion, lack of labour regulation for prisoners' work, difficult access to basic health services, and the inadequacy and ineffectiveness of psychological and rehabilitation services.

The Czech Republic has 8 000 prisoners in excess of its prisons' capacity ; in Poland there are 83 000 detainees and only 60 000 places; in Spain, prisons are overflowing, 20 of them having an occupation of close to 200% of capacity and a worse outlook, Greece is the only Member State with a bigger increase in new prisoners than Spain; Belgium, covering up the failure of prison policy and current overcrowding, is 'exporting' prisoners to the Netherlands, which has found in this agreement a way of avoiding the closure of several prisons and the consequent unemployment of hundreds of prison officers whose services had become unnecessary with the progressive decline in prisoners in recent years.

It must be taken into account that, in most cases, this overcrowding leads to deterioration and even violation of the most basic human rights of persons deprived of liberty, in unacceptably inhumane conditions.

Furthermore, in all Member States a high percentage of prisoners are foreign migrants. This fact, along with the current Community trend of criminalising persons without a residence permit, demonstrates that current migration policy and, above all, integration policy in the EU and its Member States, have failed completely.

Given the seriousness of the situation described in prisons, compounded by the deplorable phenomenon of 'Alien Internment Centres', where persons without a residence permit are deprived of their liberty in worse living conditions than in prisons:

What instruments and/or mechanisms does the Commission have to ensure and monitor compliance with human rights in prisons in European territory? Does the Commission intend to implement measures to improve the deplorable conditions to which convicted persons, deprived of their liberty, are condemned? Does the Commission intend to ensure minimum Community standards for life in prison and in Alien Internment Centres that guarantee and ensure respect for the most basic rights of the inmates?

Answer given by Ms. Reding on behalf of the Commission
(16 February 2012)

The Commission published a Green Paper 'Strengthening mutual trust in the European judicial area — A Green Paper on the application of EU criminal justice legislation in the field of detention' ([1]) in June 2011, as part of the Roadmap for strengthening procedural rights of suspected or accused persons in criminal proceedings. The aim was to achieve EU wide minimum standards and explore the extent to which detention issues impact on mutual trust between judicial systems and consequently on mutual recognition and judicial cooperation more generally within the European Union.

The Commission received many replies from Member States as well as from other stakeholders and will carefully analyse all responses before deciding whether any action at European level might be considered. However, the responsibility for detention conditions lies with Member States.

Several mutual recognition instruments ([2]) are potentially affected by the issue of detention conditions and they may be used to ease problems such as prison overcrowding and enhance the social reintegration of ex-prisoners.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/policies/criminal/procedural/docs/com_2011_327_en.pdf
([2]) The framework Decision on Transfer of Prisoners (2008/909/JHA).
The framework Decision on the European Supervision Order (2008/829/JHA) .
The framework Decision on Probation and Alternative Sanctions (2008/947/JHA).

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000517/12
an die Kommission
Thomas Ulmer (PPE)
(25. Januar 2012)

Betrifft: Medizinische Versorgung auf Offshore-Parks

Es gibt keine gesetzliche Regelung, die sich mit der medizinischen Versorgung von Mitarbeitern auf sogenannten Offshore-Parks befasst. Noch liegt die medizinische Versorgung in der Hand der Betreiber, ist aber oft schlecht ausgereift. Daher dauert es oft mehrere Stunden, bis verletzte oder erkrankte Arbeiter in ein Krankenhaus eingeliefert werden können. Dies liegt unter anderem auch an der schlechten Zugänglichkeit der Plattformen. Gerade unter dem Gesichtspunkt, dass diese Technologie in den folgenden Jahren immer mehr an Bedeutung gewinnen wird, sollte es eine Regelung für dieses Problem geben (allein in Deutschland wird erwartet, dass im Zusammenhang mit Offshore-Parks 30 000 neue Arbeitsplätze geschaffen werden).

1. Wäre eine einheitliche europäische Regelung zur arbeitsmedizinischen Betreuung auf den Plattformen sinnvoll?

2. Was wären Möglichkeiten, eine bessere medizinische Versorgung zu gewährleisten?

3. Gibt es Bestrebungen vonseiten der EU, die Arbeiter auf solchen Plattformen zu schützen?

Antwort von Herrn Andor im Namen der Kommission
(6. März 2012)

Sicherheit und Gesundheitsschutz am Arbeitsplatz sind auf EU-Ebene durch ungefähr 27 Richtlinien geregelt. In der „Rahmenrichtlinie" 89/391/EWG ([1]) sind für die gesamte EU Mindestanforderungen für die Verhütung berufsbedingter Gefahren festgelegt, wonach der Arbeitgeber verpflichtet ist, alle Risiken für Sicherheit und Gesundheit der Arbeitnehmer zu beurteilen, vorbeugende Maßnahmen zu ergreifen und einen angemessenen Schutz zu gewährleisten. Außerdem hat der Arbeitgeber ganz allgemein die Verpflichtung, für die Sicherheit und den Gesundheitsschutz der Arbeitnehmer in Bezug auf alle Aspekte, die die Arbeit betreffen, zu sorgen. Gemäß der Richtlinie müssen die Arbeitgeber der Art der Tätigkeiten angepasste Maßnahmen treffen, die zur Ersten Hilfe, Brandbekämpfung und Evakuierung der Arbeitnehmer erforderlich sind. Die Richtlinie findet Anwendung auf alle privaten oder öffentlichen Tätigkeitsbereiche sowie auf alle Personen, die von einem Arbeitgeber beschäftigt werden. Das Arbeitsumfeld der auf Offshore-Windparks beschäftigen Arbeitnehmer ist daher vollständig abgedeckt und die Arbeitgeber sind verpflichtet, je nach Ergebnis der Risikobewertung die geeigneten Präventiv- und Schutzmaßnahmen zu ergreifen, um die im Rahmen ihrer Tätigkeit bestehenden Risikofaktoren zu vermeiden bzw. zu mindern.

Die Mitgliedstaaten müssen diese Richtlinien in nationales Recht umsetzen; danach obliegt es den jeweils maßgeblichen nationalen Behörden (normalerweise den Arbeitsaufsichtsbehörden), die nationalen Rechtsvorschriften, mit denen das EU-Recht im Bereich Sicherheit und Gesundheitsschutz am Arbeitsplatz umgesetzt wurde, auch durchzusetzen.

Bei ordnungsgemäßer Anwendung durch die Mitgliedstaaten gewährleisten die obengenannten Rechtsvorschriften einen ausreichenden und wirksamen Schutz der Arbeitnehmer. Daher hat die Kommission momentan nicht die Absicht, besondere Normen für Sicherheit und Gesundheitsschutz von Arbeitnehmern auf Offshore-Windparks zu erlassen.

([1]) Richtlinie 89/391/EWG des Rates vom 12. Juni 1989 über die Durchführung von Maßnahmen zur Verbesserung der Sicherheit und des Gesundheitsschutzes der Arbeitnehmer bei der Arbeit, ABl. L 183 vom 29.6.1989.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000517/12
to the Commission
Thomas Ulmer (PPE)
(25 January 2012)

Subject: Healthcare on offshore parks

There are no legal provisions covering the healthcare provided to employees on so-called offshore parks. Healthcare is still in the hands of the operators, but is often only rudimentary. That is why it often takes several hours for sick or injured workers to be taken to hospital. One of the reasons for this is the poor accessibility of offshore platforms. In view of the fact that this technology is set to gain ever-increasing importance in the coming years, we should have regulations in place for this problem (in Germany alone it is expected that 30 000 new jobs will be created in connection with offshore parks).

1. Would it make sense to have uniform European rules on occupational healthcare on platforms?

2. What options are available for ensuring improved healthcare?

3. Is the EU making any efforts to protect workers on these platforms?

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

At EU level, occupational health and safety is governed by around 27 directives. The 'Framework' Directive 89/391/EEC ([1]) lays down EU-wide minimum requirements for the prevention of occupational risks that require the employer to evaluate all risks relating to the health and safety of workers, to put in place preventive measures and to provide appropriate protection. Moreover, the employer has a general obligation to ensure the safety and health of workers in every aspect relating to work. Furthermore, the directive requires employers to take the necessary measures for first aid, fire fighting and the evacuation of workers, adapted to the nature of the activities. It applies to all sectors of activity, both public and private, and to any person employed by an employer. The working environment of workers employed on offshore wind farms is therefore fully covered and their employers have an obligation, depending on the outcome of the risk assessment, to put in place adequate prevention and protection measures to avoid or reduce the risk factors relating to their work activities.

The Member States are required to transpose those directives into their national law; thereafter, it is the responsibility of the relevant national authorities (normally the labour inspectorates) to enforce the national provisions transposing the EU health and safety at work legislation.

If correctly implemented by Member States, the abovementioned legislation provides for sufficient and effective protection of workers. Consequently, the Commission has at present no intention to adopt additional specific health and safety at work standards for workers on offshore wind farms.

([1]) Directive 89/391/EEC of 12 June 1989 on the introduction of measures to encourage improvements in the safety and health of workers at work, OJ L 183, 29.6.1989.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000519/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(26 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Προστασία των καταναλωτών από τους πολυκυκλικούς αρωματικούς υδρογονάνθρακες (ΠΑΥ) σε καταναλωτικά είδη

Οι πολυκυκλικοί αρωματικοί υδρογονάνθρακες (ΠΑΥ) είναι μια ομάδα ουσιών που είναι γνωστές για τις μεταλλαξιγόνες, καρκινογόνες και τερατογόνες ιδιότητές τους, ενώ πολλοί από αυτούς είναι πανταχού παρόντες στο περιβάλλον. Οι εν λόγω χημικές ουσίες περιέχονται σε μια ευρεία γκάμα καταναλωτικών ειδών, συμπεριλαμβανομένων προϊόντων που χρησιμοποιούνται από παιδιά, π.χ. σε λαβές παιδικών ποδηλάτων, εργαλεία, παιχνίδια, καροτσάκια, οικιακά όργανα γυμναστικής και σε άλλα είδη με τα οποία έρχονται σε άμεση και συχνή επαφή οι καταναλωτές. Μια ανάλυση του Γερμανικού Ομοσπονδιακού Ινστιτούτου Αξιολόγησης Κινδύνων (BfR) δείχνει ότι τα καταναλωτικά είδη μπορούν να παράγονται χωρίς τη χρήση ΠΑΥ, βάσει ορθών βιομηχανικών πρακτικών. Σύμφωνα με τον κανονισμό REACH (καταχώριση 50 στο παράρτημα XVII), έχουν θεσπιστεί περιορισμοί όσον αφορά τη χρήση και τη διάθεση στην αγορά, σε έλαια αραίωσης και ελαστικά επίσωτρα, μιας σειράς ουσιών ΠΑΥ που έχουν ταξινομηθεί ως καρκινογόνες, μεταλλαξιγόνες ή τοξικές για την αναπαραγωγή (κ/μ/τ).

Ο εν λόγω περιορισμός δεν ισχύει ακόμα για άλλες χρήσεις. Η Γερμανία έχει καλέσει επίσημα την Επιτροπή να προτείνει έναν περιορισμό για οκτώ ουσίες ΠΑΥ, ο οποίος θα καλύπτει όλα τα είδη που ενδεχομένως να χρησιμοποιηθούν από καταναλωτές, καθώς και ένα γενικό όριο 0,2 mg ΠΑΥ/kg. Ο φάκελος σύμφωνα με το παράρτημα XV έχει ήδη υποβληθεί από τον Μάιο του 2010. Στο πλαίσιο της ομάδας εμπειρογνωμόνων CARACAL και ενός εργαστηριακού σεμιναρίου για ενδιαφερόμενα μέρη, η Επιτροπή υπέβαλε μια πρόταση για εξέταση, η οποία προβλέπει περιορισμό των ΠΑΥ μόνο σε καταναλωτικά είδη που προορίζονται για παιδιά ηλικίας μικρότερης των 14 ετών.

Ενόψει των ανωτέρω, μπορεί η Επιτροπή:

1. να εξηγήσει τους λόγους για την απόφασή της να προτείνει περιορισμούς στους ΠΑΥ μόνο για καταναλωτικά προϊόντα που προορίζονται για χρήση από παιδιά ηλικίας μικρότερης των 14 ετών·

2. να εξηγήσει τη στρατηγική της για τη διασφάλιση όλων των καταναλωτών από τους ΠΑΥ στα προϊόντα, δεδομένης της επείγουσας ανάγκης για προστασία όλων των καταναλωτών από επιβλαβείς χημικές ουσίες·

3. δεδομένου ότι πρόσφατες αναλύσεις έδειξαν ότι τα προϊόντα που περιέχουν ΠΑΥ συχνά προέρχονται εκτός Ευρώπης και κυρίως από τη νοτιοανατολική Ασία, να υποδείξει αν σκοπεύει να αναπτύξει στρατηγική πληροφόρησης και συνεργασίας η οποία θα απευθύνεται στα κράτη με σημαντικές εξαγωγές, όπως η Κίνα, με στόχο την αντιμετώπιση του προβλήματος·

4. να εξηγήσει την καθυστέρηση στη διαδικασία, δεδομένου ότι η Γερμανία έχει ήδη υποβάλει έναν ολοκληρωμένο φάκελο σύμφωνα με το παράρτημα XV από τον Μάιο του 2010 και ότι ο κανονισμός REACH προβλέπει μια ταχεία διαδικασία;

Απάντηση του κ. Tajani εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(28 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

Το αίτημα των γερμανικών αρχών εξετάστηκε με προσοχή από τις υπηρεσίες της Επιτροπής στο πλαίσιο του άρθρου 68 παράγραφος 2 του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) 1907/2006 (REACH) ([1]) με αποτέλεσμα την υποβολή πρότασης που περιορίζεται σε καταναλωτικά αγαθά που θα μπορούσαν να χρησιμοποιηθούν από παιδιά κάτω των 14 ετών, σε συμφωνία με το πεδίο εφαρμογής της οδηγίας 2009/48/ΕΚ ([2]). Ύστερα από την υποβολή σχολίων από εμπειρογνώμονες των ενδιαφερομένων και των αρμόδιων αρχών του REACH, η Επιτροπή επανεξετάζει την πρόταση και διερευνά διάφορους τρόπους οριστικοποίησής της το ταχύτερο δυνατόν.

([1]) Κανονισμός (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1907/2006 του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου για την καταχώριση, την αξιολόγηση, την αδειοδότηση και τους περιορισμούς των χημικών προϊόντων (REACH) και για την ίδρυση του Ευρωπαϊκού Οργανισμού Χημικών Προϊόντων καθώς και για την τροποποίηση της οδηγίας 1999/45/ΕΚ και για την κατάργηση του κανονισμού (ΕΟΚ) αριθ. 793/93 του Συμβουλίου και του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1488/94 της Επιτροπής καθώς και της οδηγίας 76/769/ΕΟΚ του Συμβουλίου και των οδηγιών της Επιτροπής 91/155/ΕΟΚ, 93/67/ΕΟΚ, 93/105/ΕΚ και 2000/21/ΕΚ (ΕΕ L 396 της 30.12.2006, σ. 1).

([2]) Οδηγία 2009/48/ΕΚ του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της 18ης Ιουνίου 2009, σχετικά με την ασφάλεια των παιχνιδιών (ΕΕ L 170 της 30.6.2009, σ. 1).

Η Επιτροπή έχει το δικαίωμα ανάληψης πρωτοβουλίας, ενώ δεν υπάρχει κάποιος αυτοματισμός ή υποχρέωση για να αντιμετωπίσει η Επιτροπή κινδύνους που συνδέονται με ουσίες ΚΜΤ αποκλειστικά στο πλαίσιο του άρθρου 68 παράγραφος 2. Στο πλαίσιο αυτό, πρέπει να επισημανθεί ότι, δυνάμει του άρθρου 69 παράγραφος 4, αν ένα κράτος μέλος θεωρεί ότι υπάρχει κίνδυνος για την ανθρώπινη υγεία ή το περιβάλλον, ο οποίος πρέπει να αντιμετωπιστεί, έχει την υποχρέωση κατάρτισης φακέλου επιβολής περιορισμών.

Η Επιτροπή δεσμεύεται για την προστασία της υγείας των καταναλωτών αλλά και για την υποβολή προτάσεων που στηρίζονται σε επιστημονικά δεδομένα και συνεκτιμούν πιθανές κοινωνικοοικονομικές επιπτώσεις.

Η Επιτροπή διαθέτει σύστημα ταχείας ανταλλαγής πληροφοριών με την Κίνα, το «RAPEX-Κίνα», το οποίο επιτρέπει στις κινεζικές αρχές να λαμβάνουν μέτρα για την πρόληψη ή τον περαιτέρω περιορισμό εξαγωγών κοινοποιημένων επικίνδυνων καταναλωτικών προϊόντων κινεζικής καταγωγής στην ΕΕ.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000519/12
to the Commission
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(26 January 2012)

Subject: Protecting consumers from polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) in consumer articles

Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) are a group of substances known for their mutagenic, carcinogenic and teratogenic properties, while many of them are ubiquitously distributed in the environment. These chemicals are contained in a wide range of consumer articles including products which are used by children, e.g. the handles of children's bicycles, tools, toys, pushchairs, home trainers and other articles with which consumers come into direct and frequent contact. An analysis by the German Federal Institute for Risk Assessment (BfR) shows that consumer articles can be produced without using PAHs, on a basis of good manufacturing practices. Under the REACH regulation (entry 50, Annex XVII), a number of PAH substances classified as carcinogenic, mutagenic or toxic to reproduction (CMR) are restricted as regards their use and marketing in extender oils and tyres.

This restriction does not yet apply to other uses. Germany has formally requested the Commission to propose a restriction for eight PAH substances covering all articles that could be used by consumers, suggesting a general limit of 0.2 mg PAH/kg. The Annex XV dossier has been submitted already, in May 2010. In the context of Caracal and a stakeholder workshop, the Commission has submitted a proposal for consideration which would only restrict PAHs in consumer articles intended for children under 14.

In the light of the above, can the Commission:

1. explain the reasons for its decision to propose PAH restrictions only for consumer products intended for use by children under 14;

2. explain its strategy for safeguarding all consumers from PAH in products, given the urgent need to protect all consumers from harmful chemicals;

3. given that recent analyses have shown that products containing PAH often originate outside Europe and notably in south-east Asia, state whether it plans to develop an information and cooperation strategy addressed to major exporter nations like China, in order to tackle the problem;

4. explain the delay in the process, given that Germany had already submitted a complete Annex XV dossier in May 2010 and that the REACH regulation offers a fast-track procedure?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(28 February 2012)

The request of the German authorities has been carefully considered by the Commission services under Article 68(2) of Regulation (EC) 1907/2006 (REACH) ([1]), resulting in a proposal limited to the consumer articles that could be used by children under 14 years of age, in coherence with the scope of Directive 2009/48/EC ([2]). Following comments from stakeholder experts and the REACH Competent Authorities the Commission is currently re-examining the proposal and considering different ways to finalise it within the shortest possible time.

The right of initiative remains with the Commission and there is neither automatism nor obligation on the Commission to address risks related to CMRs substances exclusively under Article 68(2). In this context it must be stressed that under Article 69(4), if a Member State considers that there is a risk to human health or the environment that needs to be addressed it has the obligation to prepare a restriction dossier.

The Commission is committed to the protection of consumers' health, but also to the need to make proposals which are supported by scientific evidence and that take into consideration possible socioeconomic impacts.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 concerning the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH), establishing a European Chemicals Agency, amending Directive 1999/45/EC and repealing Council Regulation (EEC) No 793/93 and Commission Regulation (EC) No 1488/94 as well as Council Directive 76/769/EEC and Commission Directives 91/155/EEC, 93/67/EEC, 93/105/EC and 2000/21/EC (OJ L 396, 30.12.2006, p. 1).

([2]) Directive 2009/48/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 June 2009 on the safety of toys (OJ L 170, 30.6.2009, p. 1).

The Commission operates a rapid information exchange system with China, 'RAPEX-China' which allows Chinese authorities to take measures to prevent or restrict further the export of notified dangerous consumer products of Chinese origin to the EU.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000531/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 de enero de 2012)

Asunto: Situación de la morosidad en España

En su respuesta a la pregunta E-005655/2011, la Comisión subrayó que, si el pago por parte de la administración pública del Reino de España para la compra de productos o servicios se dilata más de lo previsto en la ley, debería examinarse dentro de la ley aplicable nacional y con arreglo a lo previsto entre los firmantes. En caso de haber una dilación por parte de la Administración, el proveedor puede reclamar el pago de intereses.

En un estudio presentado por PMcM (http://www.pmcm.es), el plazo medio de cobro de las empresas a los proveedores del sector privado fue de 98 días en 2011, mientras que en el sector público fue de casi medio año, 162 días.

Según el Presidente de PMcM, más de un tercio de las 600 000 empresas que han cerrado en el Reino de España desde que empezó la crisis lo han hecho a causa de la morosidad. Desde el año 2009, en el sector público el plazo medio no ha parado de crecer, llegando al récord antes citado. Respecto a la *ratio* de morosidad, en lo que se refiere al porcentaje de impagos sobre el total de la facturación en 2011 llegó al 7,1 %, frente al 5,1 % de 2010.

Tal y como se menciona anteriormente, muchas de las empresas (200 000 desde que empezó la crisis, según PMcM) han tenido que cerrar debido a la morosidad y, por lo tanto, se vislumbra un problema estructural muy grave para cuya solución las actuales leyes europeas y nacionales resultan insuficientes. Así, se puede prever que la discrecionalidad entre las partes no funcionará.

A la luz de lo anterior,

1. ¿Cómo valora la Comisión la situación de la morosidad en España?

2. ¿Qué opinión le merece a la Comisión dicho estudio presentado?

Respuesta del Sr. Tajani en nombre de la Comisión
(12 de marzo de 2012)

La Comisión es consciente de los problemas a los que se enfrentan los operadores económicos europeos en toda la Unión a causa de la morosidad. La morosidad incide en el activo líquido de las empresas, complica su gestión financiera y acaba afectando a la competitividad y viabilidad de las PYME.

A pesar de la correcta transposición de la Directiva 2000/35/CE sobre la lucha contra la morosidad en las operaciones comerciales, esta sigue siendo una práctica común en toda Europa, incluida España. Esa es una de las razones por las que la Directiva 2000/35/CE ha sido sustituida por la Directiva 2011/7/UE, que recoge disposiciones más rigurosas.

La nueva Directiva forma parte del Programa de Lisboa para el Crecimiento y el Empleo y pone en práctica la iniciativa Small Business Act for Europe. Asimismo, refleja la voluntad política de la Comisión de reconocer el papel central de las PYME en la economía de la UE mediante el fomento de una cultura del «pago dentro de plazo», que podría contribuir a mejorar la situación en la que se encuentran las PYME europeas.

Así pues, la Comisión considera que la nueva Directiva forma parte de la solución de los problemas estructurales a que se refiere Su Señoría.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000531/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 January 2012)

Subject: Late payment situation in Spain

In its answer to Question E-005655/2011, the Commission underscored that, if payment by the public administration of the Kingdom of Spain for the purchase of products or services takes longer than is provided for by law, this should be examined in the light of the applicable national rules and agreements between the signatories. In case of late payment by the administration, the supplier may claim interest.

In a study presented by the Plataforma Multisectorial contra la Morosidad (PMcM — http://www.pmcm.es), the average time for vendor companies to receive payments in the private sector was stated to be 98 days in 2011, while in the public sector, it was nearly half a year, or 162 days.

According to the President of PMcM, more than one-third of the 600 000 companies that have closed in the Kingdom of Spain since the crisis began have done so because of late payment. Since 2009, the average time to receive payment has continued to grow, reaching the record level mentioned above. With regard to the proportion of late payments, non-payments as a percentage of the total amount invoiced reached 7.1% in 2011, compared to 5.1% in 2010.

As mentioned above, many companies (200 000 since the crisis began, according to the PMcM) have had to close because of late payment and, thus, a very serious structural problem is emerging, for which the current European and national laws are failing to provide a solution. So it can be expected that the discretion of the parties will not work.

In the light of the foregoing:

1. How does the Commission assess the late payment situation in Spain?

2. What opinion does the aforementioned study merit on the part of the Commission?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(12 March 2012)

The Commission is aware of the problems faced by European economic operators throughout the European Union that are due to late payment. Late payments impinge on the liquid assets of businesses, complicate their financial management, and eventually affect the competitiveness and viability of SMEs.

Despite the correct transposition of Directive 2000/35/EC on combating late payment in commercial transactions, late payment is still common practice across Europe, including Spain. This is one of the reasons why Directive 2000/35/EC is replaced by the more stringent provisions of Directive 2011/7/EU.

The new Directive is part of the Lisbon Agenda for Growth and Jobs and implements the Small Business Act for Europe. It reflects the Commission's political will to recognise the central role of SMEs in the EU economy by promoting a culture of 'payment in time' that could contribute to improving the situation faced by European SMEs.

The Commission therefore is of the opinion that this new Directive represents part of the solution for the structural problems referred to by the Honourable Member.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000536/12
to the Commission
John Bufton (EFD)
(25 January 2012)

Subject: Financial manipulation by eurozone members

Is the Commission aware of any use of currency transactions and/or hedging, swaps and derivatives by and/or at the behest of eurozone Member States to suggest that their debts are less than they were or are?

Answer given by Commissioner Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(2 March 2012)

In general, government debt in foreign currencies is reported to the Commission (Eurostat) in domestic currency at the prevailing exchange rate at year end. However where foreign currency swaps are entered into with respect to specific debt instruments, the rate in the swap instrument may be used to convert to domestic currency. Many European Union Member States with debt denominated in a foreign currency enter into such swaps.

The Commission (Eurostat) rules ensure that any off-market foreign currency swaps — where the exchange rates used deliberately diverge from the prevailing rates at inception — are properly reflected in government debt statistics. Therefore the exchange rate within a swap cannot be artificially manipulated to reduce reported government debt. All but one Member States have followed these rules since 2008. Greece was the last to adjust to the rules, in 2010.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000560/12
alla Commissione
Antonello Antinoro (PPE), Mario Mauro (PPE), Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE) e Marco Scurria (PPE)
(25 gennaio 2012)

Oggetto: Italia: liberalizzazione dei farmaci

Il governo italiano si appresta a varare una manovra finanziaria che contiene all'articolo 32 un provvedimento che estende l'autorizzazione delle vendite dei farmaci con ricetta della fascia C fuori dalla farmacia, a favore della grande distribuzione e delle parafarmacie.

Con queste misure riguardanti il servizio farmaceutico, l'Italia diventerebbe l'unico paese al mondo in cui non vi è l'esclusività della dispensazione del farmaco in farmacia.

La preoccupazione riguarda soprattutto la garanzia del massimo livello di tutela della salute dei cittadini e dell'indipendenza economica e tecnica del professionista impegnato nel campo della salute.

Può la Commissione verificare se le misure proposte dal governo italiano in merito alla liberalizzazione della vendita dei farmaci nella grande distribuzione e nelle parafarmacie sono compatibili con la tutela della salute del consumatore, soprattutto in merito ai farmaci di fascia C che necessitano non solo di una prescrizione medica ma anche di una particolare attenzione nella loro assunzione?

Risposta data da John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(15 febbraio 2012)

La Commissione rinvia gli onorevoli deputati alla propria risposta ad una precedente interrogazione dello stesso tenore, l'interrogazione P-012138/2011 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000560/12
to the Commission
Antonello Antinoro (PPE), Mario Mauro (PPE), Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE) and Marco Scurria (PPE)
(25 January 2012)

Subject: Italy: liberalisation of the sale of prescription medicines

The Italian Government is about to pass a budget package Article 32 of which sets out a measure extending the authorisation to sell Category C prescription medicines to outlets other than chemists, in particular supermarkets and parapharmacies.

These measures would make Italy the only country in the world in which prescription medicines are not sold exclusively in chemists.

This is worrying, in particular in view of the need to guarantee both the highest possible level of public health protection and the economic and technical independence of the professionals working in the health sector.

Could the Commission confirm whether the measures being proposed by the Italian Government concerning the authorisation of the sale of medicines in supermarkets and parapharmacies, in particular category C medicines, which require not only a doctor's prescription but also care in the way they are taken, are compatible with the need to safeguard consumers' health?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(15 February 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Members to its answer to a previous identical Question P-012138/2011.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-000561/12
komissiolle
Hannu Takkula (ALDE)
(25. tammikuuta 2012)

Aihe: Luonnonlohikantojen uhanalaisuus EU:n alueella

Luonnonlohikannat ovat jatkuvasti heikentyneet EU:n alueella, ja niiden tilanne on muuttumassa yhä uhanalaisemmaksi. Tähän on vaikuttanut mm. Itämerellä tapahtuva kalastus, josta merkittävä osa on laitonta. Tämän vuoksi monet kaloista tulevat kalastetuiksi ennen kuin ne ennättävät nousta jokiin kutemaan. Luonnonlohikantojen kannalta erityisen haitalliseksi on osoittautunut ajosiimapyynti (long-line fishery), koska siinä saaliiksi päätyy myös liian nuoria kaloja. Käytettävissä on kuitenkin valikoivampia kalastusmenetelmiä, joitten suosiminen siimapyynnin sijasta olisi erittäin perusteltua.

Kalastuksella on perinteisesti ollut ja on edelleen suuri merkitys varsinkin pohjoisen jokivarsien asukkaille. Tämän vuoksi kalastuksen rajoittaminen merellä ja samalla luonnonlohikantojen elvyttämiseen ja vaalimiseen tähtäävät toimet ovat tärkeitä tavoitteita pohjoisessa asuvien ihmisten elinolosuhteitten, paikallisen kulttuurin ja perinteisten elinkeinojen säilymisen kannalta.

Komissio on usein korostanut luonnonlohen säilymistä ja myös sen lausunnot ovat tähdänneet kantojen säilyttämiseen ja niiden elinolosuhteitten turvaamiseen.

— Mikä on tilanne nyt luonnonlohen säilyttämiseen ja lohikantojen turvaamiseen tähtäävien tavoitteiden toteuttamisen kohdalla?

— Mitkä toimenpiteet ovat auttaneet ja tuottaneet tulosta pyrittäessä näihin päämääriin?

— Mitä toimia on näköpiirissä luonnonlohen elinolosuhteitten turvaamiseksi myös tulevaisuudessa?

— Riittävätkö jo tehdyt päätökset luonnonlohikantojen turvaamiseksi Pohjolan joissa vai onko näköpiirissä uusia päätöksiä?

Maria Damanakin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(22. helmikuuta 2012)

Yhteisen kalastuspolitiikan puitteissa sovellettavilla lohensuojelua koskevilla säännöillä pyritään rajoittamaan kalastuksen vuoksi kantaan kohdistuvaa painetta. Komissio on sitoutunut vuoteen 2015 mennessä vähentämään kaikkien kantojen kalastuskuolevuuden tasolle, joka vastaa kestävää enimmäistuottoa. Lohikantojen suojelua Itämerellä edistetään teknisin toimenpitein, joita ovat muun muassa ajoittaiset kalastuskiellot ja tehokas valvontajärjestelmä.

Lohen suurimmat sallitut saaliit (TAC) Itämerellä on vuodeksi 2012 vahvistettu tasolle, joka on yli 50 prosenttia matalampi kuin edellisvuonna. Kestävän enimmäistuoton tavoitteen saavuttamisen arvioidaan olevan mahdollista, kun alhaisempi TAC yhdistetään jäsenvaltioiden toteuttamaan tehokkaaseen kalastuksenvalvontaan. Komissio on yksilöinyt lohen kalastuksen valvonnan yhdeksi tärkeimmistä painopisteistään vuonna 2012.

Komissio antoi elokuussa 2011 asetusehdotuksen Itämeren lohikannan ja kyseistä kantaa hyödyntävien kalastuksien monivuotisesta suunnitelmasta (KOM (2011)0470 lopullinen). Ehdotukseen sisältyy toimenpiteitä, joilla luonnonvaraisten lohikantojen suojelua parannetaan entisestään esimerkiksi vahvistamalla TACeja yksittäisille joille ja tekemällä potentiaalisiin lohijokiin istutuksia tietyin edellytyksin.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000561/12
to the Commission
Hannu Takkula (ALDE)
(25 January 2012)

Subject: Threat to stocks of wild salmon in the EU

Stocks of wild salmon have been steadily diminishing in the EU, and are coming under threat more and more. This is partly due to fishing in the Baltic Sea, much of which is illegal. Because of this, many of the fish are caught before they have time to go up into the rivers to spawn. Longline fishing has proven particularly harmful to stocks of wild salmon, because fish that are too young also end up in the haul. There are more selective fishing methods available, however, and good arguments exist for favouring these rather than longline fishing.

Traditionally, fishing has been of particular importance, and still is, for those living alongside rivers in the north. This being the case, restrictions on fishing at sea and, at the same time, measures aimed at reviving and tending stocks of wild salmon are important objectives if the living conditions, local culture and traditional livelihoods of those who live in the north are to be preserved.

The Commission has frequently emphasised the importance of preserving wild salmon, and, furthermore, the statements that it has issued have aimed at preservation of stocks and safeguarding their living conditions.

— What is the situation now regarding the attainment of targets for preserving wild salmon and protecting salmon stocks?

— What measures have helped and produced a result in pursuing these objectives?

— What measures are on the horizon to safeguard the living conditions of wild salmon now and in the future?

— Are the decisions that have already been taken enough to protect wild salmon stocks in the rivers of Nordic countries, or are there new decisions in the offing?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(22 February 2012)

The rules for the protection of salmon within the common fisheries policy aim at limiting fishing pressure on the stock. The Commission is committed to reduce fishing mortality for all stocks which corresponds to the maximum sustainable yield by 2015. Technical measures such as fishery closure periods and the efficient control system in place will all contribute to the protection of salmon stocks in the Baltic Sea.

For 2012 the total allowable catches (TAC) for salmon in the Baltic Sea has been reduced by more than 50% compared to 2011. It is believed that such a reduction combined with the efficient control of fisheries implemented by Member States will help to achieve the maximum sustainable yield (MSY) target. The Commission has identified control of salmon fisheries as one of its priorities for 2012.

In August 2011, the Commission proposed a regulation establishing a multiannual plan for the Baltic salmon stock and the fisheries exploiting that stock (COM(2011) 470 final). This proposal contains measures which will further strengthen the protection of wild salmon stocks including, for example, the setting of TAC in individual rivers and restocking of potential salmon rivers, subject to certain conditions.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-000571/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(25 janvier 2012)

Objet: Information des consommateurs sur les allégations de santé sur les produits alimentaires

Le comité permanent de la chaîne alimentaire et de la santé animale a soutenu le 5 décembre 2011 le projet de règlement de la Commission visant à adopter une liste d'allégations de santé autorisées à figurer sur les produits alimentaires.

La Commission peut-elle faire savoir si elle ne juge pas indispensable de faire diffuser largement et de commenter ces allégations de santé, très importantes pour les consommateurs, plutôt que de limiter ces informations à une publication au Journal officiel?

Réponse donnée par M. Dalli au nom de la Commission
(6 mars 2012)

Le règlement de la Commission établissant une liste d'allégations de santé autorisées a reçu un avis favorable de la part du Comité permanent de la chaîne alimentaire et de la santé animale et sera publié au Journal officiel après son adoption par la Commission, à moins qu'une objection ne soit formulée lors de l'examen approfondi du texte par le Parlement et le Conseil. La Commission convient qu'il serait souhaitable que cette liste soit plus accessible à toutes les parties prenantes, notamment les consommateurs, et qu'elle s'accompagne d'informations appropriées quant à son utilisation et à son respect.

Le règlement (CE) nº 1924/2006 ([1]), acte législatif de base concernant les allégations nutritionnelles et de santé, exige que la Commission maintienne un registre de l'Union des allégations nutritionnelles et de santé concernant les denrées alimentaires. Ce registre, qui sera mis à jour une fois adoptée la liste d'allégations de santé autorisées, comportera la formulation de l'allégation, les conditions de son utilisation, toute restriction applicable et les références à l'avis scientifique de l'Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments (EFSA). Il est disponible sur le site *web* de la Commission et peut être consulté, ainsi que d'autres informations sur les allégations nutritionnelles et de santé utiles aux différentes parties prenantes, à l'adresse suivante:

http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/labellingnutrition/claims/index_en.htm.

([1]) JO L 404 du 30.12.2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000571/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(25 January 2012)

Subject: Consumer information about health claims surrounding food products

On 5 December 2011, the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health supported the Commission's proposal for a regulation calling for the adoption of a list of permitted health claims to appear on food products.

Given the great importance of these health claims for consumers, does the Commission not consider it essential to make them widely known and to comment on them, rather than simply publishing this information in the Official Journal?

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

The Commission Regulation establishing a list of permitted health claims that received a positive opinion in the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health will be published in the Official Journal following its adoption by the Commission, provided that no objection is raised during scrutiny by the Parliament and the Council. The Commission agrees that it is desirable for this list to be more readily available to all stakeholders, including consumers, and for it to be accompanied by appropriate information to aid use and compliance.

Regulation (EC) 1924/2006 ([1]), the basic Act controlling nutrition and health claims, requires the Commission to maintain a Union Register of nutrition and health claims made on food. This Union Register, which will be updated once the list of permitted health claims is adopted, contains the wording of the claim, the conditions for its use, any restrictions that might apply and references to the scientific opinions of the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). The Union Register is maintained on the Commission website and can be found, together with other useful information about nutrition and health claims for stakeholders, by following this link:

http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/labellingnutrition/claims/index_en.htm.

([1]) OJ L 404, 30.12.2006.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000585/12
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(26 gennaio 2012)

Oggetto: Possibili finanziamenti per associazioni che si occupano della promozione umana e sociale dei disabili mentali

L'associazione Loïc Francis-Lee ONLUS si trova a Capena (Roma) e dal 1989 si occupa di pedagogia curativa e socioterapia per la promozione umana e sociale dei disabili mentali. Essa è stata costituita da genitori, educatori e cittadini volontari con la finalità di gestire iniziative atte a favorire lo sviluppo della personalità, dell'integrazione sociale e dell'autonomia dalla famiglia di appartenenza delle persone con disabilità mentale.

L'associazione è iscritta all'albo regionale delle associazioni di volontariato e si ispira nel proprio lavoro al metodo della pedagogia curativa e socioterapia di orientamento antroposofico. L'associazione dispone di due sedi, la prima delle quali, Casa Loïc, è dotata di due edifici per una superficie totale di 450mq e un terreno di 18 000mq, e offre un'assistenza diurna. I due edifici ospitano, inoltre, laboratori artigianali, spazi per il tempo libero, per la dramma terapia e le arti figurative. La seconda sede, Casa Maria Grazia, operante dal 1998, è una casa-famiglia e ospita durante la giornata 6 giovani con disabilità mentale. Presso le due strutture prestano assistenza medici, educatori specializzati, giovani in servizio sociale, volontari ed artigiani.

Ciò detto, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. Quali finanziamenti a livello comunitario o nazionale sono disponibili per le associazioni ONLUS che si occupano della promozione umana e sociale dei disabili mentali;

2. Se esistono negli Stati membri associazioni di volontariato con finalità simili al caso su esposto;

3. Un quadro generale.

Risposta data da Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(5 marzo 2012)

Come illustrato nella strategia europea sulla disabilità 2010-2020, la Commissione promuove alcune politiche e azioni a livello europeo e sostiene gli sforzi nazionali per migliorare la situazione delle persone con disabilità, comprese quelle con disabilità mentali. Tuttavia, la competenza principale in molti ambiti strettamente rilevanti per la vita quotidiana dei disabili spetta alle autorità nazionali o locali.

La Commissione non finanzia direttamente le attività di organizzazioni nazionali o locali quali l'associazione Loïc Francis-Lee di Capena (Roma), né può fornire una lista di associazioni di volontariato simili, presenti negli Stati membri. Ciononostante, tali associazioni potrebbero beneficiare del sostegno dei Fondi strutturali europei, in particolare del Fondo sociale europeo (FSE), a cui possono accedere attraverso appositi inviti a presentare proposte che vengono gestiti a livello nazionale, in questo caso dalle autorità italiane competenti.

Il FSE può sostenere iniziative di rafforzamento delle capacità e azioni specifiche intraprese dalle ONG, incluse quelle che si occupano di disabilità. Le opportunità di finanziamento sono offerte nel quadro dei programmi operativi a livello nazionale e regionale. Nel caso specifico, il programma operativo regionale FSE per il Lazio potrebbe erogare il sostegno necessario per questo tipo di attività. Altre informazioni sul programma operativo FSE Regione Lazio 2007-2013 sono disponibili sul sito web della Regione Lazio: http://www.sirio.regione.lazio.it/

Ulteriori opportunità di finanziamento attraverso altri programmi UE, come il programma in materia di salute 2008-2013 ([1]), vengono segnalate dalle Direzioni generali competenti per il settore politico specifico. Gli interessati possono partecipare rispondendo agli appositi inviti a presentare proposte secondo i rispettivi criteri ([2]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/programme/policy/2008-2013/index_en.htm
([2]) Un elenco dei settori di intervento è consultabile al seguente indirizzo: . http://ec.europa.eu/contracts_grants/grants_it.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000585/12
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(26 January 2012)

Subject: Possible funding for associations providing humanitarian and social assistance to mentally disabled people

Since 1989 the Loïc Francis-Lee Association (a not-for-profit social organisation or ONLUS), based in Capena (Rome), has been dealing with curative education and social therapy to provide social and humanitarian assistance to mentally disabled people. It was founded by parents, teachers and volunteers with the aim of managing initiatives to encourage the personal development and social integration of people with mental disabilities and the independence of their families.

The Association is registered in the Regional Register of Voluntary Associations and its work is inspired by therapeutic pedagogy and social therapy with an anthroposophic orientation. The Association has two centres, the first of which, Casa Loïc, has two buildings with a total area of 450 m^2 and 18 000 m^2 of land and offers daytime care. The two buildings accommodate craft workshops, leisure facilities and spaces for drama therapy and visual arts. The second centre, Casa Maria Grazia, in operation since 1998, is a family home which takes in six mentally disabled young people during the day. In both places, doctors, specialist teachers, young people doing social work, volunteers and craftspeople offer their support.

1. What EU or national funds are available for ONLUS associations which deal with humanitarian and social assistance to the mentally disabled?

2. Are there other voluntary associations in Member States with similar aims to the abovementioned one?

3. Can the Commission provide an overview?

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

As detailed in the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020, the Commission carries out certain policies and actions at European level and supports national efforts to improve the situation of people with disabilities, including those with mental disabilities. However, the main competence in many fields directly relevant to the everyday life of disabled people lies with national or local authorities.

The Commission does not directly fund the activities of national/local organisations such as Loïc Francis-Lee Association in Capena (Rome) neither can it provide a list of similar voluntary associations in the member states. However, such associations could qualify for support from the European Structural Funds, in particular the European Social Fund (ESF), to be obtained via participation in specific Calls for Proposals managed nationally, in this case by the responsible Italian authorities.

The ESF can support capacity building and specific actions undertaken by NGOs, including those working on disability issues. Funding opportunities are provided within the framework of Operational Programmes at national and regional level. In this regard the ESF Regional Operational Programme for Lazio could provide the necessary support for this kind of activities. Further information on the ESF Regional Operational Programme Lazio 2007-2013 is available on Lazio Region website at http://www.sirio.regione.lazio.it/

Funding opportunities under other EU programmes, like the Health Programme 2008-2013 ([1]), are advertised by the Commission Directorates-General directly responsible for a specific policy area. Interested parties can apply by responding to specific Calls for Proposals according to the participation criteria set therein ([2]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/programme/policy/2008-2013/index_en.htm
([2]) A list fields of action is available for browsing at the following page: http://ec.europa.eu/contracts_grants/grants_en.htm

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000588/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(26 de enero de 2012)

Asunto: Morosidad en las administraciones del Estado español

Según aparece publicado el 17 de enero en el diario *El Mundo* ([1]), el Ministerio de Fomento del Gobierno español debe 600 millones de euros por expropiaciones de terrenos de obras ya realizadas.

Parece ser que estas expropiaciones pendientes de pago corresponderían a terrenos para las obras licitadas de alta velocidad y, mayoritariamente, se adeuda a particulares. La escasez de recursos no fue impedimento para que el Ministerio, dirigido entonces por José Blanco, siguiera licitando nuevos proyectos que requerían más expropiaciones.

¿No cree la Comisión que esta deuda podría considerarse una morosidad y, por lo tanto, el Gobierno español estaría incumpliendo los plazos de pago fijados en la Directiva 2000/35/CE?

Respuesta del Sr. Tajani en nombre de la Comisión
(13 de marzo de 2012)

La Directiva 2000/35/CE, por la que se establecen medidas de lucha contra la morosidad en las operaciones comerciales, y la Directiva 2011/7/UE, que la refunde, se aplican a todos los pagos efectuados como contraprestación en operaciones comerciales entre empresas o entre empresas y poderes públicos que den lugar a la entrega de bienes o la prestación de servicios.

En consecuencia, la compra de terrenos por parte de una administración pública no entra dentro del ámbito de aplicación de estas Directivas.

La Directiva 2000/35/CE estará en vigor hasta la transposición de la Directiva 2011/7/UE, cuyo plazo finaliza el 16 de marzo de 2013. En la respuesta a la pregunta parlamentaria E-533/2012 de Su Señoría se ofrece más información acerca de la rápida transposición de la Directiva 2011/7/UE y su importancia.

([1]) http://elmundo.orbyt.es/2012/01/17/orbyt_en_elmundo/1326832049.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000588/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(26 January 2012)

Subject: Late payments by government bodies in Spain

According to reports published on 17 January 2012 in the newspaper '*El Mundo*' ([1]), Spain's Ministry of Public Works and Buildings owes EUR 600 million for the compulsory purchase of land on which works have now been completed.

It would seem that the outstanding payments are for the compulsory purchase of land for works, put out to tender, on the high-speed rail network and that the money is, for the most part, owed to private individuals. The shortage of resources did not stop the Ministry, then headed by José Blanco, continuing to put out for tender new projects for which further compulsory land purchases were necessary.

Would the Commission not agree that the monies owed here can be considered a late payment and that, therefore, the Spanish Government is failing to comply with the payment periods laid down in Directive 2000/35/EC?

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

Directive 2000/35/EC on combating late payment in commercial transactions and its recast Directive 2011/7/EU apply to all payments made as remuneration for commercial transactions between undertakings or between undertakings and public authorities which lead to the delivery of goods or provision of services.

Therefore the purchase of land by a public administration falls outside the scope of the directive.

Directive 2000/35/EC is still in force until the transposition of Directive 2011/7/EU which has to be transposed by 16 March 2013 at the latest. More details as to the early transposition of Directive 2011/7/EU and to its significance are provided in the answer to Written Question E-533/2012 of the Honourable Member.

([1]) http://elmundo.orbyt.es/2012/01/17/orbyt_en_elmundo/1326832049.html

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000589/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(27 de enero de 2012)

Asunto: Clasificación NUTS

Cataluña es una comunidad autónoma del Estado español que cuenta con 7 364 078 habitantes, tiene una economía por valor de 202 509 millones de euros y cuenta con competencias fiscales y legislativas.

Según el segundo párrafo del artículo 3 del Reglamento (CE) n° 1059/2003 sobre el establecimiento de una clasificación territorial común en materia estadística (NUTS) existen tres niveles para distribuir las regiones europeas según su importancia demográfica.

El nivel NUTS 1 incluye las regiones de 3 a 7 millones de habitantes. El nivel NUTS 2 incluye a las regiones entre 800 000 y 3 millones y finalmente la NUTS 3 con poblaciones entre los 150 000 y los 800 000 habitantes.

Aún así, la clasificación sitúa Cataluña como una región NUTS 2 a pesar de que su población sobrepasa de forma notoria las cifras de esta calificación y sin duda se asemejan a la de NUTS 1. De igual forma sucede con las provincias de Lleida, Girona, Tarragona y Barcelona, que deberían formar parte del tipo NUTS 2 y no NUTS 3.

Teniendo en cuenta que según el primer párrafo del citado artículo la existencia de unidades administrativas debe constituir el primer criterio utilizado para la clasificación de unidades territoriales,

1. ¿Estudia la Comisión la posibilidad de actualizar las cifras de las distintas horquillas NUTS para adecuarlas a los datos de población presentes en las regiones?

2. ¿Estudia la Comisión la posibilidad de rehacer la clasificación en el caso particular de España y Cataluña, para tomar en debida cuenta los datos anteriormente citados?

3. ¿No cree la Comisión que la composición de las regiones incluidas en NUTS debería estar basada solamente en la realidad política y administrativa de los Estados miembros?

Respuesta del Sr. Šemeta en nombre de la Comisión
(2 de marzo de 2012)

Los principios y las condiciones de la clasificación NUTS se establecen en el Reglamento (CE) n° 1059/2003 ([1]). En el artículo 3, apartado 2, se especifica que una clase determinada de unidades administrativas se clasifica en niveles jerárquicos, en función de la media de población de todas las regiones en ese nivel. En dicho artículo se especifican también los umbrales de población que hay que tener en cuenta. En el anexo 2 del mismo Reglamento se enumeran las unidades administrativas existentes para los diferentes niveles NUTS en todo el país.

Dado que la media de población de las comunidades y ciudades autónomas de España es de aproximadamente 2 423 000 (2011), el anexo 2 determina que las regiones de dicho nivel administrativo, incluida Cataluña, pertenecen al nivel NUTS 2.

1. Los principios y las condiciones de la clasificación NUTS se establecieron mediante un amplio procedimiento de consulta con las partes interesadas nacionales y fueron aprobados por el Parlamento Europeo y el Consejo. Se considera que las especificaciones del Reglamento, incluidos los umbrales de población, son claras y han demostrado su eficacia en el pasado. Así pues, la Comisión no tiene previsto revisar los principios ni las condiciones de la clasificación NUTS.

2. En el artículo 5 del Reglamento anteriormente mencionado se establecen las condiciones relativas a las enmiendas a la clasificación NUTS. España no ha informado a la Comisión de ninguna modificación en su nivel administrativo que pueda afectar a la clasificación NUTS, por lo que no se prevé ninguna revisión de dicha clasificación respecto de las regiones españolas.

3. El establecimiento de niveles regionales no administrativos y estables para la clasificación NUTS proporciona los medios que permiten una comparabilidad considerablemente mejor de las estadísticas regionales de la UE. La Comisión aprueba la necesidad de tal concepto y no tiene previsto abandonarlo.

([1]) Reglamento (CE) n° 1059/2003 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 26 de mayo de 2003, por el que se establece una nomenclatura común de unidades territoriales estadísticas (NUTS), DO L 154 de 21.6.2003.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000589/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(27 January 2012)

Subject: NUTS classification

Catalonia is an autonomous community of Spain that has 7 364 078 inhabitants ([1]), an economy worth EUR 202 509 million ([2]) and its own taxation and legislative powers.

Article 3(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1059/2003 on the establishment of a common territorial classification regarding statistics (NUTS) establishes three levels in which European regions are classified according to the size of their populations.

NUTS level 1 covers regions with 3 to 7 million inhabitants, NUTS level 2 covers regions with between 800 000 and 3 million inhabitants and NUTS level 3 those with between 150 000 and 800 000 inhabitants.

Catalonia is classified as a NUTS 2 region despite the fact that the size of its population far surpasses the figures given for that level and clearly places it in the NUTS 1 bracket. Similarly, the provinces of Lleida, Girona, Tarragona and Barcelona should come under NUTS 2 rather than NUTS 3.

Given that, under the first paragraph of the above article, existing administrative units constitute the first criterion used to classify territorial units,

1. is the Commission looking into the possibility of updating the figures for the various NUTS brackets so that they actually reflect the current population figures for the regions?

2. is the Commission looking into the possibility of revising the classification for Spain and Catalonia in order to take due account of the information set out above?

3. does the Commission not think that the composition of the regions included in NUTS should be based solely on the political and administrative realities in the Member States?

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

The principles and conditions of the NUTS classification are outlined in Regulation (EC) No 1059/2003 ([3]). Article 3(2) specifies that an existing layer of administrative units is classified into the NUTS hierarchy based on the average population size of all regions on that level. The population thresholds to be taken into account are specified in the same article. Annex II of that regulation lists the existing administrative units for the different NUTS levels in all country.

As the average population size of the *comunidades y ciudades autónomas* of Spain is about 2 423 000 (2011) Annex II specifies that regions of that administrative level, including Catalonia, are represented on NUTS level 2.

1. The principles and conditions of the NUTS classification were established by a lengthy consultation procedure with national stakeholders and were approved by the European Parliament and the Council. The specifications of the regulation, including the population thresholds, are considered to be straightforward and have proven their worth in the past. Thus, the Commission does not plan revising the principles and conditions of the NUTS classification.

2. The abovementioned regulation specifies in Article 5 the conditions for amending the NUTS classification. Spain has not informed the Commission of changes in its administrative level that might affect the NUTS classification, thus there is no revision of the classification of Spanish NUTS regions foreseen.

3. The establishment of stable, non-administrative regional levels for the NUTS classification provides the means for a significantly improved comparability of EU regional statistics. The Commission approves the necessity of that concept and does not plan to abandon it.

([1]) http://www.gencat.cat/catalunya/cas/coneixer-poblacio.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/policy/ecomm/doc/library/public_consult/nga/catalonia_2_min.pdf
([3]) Regulation (EC) No 1059/2003 of the Parliament and of the Council of 26 May 2003 on the establishment of a common classification of territorial units for statistics (NUTS), OJ L 154, 21.6.2003.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000598/12
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(26 gennaio 2012)

Oggetto: Mancato rispetto delle direttive sulla valutazione di impatto ambientale 85/337/CEE, 97/11/CE e 2001/42/CE nei lavori di ampliamento dell'aeroporto «Canova» di Treviso?

In merito al progetto denominato «Incremento fruitivo dell'aeroporto civile di Treviso: piano di controllo e riduzione degli impatti» in data 6.12.2002 è stata chiesta la compatibilità ambientale alla quale il Ministero dell'ambiente replicava con un «parere interlocutorio negativo» ([1]) sulla V.I.A. — valutazione di impatto ambientale.

Detto parere prevedeva l'obbligo, per le competenti autorità, di presentare una nuova procedura di V.I.A. entro tre mesi, cosa che non è stata fatta, inoltre imponeva un limite Scautelativo non superiore a 16 300 voli l'anno, limite non rispettato, poiché nel 2010 sono stati raggiunti ben 20 588 voli.

Le società di gestione dell'aeroporto, SAVE spa e AERTRE spa, a partire dal 2007 hanno realizzato interventi di ampliamento come la nuova aerostazione passeggeri, sviluppata in due piani per circa 10 000 metri quadrati e nuove aree di parcheggio.

Per questo aeroporto l'ENAC ([2]) ha successivamente autorizzato un nuovo piano di sviluppo aeroportuale, senza sottoporlo alla V.I.A. e realizzando, tra il 5.6.2011 e il 5.12.2011, ulteriori lavori di potenziamento e di ampliamento dello scalo, tra cui la riqualifica profonda della pista, il nuovo sistema luminoso di avvicinamento degli aeromobili, strutture che aumenteranno l'arrivo di aerei e passeggeri.

Tali opere sono state eseguite attraverso un documento rilasciato dal Ministero dell'ambiente in data 5.5.2011 ([3]) che ha concesso un «parere favorevole all'esclusione della procedura V.I.A. », atto portato in giudizio dinanzi al Tribunale amministrativo regionale del Veneto dal «Comitato per la riduzione dell'impatto ambientale dell'aeroporto di Treviso», associazione di 520 residenti nei pressi dell'aeroporto, e da «Italia Nostra», associazione nazionale riconosciuta dal Ministero dell'ambiente.

In merito alla valutazione di impatto ambientale, si precisa che in passato il Consiglio di Stato con più sentenze ([4]) ha considerato illegittimo suddividere o frazionare un progetto al fine di evitare tale procedura.

Ciò esposto, ritiene la Commissione che le direttive 85/337/CEE, 97/11/CE e 2001/42/CE siano state correttamente applicate dalle autorità italiane e dalla società di gestione dell'aeroporto: «A. Canova» di Treviso? Quali azioni intende intraprendere in caso di non corretta applicazione delle citate direttive?

Risposta data da Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(5 marzo 2012)

La Commissione sta attualmente esaminando la questione sollevata dall'onorevole parlamentare, il quale riceverà una risposta complementare a tempo debito. La Commissione non esiterà ad adottare opportuni provvedimenti qualora riscontrasse una violazione del diritto dell'UE.

Risposta complementare di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(5 novembre 2012)

La direttiva 2001/42/CE ([5]), ovvero direttiva VAS, non è applicabile al caso in specie in quanto si riferisce esclusivamente alla valutazione di piani e programmi. Le direttive 85/337/CEE e 97/11/CE sono state sostituite dalla direttiva VIA 2011/92/UE ([6]), del 13 dicembre2011, che valuta l'impatto ambientale dei progetti, e codificate nella medesima.

([1]) Decreto del Ministero dell'ambiente n. 398 del 14.5.2007.
([2]) Ente nazionale per l'aviazione civile.
([3]) Prot. n. DVA-2011-0010666 del 5.5.2011.
([4]) Sentenza n. 4368 del 30.8.2002 della sezione VI e sentenza n. 5760 del 2.10.2006 (C.C. 11.7.2006) della sezione IV.
([5]) Direttiva 2001/42/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 27 giugno 2001, concernente la valutazione degli effetti di determinati piani e programmi sull'ambiente (Gazzetta ufficiale L 197 del 21.7.2001).
([6]) Direttiva 2011/92/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 13 dicembre 2011, concernente la valutazione dell'impatto ambientale di determinati progetti pubblici e privati (Gazzetta ufficiale L 26 del 28.1.2012).

In base a denunce concernenti presunte violazioni sistematiche sia della direttiva VAS che della direttiva VIA in relazione a diversi aeroporti italiani, la Commissione ha lanciato l'indagine pilota dell'UE 3720/12/ENVI. L'indagine, attualmente in corso, riguarda la potenziale violazione della direttiva VIA in merito a progetti riguardanti l'ampliamento di diversi aeroporti italiani, tra cui le modifiche dell'aeroporto di Treviso cui si riferisce l'onorevole parlamentare.

La Commissione sta valutando le informazioni che le autorità italiane hanno trasmesso nel settembre 2012 nell'ambito della sopracitata indagine. La Commissione adotterà le misure del caso qualora dovessero emergere prove di una violazione della direttiva VIA.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000598/12
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(26 January 2012)

Subject: Possible non-compliance with Environmental Impact Assessment Directives 85/337/EEC, 97/11/EC and 2001/42/EC in the work to enlarge Treviso's Canova airport

Environmental compatibility approval was requested from the Italian Ministry of the Environment for the project entitled 'Increasing the productivity of Treviso civil airport: impact control and reduction plan' on 6 December 2002, to which the Ministry replied with a 'provisionally negative opinion' ([1]) for the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).

That decision required the competent authorities to present a new EIA within three months, which was not done. Furthermore, it imposed a precautionary limit of not more than 16 300 flights a year, a limit which was not complied with, because there were 20 588 flights to and from the airport in 2010.

Since 2007, the companies managing the airport, SAVE S.p.A. and AERTRE S.p.A., have carried out enlargement work, such as the new passenger terminal, built on two stories and totalling around 10 000 square metres, and new parking areas.

ENAC ([2]) subsequently authorised a new airport development plan for the airport without submitting it for an EIA and, between 5 June 2011 and 5 December 2011, carried out further improvement and enlargement works there, among which was a radical overhaul of the runway, with a new approach lighting system, which will increase the number of aircraft and passenger arrivals.

That work were carried out by virtue of a Ministry of the Environment text, dated 5 May 2011 ([3]) which granted a 'favourable opinion on exemption from the EIA procedure'. That authorisation has been referred to the Administrative Court of the Veneto region by the Committee for the Reduction of the Environmental Impact of Treviso Airport, which is an association consisting of 520 residents of the area surrounding the airport, and by Italia Nostra, a national association recognised by the Ministry of the Environment.

Regarding the Environmental Impact Assessment, it should be clarified that, in the past, the Council of State has, in several judgments ([4]), found that it is unlawful to subdivide or split up a project in order to bypass such procedures.

On the basis of the above, does the Commission consider that directives 85/337/EEC, 97/11/EC and 2001/42/EC have been correctly applied by the Italian authorities and by the company managing Treviso's 'A. Canova' airport? What action will it take if it feels that those directives have not been correctly applied?

Preliminary answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(5 March 2012)

The Commission is currently investigating the matter referred to by the Honourable Member. A supplementary answer will be provided to him in due course. The Commission will not hesitate to take appropriate action should evidence of a breach of EC law emerge.

Supplementary answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(5 November 2012)

Directive 2001/42/EC ([5]), or SEA Directive, is not relevant to the case at hand because it relates exclusively to the assessment of plans and programmes. Directives 85/337/EEC and 97/11/EC have now been replaced by, and codified in, the EIA Directive 2011/92/EU ([6]) of 13 December 2011 which assesses the environmental impacts of projects.

([1]) Ministerial Decree of the Ministry of the Environment No 398 of 14 May 2007.
([2]) Italian National Civil Aviation Authority.
([3]) Prot. No DVA-2011-0010666 of 5 May 2011.
([4]) Judgment 4368 of 30 August 2002 of section VI and judgment No 5760 of 2 October 2006 (Court of Cassation 11 July 2006) of section IV.
([5]) Directive 2001/42/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 June 2001 on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment (OJ L 197, 21/07/2001).
([6]) Directive 2011/92/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment (OJ L 026, 28/01/2012).

Based on complaints about alleged systematic breaches of both the SEA and EIA Directives in relation to several Italian airports, the Commission has launched the EU Pilot investigation 3720/12/ENVI. This ongoing investigation concerns the potential breach of the EIA Directive in relation to projects for the extension of several Italian airports, including the modifications to the Treviso airport referred to by the Honourable Member.

The Commission is assessing the information that the Italian authorities submitted in September 2012 in the framework of the above investigation. The Commission will take the appropriate action should evidence of a breach of the EIA Directive emerge.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000660/12
aan de Commissie
Derk Jan Eppink (ECR)
(30 januari 2012)

Betreft: Kimberlyproces — Verantwoordelijke instelling

De Kimberlyprocescertificering (KPCS) is een internationale overeenkomst waarmee de handel in ruwe diamant beperkt wordt tot landen die aan bepaalde criteria voldoen.

Binnen de EU is de uitvoering van de KP-certificering geregeld door middel van Verordening (EG) nr. 2368/2002 van de Raad, op grond waarvan een communautair systeem van certificering en in- en uitvoercontroles voor ruwe diamant is opgezet. Deze verordening bepaalt bovendien dat de Gemeenschap als één partij aan de KPCS zou deelnemen en dat de Commissie zodoende de Gemeenschap in de KPCS zou vertegenwoordigen, bijgestaan door een comité waarin de lidstaten overleg voeren met de Commissie.

Tot voor kort coördineerde de dienst Instrumenten buitenlands beleid van de Commissie (DG FPI) en in het bijzonder Eenheid 2: Operaties Stabiliteitsinstrument het EU-standpunt in het Kimberleyproces. Daarnaast was deze dienst voorzitter van het comité voor de uitvoering van de KP-certificering voor de internationale handel in ruwe diamant, dat uit vertegenwoordigers van de lidstaten bestaat en toezicht houdt op de uitvoering van het proces op EU-niveau.

Als hoge vertegenwoordiger van de EU heeft Catherine Ashton echter persberichten betreffende het Kimberleyproces uitgegeven. Binnen de EU gaan er daarnaast stemmen op die menen dat de bevoegdheid van DG FPI na de inwerkingtreding van het Verdrag van Lissabon is overgedragen aan de Europese Dienst voor extern optreden. Bovendien heeft mevrouw Ashton in januari 2011 de Britse diplomaat Nicholas Westcott benoemd tot directeur Afrika van de EDEO, terwijl de heer Westcott recentelijk door de BBC aangeduid werd als de „woordvoerder van de werkgroep voor het toezicht op het KP, die zich onder het voorzitterschap bevond van Stéphane Chardon, werkzaam voor Eenheid 2: Operaties Stabiliteitsinstrument".

Welke Europese instelling heeft de uiteindelijke politieke en juridische verantwoordelijkheid voor de vertegenwoordiging van de EU-lidstaten in het kader van het Kimberleyproces?

Antwoord van de Hoge Vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(27 februari 2012)

De Commissie heeft de EU in het Kimberlyproces (KP) vertegenwoordigd sinds de oprichting ervan, zoals bepaald in Verordening (EG) nr. 2368/2002 ([1]). De vertegenwoordiging van de EU in het KP wordt geregeld door de dienst Instrumenten van het buitenlands beleid (FPI), een dienst onder het gezag van mevrouw Ashton in haar hoedanigheid van vicepresident van de Commissie. Voor het vervullen van zijn verantwoordelijkheden coördineert de FPI met andere betrokken diensten van de Commissie, met de Europese dienst voor extern optreden (EDEO) en met de lidstaten — voornamelijk via een Comité en door het regelmatig inlichten van de Raad over de ontwikkelingen.

De Commissie vertegenwoordigt de EU in alle KP-vergaderingen en in alle KP-werkgroepen, inclusief als voorzitter van de werkgroep die toezicht houdt op het KP.

In 2011 nam de impasse in het KP over de status van de diamantrijke Zimbabwaanse regio Marange een prominente plaats in en kreeg deze een bijzonder politieke dimensie, niet alleen voor Zimbabwe, maar ook voor de ruimere regio. In deze context heeft de Commissie gezorgd voor de volledige coördinatie van het standpunt van de EU in het KP met het Afrika-directoraat van de EDEO onder leiding van Nicholas Westcott; hij was daarom de geschikte persoon om het onderwerp in de BBC-documentaire te bespreken. Het feit dat zowel de FPI als de EDEO tot de bevoegdheid van Hoge Vertegenwoordiger/vicepresident (HV/VP) Ashton behoren, heeft deze coördinatie vereenvoudigd.

De EU is erin geslaagd een prominente rol te spelen bij het vinden van een uitweg uit deze impasse, die het KP dreigde te ondermijnen. In overeenstemming met de hierboven beschreven aanpak, werd het initiatief van de EU ontwikkeld en geleid door de Commissie, doch in nauwe coördinatie met de EDEO, die niet alleen de samenhang van deze aanpak met andere aspecten van het externe optreden van de EU kon helpen waarborgen, maar tevens assistentie kon verlenen bij het leggen van diplomatieke contacten met alle KP-deelnemers.

([1]) PB L 358 van 31.12.2002.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000660/12
to the Commission
Derk Jan Eppink (ECR)
(30 January 2012)

Subject: Kimberly Process — Responsible Institution

The Kimberly Process Certification Scheme (KPCS) is an international agreement that limits the trade in rough diamonds to countries meeting certain criteria.

Within the EU the implementation of the Certification Scheme has been achieved with Council Regulation (EC) No 2368/2002, which set up a Community system of certification and import and export controls for rough diamonds. Moreover, this regulation decided that the Community would be a single participant in the KPCS, and that accordingly the Commission would represent the Community in the KPCS, assisted by a committee in which Member States consult with the Commission.

Until recently, the Commission's Service for Foreign Policy Instruments (DG FPI) and more specifically 'Unit 2: Stability Instrument Operations' coordinated the EU's position in the Kimberley Process. Additionally, it chaired the Committee for Implementation of the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme for the International Trade in Rough Diamonds, which is made up of representatives of the Member States and oversees the implementation of the process at EU level.

However, the EU High Representative Catherine Ashton has issued press releases related to the Kimberley Process, and there are those within the EU that see the competence of DG FPI transferred to the European External Action Service following the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty. Moreover, in January 2011, Ms Ashton appointed the British diplomat Nicholas Westcott Managing Director for Africa in the EEAS, and Mr Westcott has recently been referred to by the BBC as spokesman for the Working Group on Monitoring of the KP, which has been chaired by Stéphane Chardon, part of 'Unit 2: Stability Instrument Operations".

Which EU institution has the final political and legal responsibility for representing the EU Member States in the context of the Kimberley process?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(27 February 2012)

The Commission has represented the EU in the Kimberley Process (KP) since its inception as stipulated by Regulation (EC) No 2368/2002 [1]. The representation of the EU in the KP is handled by the Foreign Policy Instruments (FPI), a service under the authority of Mrs Ashton in her capacity as Vice-President of the Commission. In fulfilling its responsibilities, FPI coordinates with other relevant Commission services, with the European External Action Service (EEAS), and with Member States — primarily through a Committee and through briefing the Council periodically on developments.

The Commission represents the EU at all KP meetings and on all KP working groups, including as chair of the KP's Working Group on Monitoring.

During 2011, the impasse in the KP regarding the status of the diamond-rich Marange region of Zimbabwe took on particular prominence, and a particularly political dimension not only for Zimbabwe but for the wider region. In this context, the Commission has ensured full coordination of the EU's position in the KP with the Africa directorate of the EEAS headed by Nicholas Westcott; he was therefore well placed to discuss the issue for the BBC documentary. The fact that both FPI and EEAS are under the authority of High Representative/Vice-President (HR/VP) Ashton facilitated such coordination.

The EU was able to play a prominent role in finding a way for the KP to move forward from this impasse that had threatened to derail it. In line with the approach described above, the EU's initiative was developed and led by the Commission, but in close coordination with the EEAS who were able to assist not only with ensuring the coherence of this approach with other aspects of EU external action, but also with the diplomatic outreach to all KP participants.

[1] OJ L 358, 31.12.2002.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000666/12
aan de Commissie
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(30 januari 2012)

Betreft: Erkenning van doktersvoorschriften uit een andere lidstaat

In Richtlijn 2011/24/EU betreffende de toepassing van de rechten van patiënten bij grensoverschrijdende gezondheidszorg van 9 maart 2011 wordt het afhalen van geneesmiddelen met doktersvoorschriften uit het thuisland in een andere lidstaat geregeld. Desalniettemin blijven er nog tal van onduidelijkheden bestaan en stuiten Europese burgers vaak op moeilijkheden wanneer ze in het buitenland bij de apotheker geneesmiddelen willen afhalen met een doktersvoorschrift uit eigen land. Om na te gaan hoe de erkenning van grensoverschrijdende doktersvoorschriften verbeterd kan worden, heeft de Europese Commissie een consultatieronde gehouden bij de belangrijkste stakeholders.

Welke conclusies trekt de Commissie uit deze consultatieronde?

Welke stappen zal de Commissie in de nabije toekomst ondernemen, ermee rekening houdend dat er volgens Richtlijn 2011/24/EU uiterlijk op 25 oktober 2012 maatregelen moeten worden genomen door de Commissie om de situatie te verbeteren?

Antwoord van Mr. Dalli namens de Commissie
(13 maart 2012)

Tijdens de raadplegingsronde werd de mening gevraagd van patiënten, dokters, apothekers en de medische industrie. Ze werd afgesloten met een publieksraadpleging op internet tussen 28 oktober 2011 en 8 januari 2012. De bedoeling was om de effectbeoordeling ([1]) ter voorbereiding van uitvoeringshandelingen overeenkomstig artikel 11, lid 2, onder a), c) en d) van Richtlijn 2011/24/EU van 9 maart 2011 betreffende de toepassing van de rechten van patiënten bij grensoverschrijdende gezondheidszorg te verbeteren. De effectbeoordeling zal naar verwachting in mei 2012 worden afgerond. Vóór die datum wil de Commissie op de website van Gezondheid en consumenten alle bijdragen publiceren die ze heeft ontvangen via de publieksraadpleging op internet, evenals een verslag met een analyse van de antwoorden.

Er zijn enkele belangrijke volgende stappen gepland ter voorbereiding van de uitvoeringshandelingen waarnaar verwezen wordt onder c) en d) van artikel 11, lid 2 van Richtlijn 2011/24/EU van 9 maart 2011 betreffende de toepassing van de rechten van patiënten bij grensoverschrijdende gezondheidszorg. De Commissie zal tussen februari en mei 2012 overleg blijven plegen met deskundigen van lidstaten om de effectbeoordeling af te ronden. Daarna zal de Commissie de maatregelen beginnen uit te werken. De bedoeling is om in september 2012 ontwerpuitvoeringsregels voor te leggen aan het Permanent Comité.

([1]) Zie het stappenplan voor de effectbeoordeling: http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/planned_ia/docs/2013_sanco_004_mutual_recognition_of_prescriptions_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000666/12
to the Commission
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(30 January 2012)

Subject: Recognition of prescriptions from other Member States

Directive 2011/24/EU on the application of patients' rights in cross-border healthcare of 9 March 2011 regulates the dispensing of medicinal products on prescriptions from other Member States. Nevertheless, there is still a lack of clarity on many points in this regard and European citizens often encounter difficulties abroad when they go to a pharmacist to pick up medicinal products using a prescription from their home country. The European Commission has held a round of consultations with important stakeholders to identify ways of improving the situation with regard to the recognition of cross-border prescriptions.

What conclusions has the Commission drawn from those consultations?

What steps will the Commission undertake in the near future, considering that, according to Directive 2011/24/EU, the Commission should take action to improve the situation by 25 October 2012 at the latest?

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

The round of consultations included patients, physicians, pharmacists and the medical industry and was completed with a web-based public consultation held between 28 October 2011 and 8 January 2012. The purpose was to enrich an impact assessment ([1]) drafted in preparation of implementing acts under Article 11 para. 2 (a), (c) and (d) of Directive 2011/24/EU of 9 March 2011 on the application of patients' rights in cross-border healthcare. The impact assessment is planned to be finalised by May 2012. Prior to this date, the Commission plans to publish on the Health and Consumers website all contributions it has received to the web-based public consultation, as well as a report analysing the replies.

Some important next steps are planned in preparation of the implementing acts referred to in points (c) and (d) of Article 11 para. 2 of Directive 2011/24/EU of 9 March 2011 on the application of patients' rights in cross-border healthcare. The Commission will continue to hold discussions with experts from Member States between February and May 2012 in order to finalise the impact assessment. The Commission will subsequently start the drafting of the measures. The intention is to present draft implementing rules to the standing committee in September 2012.

([1]) See impact assessment roadmap document:
http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/planned_ia/docs/2013_sanco_004_mutual_recognition_of_prescriptions_en.pdf

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-000713/12
do Komisji
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(30 stycznia 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Zaostrzenie kary dla białoruskich więźniów politycznych

17 stycznia została podjęta decyzja o zaostrzeniu rygoru odbywania kary dla białoruskiego więźnia politycznego Mykoły Autuchowicza, skazanego w maju 2010 r. na pięć lat i dwa miesiące pozbawienia wolności. Autuchowicz zostanie przeniesiony do zamkniętego więzienia. Jest to kara za rzekome naruszenie regulaminu więziennego. Przypominam, że w grudniu 2011 r. ze względu na presję, jaką wywierały na niego władze więzienia, usiłował popełnić samobójstwo.

Również Mykoła Statkiewicz, były kandydat na prezydenta Białorusi, decyzją sądu z 12 stycznia zostanie przeniesiony na 3 lata do więzienia o jeszcze bardziej zaostrzonym rygorze. Przeniesienia domagała się administracja kolonii. Opozycjoniście zarzucono, że „nie poddaje się resocjalizacji w kolonii" i dopuszcza się „złośliwych wykroczeń".

Nieoficjalnie chodzi o to, że ani Statkiewicz, ani Autuchowicz nie chcieli podpisać prośby o ułaskawienie do prezydenta Łukaszenki.

Fala represji białoruskich władz wobec przedstawicieli opozycji i więźniów politycznych narasta. W związku z tym pragnę zapytać Komisję, czy ma zamiar podjąć interwencję w sprawie wyroków dla Autuchowicza i Statkiewicza i wyrazić zdecydowany sprzeciw wobec działań władz Białorusi?

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-000931/12
do Komisji
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(1 lutego 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Andriej Sannikau poddawany torturom w kolonii karnej

25 stycznia w mediach pojawiły się niepokojące informacje na temat byłego kandydata na prezydenta Białorusi, Andrieja Sannikaua, odbywającego obecnie wyrok 5 lat więzienia w kolonii karnej w Witebsku. Jak poinformowała na konferencji prasowej żona Andrieja Sannikaua, 20 listopada polityk został zmuszony do napisania prośby o ułaskawienie do Aleksandra Łukaszenki. Białoruscy opozycjoniści są przekonani, że Sannikau podpisał list, gdyż był poddawany torturom. Możliwe, że właśnie tortury spowodowały, że przez 3 miesiące był on w pełnej izolacji i nie dopuszczano do niego nawet adwokata. Jak poinformowała Irina Chalip, mąż dał jej do zrozumienia, że jeszcze w więzieniu w Mohylewie grożono mu, że zostanie zabita ona i ich 4-letni synek. Podczas widzenia Sannikau przyłożył do szyby kartkę, na której było napisane: „W grę wchodzi życie. W każdej chwili mogą mnie zabić".

Przypominam, że nie jest to pierwsze doniesienie dotyczące tortur i brutalnego traktowania w białoruskich więzieniach. O praktykach tortur stosowanych przez funkcjonariuszy więziennych opowiedział również Aleś Michalewicz, zwolniony z aresztu 19 lutego 2011 r. Polityk poinformował dziennikarzy, że skuwano mu ręce kajdankami oraz pozbawiano go snu. Kazano mu stać nago w rozkroku z podniesionymi do góry rękami. Michalewicza pozbawiano również kontaktu z prawnikiem.

W związku z tym pragnę zapytać, czy Komisji są znane praktyki tortur stosowane przez reżim Łukaszenki w stosunku do więźniów politycznych i czy Komisja ma zamiar podjąć interwencję w sprawie sytuacji Andrieja Sannikaua i pozostałych białoruskich więźniów politycznych?

Wspólna odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Komisji Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(14 marca 2012 r.)

Unia Europejska jest głęboko zaniepokojona doniesieniami o stosowaniu tortur, znęcaniu się nad zatrzymanymi i nieludzkich warunkach przetrzymywania więźniów politycznych na Białorusi, m.in. Andrieja Sannikaua, Mykoły Autuchowicza, Mykoły Statkiewicza, Dzmitrija Bandarenki i Dzmitrija Daszkiewicza. Niepokój Komisji i Wysokiej Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącej budzą również doniesienia o przypadkach odmowy kontaktu z adwokatem i członkami rodziny.

UE wielokrotnie wzywała władze białoruskie, by zwolniły i rehabilitowały wszystkich więźniów politycznych. Za pomocą oświadczeń publicznych i innymi drogami wezwała również władze Białorusi do podjęcia wszelkich koniecznych środków – ustawodawczych, administracyjnych, sądowych i innych – mających zapewnić pełne poszanowanie międzynarodowych zobowiązań prawnych tego kraju w odniesieniu do absolutnego zakazu stosowania tortur oraz innego okrutnego, nieludzkiego lub poniżającego traktowania lub karania.

UE wdrożyła szereg środków ograniczających wobec osób odpowiedzialnych za obecne represje. Dnia 23 stycznia 2012 r. Rada do Spraw Zagranicznych przyjęła decyzję o rozszerzeniu wspomnianych środków na osoby lub podmioty odpowiedzialne za łamanie praw człowieka i represje wobec społeczeństwa obywatelskiego i demokratycznej opozycji, jak również na osoby i podmioty, które czerpały korzyści z istniejącego na Białorusi reżimu bądź też wspierały ten system.

Ponadto UE będzie nadal wspierać działania organizacji społeczeństwa obywatelskiego na Białorusi, m.in. udzielając dalszej pomocy ofiarom represji i ich rodzinom.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000713/12
to the Commission
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(30 January 2012)

Subject: Harsher punishment for Belarusian political prisoners

On 17 January a decision was taken to increase the severity of the punishment for the Belarusian political prisoner Mikalai Autukhovich, who had been sentenced in May 2010 to five years and two months' imprisonment. Autukhovich will be moved to a closed prison. This is punishment for an alleged breach of prison rules. I remind you that in December 2011 he attempted to commit suicide due to pressure from the prison authorities.

In addition, on the basis of a court ruling of 12 January, Nikolai Statkevitch, a former presidential candidate in Belarus, will be moved for three years to a prison with an even stricter regime. The move was requested by the prison administration. The opposition politician was accused of 'not succumbing to rehabilitation' and 'committing malicious transgressions'.

Unofficially, the reason is that neither Statkevitch nor Autukhovich were willing to sign a request for a pardon from President Lukashenko.

The wave of repressions carried out by the Belarusian authorities against representatives of the opposition and political prisoners is only increasing. Does the Commission therefore intend to intervene in the matter of the sentences of Autukhovich and Statkevitch and take a firm stand against the actions of the Belarusian authorities?

Question for written answer P-000931/12
to the Commission
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(1 February 2012)

Subject: Andrei Sannikov subjected to torture in a penal colony

On 25 January disturbing information appeared in the media about a former Belarusian presidential candidate — Andrei Sannikov — who is currently serving a five-year prison term in the Vitebsk penal colony. As Andrei Sannikov's wife, Irina Khalip, told a press conference on 20 November, the politician had been forced to write a request for clemency to Alexander Lukashenko. Belarusian opposition activists are convinced that Sannikov signed the letter because he had been subjected to torture. It is possible that torture was the reason he was held in complete isolation for three months without even access to a lawyer. Khalip said that her husband had led her to understand that while still in prison in Mogilev he had been threatened that she and their four-year-old son would be killed. During a visit, Sannikov pressed a piece of paper to the glass, which read: 'My life is in danger. They can kill me at any moment'.

Note that this is not the first report of torture and brutal treatment in Belarusian prisons. The torture practices used by prison officers were also reported by Ales Mikhalevich, who was released from custody on 19 February 2011. He told journalists that his hands had been handcuffed and he had been deprived of sleep, and that he had been ordered to stand naked with his legs apart and his hands raised. Mikhalevich was also denied contact with a lawyer.

Is the Commission aware of the torture practices used by the Lukashenko regime against political prisoners, and does it intend to intervene in the case of Andrei Sannikov and other Belarusian political prisoners?

Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(14 March 2012)

The EU is deeply concerned by the reports of torture, mistreatment and inhumane prison conditions of political prisoners in Belarus, including Andrei Sannikaw, Mikalay Autokovich, Mikalay Statkevich, Dzmitry Bandarenka and Dzmitry Dashkevich. They are also concerned by the reports of denied access to their lawyers and family members.

The EU has repeatedly called on the Belarusian authorities to release and rehabilitate all political prisoners. It has also, through public statements and by other means, exhorted the authorities of Belarus to take all necessary legislative, administrative, judicial and other measures to ensure the full respect of its international legal obligations with regard to the absolute prohibition of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

The EU has implemented a range of restrictive measures against those responsible for this ongoing repression. On 23 January 2012, the Foreign Affairs Council decided to extend these measures further to cover persons or entities responsible for human rights violations and the repression of civil society and democratic opposition, as well as those who have benefitted from, or supported, the regime in the country.

In addition, the EU will continue its efforts to support the work of civil society organisations in Belarus, including through continued assistance to victims of repression and their families.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000732/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(31 de enero de 2012)

Asunto: Financiación del Proyecto de regadío del Canal Segarra-Garrigues

En la provincia de Lleida, Catalunya, se está ejecutando el Proyecto de regadío del Canal Segarra-Garrigues. Su finalidad inicial era la puesta en regadío de 70 150 hectáreas. Pero dicha puesta en regadío se ha visto directamente afectada por la «Red Natura 2000» (Directivas 1992/43/CEE y 1979/409/CEE), la cual ha comportado que unas 42 100 hectáreas dejen de ser regables —un 60 % del total— al pasar a ser espacios protegidos.

Teniendo en cuenta el artículo 8 de la Directiva Hábitats 1992/43/CEE, en particular los puntos 2 y 3 referentes a la evaluación de la cofinanciación y de las medidas indispensables para el mantenimiento de los hábitats.

1. ¿Puede indicar la Comisión qué medidas se han consensuado o implementado para el mantenimiento o el restablecimiento del estado de conservación de las ZEPA incluidas dentro del ámbito del canal Segarra-Garrigues?

2. ¿Cuáles han sido, o van a ser, los costes totales que se derivarán de la aplicación de las medidas citadas?

3. ¿Quién debe financiarlos?

4. ¿Cual ha sido, o va a ser, la cofinanciación comunitaria prevista para dicha finalidad?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(14 de marzo de 2012)

Las autoridades españolas competentes han adoptado una decisión por la que se declara de interés público superior el proyecto mencionado y se aprueban medidas compensatorias ([1]); se aprueba la declaración de impacto ambiental del proyecto de regadío del canal Segarra-Garrigues ([2]), donde se describen en detalle las medidas pertinentes de atenuación y compensación; y se aprueban los planes de gestión de las zonas de protección especial para las aves en el ámbito del proyecto ([3]).

En lo que se refiere a los costes derivados de la aplicación de los planes de gestión mencionados, la Comisión remite a Su Señoría a las autoridades regionales de Cataluña y a la respuesta ya dada a la pregunta escrita E-009838/2011 ([4]).

Diversos fondos, relacionados, en particular, con la política de cohesión, el desarrollo rural y el programa LIFE, ofrecen de forma integrada posibilidades de cofinanciación por parte de la UE de lugares de la red Natura 2000. Incumbe a los Estados miembros el pleno aprovechamiento de estos fondos para aplicar las medidas de conservación relativas a los lugares de la red Natura 2000. En cuanto al apoyo proporcionado por los fondos de la UE durante el periodo 2007-2013, la Comisión remite a Su Señoría a la respuesta dada a la pregunta escrita E-000733/2012 ([5]).

([1]) Acuerdo GOV/184/2010, de 11 de octubre, por el que se declara que concurren razones imperiosas de interés público de primer orden para la realización del proyecto de regadío y concentración parcelaria del canal Segarra-Garrigues y se aprueban medidas compensatorias (DOGC núm. 5755 — 15.11.2010).

([2]) Resolución MAH/3644/2010, de 22 de octubre, por la que se hace público el Acuerdo de declaración de impacto ambiental del Proyecto de regadío y concentración parcelaria del Segarra-Garrigues. Transformación en regadío, obras de distribución y concentración parcelaria en varios términos municipales (DOGC núm. 5759 — 19.11.2010).

([3]) Acuerdo GOV/185/2010, de 11 de octubre, por el que se aprueban definitivamente el Plan especial de protección del medio natural y del paisaje de los espacios naturales protegidos de la Plana de Lleida y el Plan de gestión de estos espacios (DOGC núm. 5755 — 15.11.2010).

([4]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2011-009838&language=ES.

([5]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000732/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(31 January 2012)

Subject: Financing of the Segarra-Garrigues Canal Irrigation Plan

The Segarra-Garrigues Canal Irrigation Plan is being carried out in the province of Lleida, Catalonia. Its initial purpose was to irrigate 70 150 hectares. However, this irrigation has been directly affected by the 'Natura 2000 network' (Directives 1992/43/EEC and 1979/409/EEC), which has meant that some 42 100 hectares — 60% of the total — are no longer irrigable, since they have become protected areas.

Bearing in mind Article 8 of the Habitats Directive 1992/43/EEC, particularly paragraphs 2 and 3 on assessment of co-financing and the measures essential for the maintenance of habitats:

1. Can the Commission indicate what measures have been agreed to or implemented in order to maintain or re-establish the conservation status of the special protection areas for birds in the area of the Segarra-Garrigues canal?

2. What total costs have been, or will be, incurred in the application of the aforementioned measures?

3. Who should finance them?

4. What Community co-financing has been, or will be, provided for this purpose?

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

The competent authorities of Spain have taken a decision declaring the above project of overriding public interest and specifying the compensatory measures ([1]); approving the environmental impact statement of the Segarra-Garrigues irrigation project ([2]), where the relevant mitigation and compensation measures are described in detail; and approving the Management Plans of the Special Protection Areas for Birds in the area of the project ([3]).

Regarding the costs incurred in the application of the referred management plans, the Commission refers the Honourable Member to the regional authorities of Cataluña and to the answer already given to Written Question E-009838/2011 ([4]).

Possibilities for EU co-financing of Natura 2000 sites are provided for in an integrated way through various EU funds, including for cohesion policy, rural development and in LIFE programme. It is for the Member States to fully avail themselves of these funds for delivering the conservation measures for the Natura 2000 sites. Concerning the support by EU funds during the 2007-2013 period, the Commission refers the Honourable Member to the answer provided to Written Question E-000733/2012 ([5]).

([1]) Acuerdo GOV/184/2010, de 11 de octubre, por el que se declara que concurren razones imperiosas de interés público de primer orden para la realisación del proyecto de regadío y concentración parcelaria del canal Segarra-Garrigues y se aprueban medidas compensatorias (DOGC núm. 5755 — 15/11/2010).

([2]) Resolución MAH/3644/2010, de 22 de octubre, por la que se hace público el Acuerdo de declaración de impacto ambiental del Proyecto de regadío y concentración parcelaria del Segarra-Garrigues. Transformación en regadío, obras de distribución y concentración parcelaria en varios términos municipales (DOGC núm. 5759 — 19/11/2010).

([3]) Acuerdo GOV/185/2010, de 11 de octubre, por el que se aprueban definitivamente el Plan especial de protección del medio natural y del paisaje de los espacios naturales protegidos de la Plana de Lleida y el Plan de gestión de estos espacios (DOGC núm. 5755 (15/11/2010).

([4]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2011-009838&language=EN.

([5]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-000733/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(31 de enero de 2012)

Asunto: Justificación y finalidad de los importes de financiación Segarra Garrigues

Financiación del Proyecto de regadío del Canal Segarra-Garrigues (Comunidad Autónoma de Catalunya-Reino de España)

El 31 de octubre de 2011 se formuló una pregunta parlamentaria a la Comisión sobre la financiación, con fondos comunitarios, del proyecto de regadío del Canal Segarra-Garrigues. Especialmente porque este Proyecto se ha visto afectado considerablemente por la implantación de la «Red Natura 2000» (Directiva Hábitats 1992/43/CEE), resultando una reducción de la zona regable, quedando a sólo un 40 % de la prevista. Se preguntaba si tenía lógica una financiación comunitaria de un proyecto económico que se había recortado considerablemente por razones ambientales.

En su respuesta, de fecha 14 de diciembre de 2011, se manifiesta que durante el período de programación 2000-2006, la región de Cataluña recibió casi 6 millones de euros —2,37 millones correspondientes al FEOGA— para dicho proyecto. Así mismo, se indica que desde el 2007 no se ha financiado en nada.

A la vista de lo anterior,

1. ¿Puede la Comisión informar cuál ha sido el desglose de los conceptos y la especificación de los importes correspondientes a los citados 6 millones de euros destinados al proyecto del canal Segarra-Garrigues?

2. ¿Puede la Comisión informar de cuál ha sido la justificación y finalidad de los 32 millones de euros, atorgados a través del Programa Operativo del Fondo de Cohesión FEDER 2007-2013, para el Proyecto «Abastecimiento desde el canal de Segarra-Garrigues (Lleida)» y de los que ha sido beneficiaria la sociedad estatal Acuaebro?

Respuesta del Sr. Hahn en nombre de la Comisión
(12 de marzo de 2012)

En lo que respecta al proyecto de irrigación Segarra-Garrigues, la Comisión remite a Su Señoría a su respuesta a la pregunta escrita E-9838/11 ([1]), en relación con la asistencia financiera del FEOGA concedida para el periodo 2000-2006. La información adicional sobre este proyecto debe solicitarse a la autoridad de gestión del programa de desarrollo rural «Mejora de las Estructuras de Producción en Regiones Fuera de Objetivo n° 1 en España»:

Dirección General de Desarrollo Rural y Política forestal
Ministerio de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio Ambiente
C/ Alfonso XII, 62
28071 MADRID
Tel: +34 913471911
dgdesar@marm.es

Además, un proyecto relativo al abastecimiento de agua potable del canal Segarra-Garrigues se ha beneficiado de una ayuda adicional ([2]) de 15,5 millones EUR del Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Regional respecto a un coste subvencionable total de 31,3 millones EUR en el marco del programa operativo nacional del FEDER/Fondo de Cohesión para el actual periodo de programación 2007-2013. El desglose de los costes de este proyecto es el siguiente: 1) construcción y edificación: 29,9 millones EUR; 2) asistencia técnica: 1,3 millones EUR; 3) publicidad: 100 000 EUR. Cabe mencionar que este importante proyecto no está relacionado directamente con el proyecto de irrigación mencionado por Su Señoría. Esta cuestión fue explicada claramente por la Comisión en el marco de la petición 195/2011 sobre el mismo asunto.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp
([2]) Decisión de la Comisión de 5.12.2911, C(2011) 8612, «Abastecimiento desde el Canal de Segarra-Garrigues (Lérida)».

Como el FEDER y el Fondo de Cohesión se gestionan en responsabilidad compartida, la Comisión invita a Su Señoría a dirigirse, para cualquier información adicional que necesite, a la autoridad responsable de la gestión:

Dirección General de Fondos Comunitarios
Ministerio de Hacienda
Paseo de la Castellana, 162
28046 MADRID
ARGarcia@sgpg.meh.es

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000733/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(31 January 2012)

Subject: Justification and purpose of funding for Segarra Garrigues

Funding for the Segarra-Garrigues canal irrigation project (Autonomous Community of Catalonia — Kingdom of Spain)

On 31 October 2011, the Commission was asked a parliamentary question regarding the funding from Community funds of the Segarra-Garrigues canal irrigation project, particularly in view of the fact that this project has been considerably affected by the creation of the 'Natura 2000 network' (Habitats Directive 1992/43/EEC), resulting in the irrigable area being cut to just 40% of what had been anticipated. The Commission was asked whether it was logical to use Community funds for an economic project that had been considerably cut back on environmental grounds.

In its response of 14 December 2011, the Commission stated that, during the 2000-2006 programming period, the Catalonia Region received nearly EUR 6 million — EUR 2.37 million under the EAGGF — for said project. It also stated that it had not granted any funding since 2007.

In light of the above,

1. Can the Commission provide information on the breakdown of the headings and give details of how the aforementioned EUR 6 million for the Segarra-Garrigues canal project was allocated?

2. Can the Commission provide information as to the justification and purpose of the EUR 32 million granted through the Operational Programme for the 2007-2013 ERDF Cohesion Fund to the 'Supply from the Segarra-Garrigues (Lleida) Canal' project and of the funding from which the State enterprise ACUAEBRO benefited?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(12 March 2012)

As regards the Segarra-Garrigues irrigation project, the Commission would like the Honourable Member to refer to its answer to the Written Question E-9838/11 ([1]) in relation to the EAGGF financial assistance granted under the 2000-2006 period. Further details about this project should be requested to the managing authority of the Rural Development Programme 'Mejora de las Estructuras de Producción en Regiones Fuera de Objetivo N° 1 en España':

Dirección General de Desarrollo Rural y Política forestal
Ministerio de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio Ambiente
C/ Alfonso XII, 62
28071 Madrid
Tel.: +34 913471911
dgdesar@marm.es

Moreover, a project concerning drinking water supply from the Canal Segarra-Garrigues has benefited from a further aid ([2]) of EUR 15.5 million from the European Regional Development Fund relative to a total eligible cost of EUR 31.3 million under the national ERDF- Cohesion Fund operational programme for the current programming period 2007-13. The breakdown of cost for this project is the following: 1) building and edification: EUR 29.9 million; 2) technical assistance: EUR 1.3 million; 3) publicity: EUR 100 000. It is important to note that this major project is not directly related to the irrigation project mentioned by the Honourable Member. This question has been clearly explained by the Commission in the framework of Petition 195/2011 on the same matter.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp
([2]) Commission decision of 5.12.2011 (C(2011)8612) 'Abastecimiento desde el Canal de Segarra-Garrigues (Lérida)'.

As the ERDF and the Cohesion Fund are managed under shared responsibility, the Commission invites the Honourable member to request any further information to the responsible managing authority:

Dirección General de Fondos Comunitarios
Ministerio de Hacienda
Paseo de la Castellana, 162
28046 Madrid
ARGarcia@sgpg.meh.es

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-000774/12
til Kommissionen
Ole Christensen (S&D)
(31. januar 2012)

Om: Ungdomsledighed og uddannelsessystemet

Der kan ikke være tvivl om, at den alarmerende høje ungdomsledighed i EU er øverst på listen over vores bekymringer. Millioner af unge har mistet kontakten med arbejdsmarkedet og risikerer at blive tabt på gulvet.

Der er grund til at tro, at der er en vis sammenhæng mellem den måde, som uddannelsessystemet er skruet sammen på, og omfanget af ungdomsarbejdsløsheden er. I de få lande, hvor man har et såkaldt vekseluddannelsessystem, der effektivt kobler bred, teoretisk indlæring i skoleforløb med længere praktikophold på en virksomhed under ordnede forhold, er ungdomsledigheden markant lavere end andre steder.

Det nytter ikke noget at uddanne de unge til jobs, der ikke udbydes. Der skal derfor være en tæt kobling mellem erhvervslivets behov og uddannelsernes sammensætning. Dette skal selvfølgelig ske inden for en ramme, der kvalitetssikrer praktikopholdene på virksomhederne — sådan at fokus fastholdes på uddannelse og oplæring af de unge.

1. Ifølge bl.a. OECD er der en positiv sammenhæng mellem vekseluddannelse og fremtidige beskæftigelsesmuligheder, idet vekseluddannelse øger de unges »employability«. Hvad kan Kommissionen gøre for at udbrede de positive erfaringer med et vekseluddannelsessystem til flere medlemsstater?

2. En række medlemsstater har i deres nationale EU2020-reformprogrammer allerede opsat mål om at bringe deres uddannelsessystemer tættere på arbejdsmarkedets behov, ved f.eks. at styrke vekseluddannelsesprincipperne. Hvordan kan Kommissionen understøtte medlemsstaternes bestræbelser?

3. Der er en række initialudgifter forbundet med at udvikle og omdanne et uddannelsessystem. Hvordan forholder Kommissionen sig til at øremærke ESF-midler til at dække initialudgifter i de medlemsstater, der ønsker at udvikle deres uddannelsessystemer i retning af øget brug af de såkaldte vekseluddannelser?

4. Erhvervsuddannede vil også i fremtiden udgøre kernearbejdskraftressourcen i den private sektor. Har Kommissionen planer om at iværksætte initiativer, der skal sikre, at flere unge får en erhvervsfaglig uddannelse?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Androulla Vassiliou
(12. marts 2012)

Som led i EU's 2020-strategi for uddannelse fremmer Kommissionen peerlæring mellem medlemsstaterne og tilskynder til bedste praksis. EU's program for livslang læring støtter grænseoverskridende lærlingeuddannelser og praktikophold med et samlet budget på 250 mio. EUR (80 000 lærlinge og 50 000 praktikanter) for 2012. I 2011 iværksatte Kommissionen initiativet om bedre muligheder for unge med fokus på de udfordringer, de unge står over for på arbejdsmarkedet.

Kommissionen bedømmer medlemsstaternes reformprogrammer under det europæiske semester. En tilpasning af uddannelsessystemerne til behovene på arbejdsmarkedet står øverst på prioriteringslisten og førte til 16 landespecifikke henstillinger i 2011.

Der ydes støtte til modernisering af uddannelsessystemerne via Den Europæiske Socialfond, og Kommissionen har til hensigt at prioritere denne investering i fremtiden. På Det Europæiske Råds uformelle møde den 30. januar meddelte Kommissionens formand José Manuel Barroso, at der vil blive foretaget en revision af EU's tildelinger af midler til lande, hvor ungdomsarbejdsløsheden er højere end 30 % (Grækenland, Irland, Italien, Letland, Litauen, Portugal, Slovakiet og Spanien). Fælles team med deltagelse af nationale embedsmænd og tjenestemænd fra Kommissionen vil finde frem til, hvordan ikke-tildelte midler fra strukturfondene kan omdirigeres til disse lande, bl.a. til praktikophold og uddannelse under programmet for livslang læring.

I henhold til Bruggekommunikéet om et styrket europæisk samarbejde om erhvervsrettet uddannelse skal medlemsstaterne, arbejdsmarkedets parter og Kommissionen bestræbe sig på at udvikle et moderne og attraktivt erhvervsuddannelsessystem inden 2020. EU vil understøtte disse bestræbelser via sit nye uddannelsesprogram »Erasmus for Alle«, som blev foreslået af Kommissionen i november 2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000774/12
to the Commission
Ole Christensen (S&D)
(31 January 2012)

Subject: Youth unemployment and the educational system

There can be no doubt that the alarmingly high rate of youth unemployment in the EU is at the top of our list of concerns. Millions of young people have lost touch with the labour market and are at risk of being left behind.

There is reason to believe that there is a direct link between the way the educational system is structured and the extent of youth unemployment. In those few countries which have introduced work-linked training, which combines broad-based, theoretical learning at school in an effective manner with properly regulated longer-term work experience in a company, youth unemployment is noticeably lower than elsewhere.

There is no point in training young people to do jobs which are not available. The needs of business and the educational structure must therefore be closely interlinked. This must obviously occur within a framework which ensures the quality of work experience placements in companies, so as to ensure that the focus continues to be on the education and training of young people.

1. According to bodies such as the OECD, there is a positive correlation between work-linked training and future employment opportunities, as work-linked training enhances young people's employability. What can the Commission do to extend the positive experiences of a work-linked training system to more Member States?

2. In their national EU2020 reform programmes a number of Member States have already set targets with a view to making education systems more relevant to the needs of the labour market, e.g. by strengthening the principles of work-linked training. How can the Commission support the efforts of these Member States?

3. There are a number of initial expenses associated with developing and transforming an education system. What is the position of the Commission on earmarking ESF funds to cover the initial expenses of those Member States wishing to develop their education systems so as to make greater use of work-linked training?

4. In the future, those who have received vocational training will constitute the core labour resource in the private sector. Does the Commission have any plans to implement initiatives to ensure that more young people receive vocational training?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(12 March 2012)

Under the EU Education and Training 2020 strategy, the Commission facilitates peer learning between Member States and promotes best practice. The EU Lifelong Learning Programme supports transnational apprenticeships and traineeships, with a total budget of EUR 250 million (80 000 apprentices and 50 000 trainees) for 2012. In 2011 the Commission launched the Youth Opportunities Initiative, focusing on the challenges facing young people on the labour market.

The Commission evaluates Member States' Reform Programmes under the European Semester. Adapting education and training systems to labour market needs is a core priority and led to 16 Country Specific Recommendations in 2011.

Support for modernisation of education and training systems is available from the European Social Fund, and the Commission intends to maintain this investment priority in the future ([1]). At the informal European Council on 30 January, President Barroso announced a review of EU funding allocations in countries where youth unemployment is above 30% (Greece, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Portugal, Slovakia and Spain). Joint actions teams involving national and Commission officials will identify opportunities for redirecting unallocated structural funds in these countries, including for apprenticeships and training under the Lifelong Learning Programme.

([1]) COM(2011) 607 final, Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the European Social Fund and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1081/2006, Article 3 (1. b).

The Bruges Communiqué on Enhanced European Cooperation in Vocational Education and Training committed Member States, social Partners and the Commission to the development of a modern and attractive VET system by 2020. The EU will contribute to these efforts through its new education and training programme, 'Erasmus for All', which the Commission proposed in November 2011.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000778/12
alla Commissione
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(31 gennaio 2012)

Oggetto: Spose bambine nello Yemen

Nel dicembre 2011, Human Rights Watch ha pubblicato una relazione sull'agghiacciante fenomeno delle spose bambine nello Yemen. Secondo un'indagine condotta nel 2006 dal governo yemenita e dal Fondo delle Nazioni Unite per l'infanzia (UNICEF), il 14 % delle bambine nello Yemen si sposa prima di compiere i 15 anni e il 52 % prima di compiere i 18. Nel 2005 l'Università di Sanaa ha rilevato che in alcune aree rurali vengono date in sposa persino bambine di otto anni.

Attualmente nello Yemen non è prevista un'età minima per contrarre matrimonio. Sia i bambini che le bambine possono sposarsi a qualsiasi età, ma in pratica più frequentemente sono le bambine ad essere sposate in giovane età. Nel 1999 il parlamento yemenita ha abrogato l'articolo 15 della legge nazionale sullo status personale, che fissava l'età minima per contrarre matrimonio a 15 anni per i bambini e le bambine. L'unica protezione offerta ai sensi del summenzionato articolo 15 è il divieto di avere rapporti sessuali con le bambine prima che abbiano raggiunto la pubertà.

Fra le conseguenze del matrimonio in età infantile vi è l'abbandono scolastico da parte delle bambine, che preclude loro la possibilità di trovare un impiego redditizio e non consente loro di controllare la propria salute riproduttiva. Lo Yemen presenta già ora uno dei tassi di mortalità materna più alti della regione.

Molti funzionari del parlamento yemenita concordano sul fatto che proibire il matrimonio in età infantile sia fondamentale per tutelare i diritti delle bambine. Tuttavia, alcuni deputati conservatori sostengono che la fissazione di un'età minima per il matrimonio comporterebbe una «diffusione dell'immoralità» e sarebbe contrario alla Sharia. Nel 2009 la maggioranza dei parlamentari ha votato a favore della fissazione dell'età minima per contrarre matrimonio a 17 anni, ma l'opposizione conservatrice ha fatto ricorso a una procedura parlamentare per bloccare la proposta di legge a tempo indeterminato.

Lo Yemen è parte di vari trattati e convenzioni internazionali che proibiscono il matrimonio in età infantile e che impegnano gli Stati parte a prendere provvedimenti per eliminare la pratica. Tra questi si annoverano la Convenzione sui diritti del fanciullo e la Convenzione sull'eliminazione di ogni forma di discriminazione nei confronti della donna.

1. È al corrente la Commissione del diffuso problema dei matrimoni infantili nello Yemen?

2. Quale ruolo è disposta a svolgere per persuadere la nuova autorità ad interim di Abd Rabbu Mansour Hadi a stabilire a 18 anni l'età minima per contrarre matrimonio, il che sarebbe conforme alla definizione contenuta nella Convenzione sui diritti del fanciullo?

3. Ha tentato in passato di sollevare la questione con le autorità yemenite? In caso affermativo, con quali risultati? Tali autorità hanno adottato delle misure? Quali?

4. Collabora la Commissione attualmente con organizzazioni e ONG locali che s'impegnano per migliorare l'accesso ai servizi per la salute riproduttiva e per sostenere il diritto delle bambine all'istruzione scolastica? In caso negativo, sarebbe disposta a contattare le ONG attive in questo campo?

Risposta data dall'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(23 marzo 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza del diffuso problema dei matrimoni infantili nello Yemen. La condizione delle donne yemenite in generale e dei matrimoni infantili in particolare preoccupa seriamente l'Unione europea.

Nei suoi contatti con il governo, l'Unione rammenta regolarmente allo Yemen i suoi obblighi internazionali, giacché il paese ha ratificato sia la convenzione sull'eliminazione di ogni forma di discriminazione nei confronti della donna, sia la convenzione sui diritti del fanciullo.

A causa dell'instabilità politica del paese che ha portato a un'interruzione delle attività parlamentari, non è stato possibile discutere la proposta di legge relativa ai matrimoni precoci previamente bloccata dalle forze religiose conservatrici.

Il governo di transizione dello Yemen si trova ora a dover fronteggiare molteplici sfide per rispondere alle necessità di una popolazione in condizioni di estrema difficoltà. Le questioni relative ai diritti umani sono uno dei settori che richiedono urgentemente l'attenzione del governo.

La Commissione intrattiene un dialogo costante con le autorità yemenite su tutti i problemi in materia di diritti umani — in particolare i diritti delle donne e dei bambini — a ogni livello, sia all'interno del paese, tramite la delegazione UE, che nel corso di incontri e colloqui ufficiali. Periodicamente vengono intraprese iniziative su questi temi con le autorità e i parlamentari del paese. L'Unione europea prosegue altresì un dialogo continuo e una collaborazione costante con il Ministero responsabile dei diritti umani.

La Commissione è inoltre in contatto diretto con le organizzazioni della società civile in difesa dei diritti delle bambine yemenite e sostiene, attraverso una serie di progetti, molte organizzazioni locali che si occupano di questioni relative alla promozione e alla tutela dei diritti delle donne e dei bambini.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000778/12
to the Commission
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(31 January 2012)

Subject: Child brides in Yemen

In December 2011 Human Rights Watch released a report on the shocking phenomenon of child brides in Yemen. According to a 2006 survey by the Yemeni government and Unicef, 14% of girls in Yemen are married before reaching the age of 15 and 52% before 18. In 2005 the University of Sana'a reported that in some rural areas girls are young as eight are married.

At present Yemen has no minimum age for marriage. Boys and girls can be married at any age, but in practice it is girls who are most often married young. In 1999 Yemen's parliament repealed Article 15 of the country's Personal Status Law, which had set the minimum age for both boys and girls at 15. The only protection offered under that Article 15 was the prohibition on sexual intercourse until a girl reaches puberty.

Among the consequences of child marriage is that of girls having to cut short their education, meaning they have little chance of finding gainful employment and little control over their reproductive health. Yemen already has one of the region's highest maternal mortality rates.

Many parliamentary figures in Yemen agree that a ban on child marriage is fundamental to safeguarding the rights of young girls. However, a number of conservative deputies argue that setting a minimum age for marriage would lead to 'the spreading of immorality' and would be contrary to Sharia law. In 2009, a majority of parliamentarians voted to set the minimum age for marriage at 17, but the conservative opposition used a parliamentary procedure to stall the draft law indefinitely.

Yemen is party to a number of international treaties and conventions that prohibit child marriage and commit states parties to take measures to eliminate the practice. These include the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women.

1. Is the Commission aware of the problem of widespread child marriage in Yemen?

2. What role is the Commission prepared to play in persuading the new interim authority of Abd-Rabbu Mansour Hadi to set a minimum age for marriage of 18, which would be in accordance with the definition in the Convention on the Rights of the Child?

3. Has the Commission tried to approach the Yemeni authorities in the past about the problems mentioned above? If so, what was the outcome, and what steps, if any, did the authorities take?

4. Is the Commission currently working with local organisations and NGOs which are involved in improving access to reproductive health services and supporting the right of girls to stay in school? If not, would the Commission be prepared to reach out to NGOs working in this field?

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

The Commission is well aware of the widespread problem of child marriage in Yemen. The situation of women in Yemen in general and child marriages in particular are of great concern to the EU.

In its contacts with the Yemeni government, the EU regularly reminds Yemen of its international obligations, as Yemen has ratified the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) as well as the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC).

Draft legislation on child marriage previously blocked by conservative religious forces has not been debated as a result of the political unrest which interrupted parliamentary activities.

The transitional Yemeni government now faces multiple challenges addressing the needs of a suffering population. Human rights issues are among the areas the government has to pay attention to urgently.

The Commission pursues a continuous dialogue with the Yemeni authorities on all issues related to human rights, in particular women's and children's rights, at all levels, both in-country through the EU Delegation and during official meetings and dialogues. Regular demarches are made with the Yemeni authorities and parliamentarians. The EU also maintains a standing dialogue and constant cooperation with the Ministry of Human Rights.

In addition the Commission is directly in contact with civil society organisations who advocate for girls' rights in Yemen. The Commission is supporting, through a number of projects, many local organisations working on issues related to promotion and protection of women's and children's rights.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000784/12
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(31 January 2012)

Subject: Use of EU taxpayers' money

In these times of austerity, how is the Commission ensuring that EU taxpayers' euros are used to maximum effect and waste is kept to the absolute minimum?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(12 March 2012)

The efficiency of public spending is an important concern of the Commission, particularly at this time when growth-friendly and differentiated fiscal consolidation is a pre-requisite for restoring confidence in the sustainability of public finances. In its 2012 Annual Growth Survey (AGS), the Commission has set out concrete avenues for fiscal consolidation while protecting growth-enhancing spending, e.g. on education, research and development, as well as infrastructure investment. The Commission also made proposals to reduce harmful tax practices, tax evasion and tax fraud, e.g. in the annex on the 2012 AGS. The Commission contributes to ensuring efficient public spending of Member States through the country-specific recommendations under the Stability and Growth Pact.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000829/12
alla Commissione
Giancarlo Scottà (EFD)
(1º febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: Etteraggio nella riforma della PAC

Il paragrafo 5 dell'articolo 22 della proposta di regolamento recante norme sui pagamenti diretti agli agricoltori nell'ambito dei regimi di sostegno previsti dalla politica agricola comune prevede che «Al più tardi a decorrere dall'anno di domanda 2019, tutti i diritti all'aiuto di un dato Stato membro o, in caso di applicazione dell'articolo 20, di una data regione, hanno un valore unitario uniforme».

L'articolo 20 cui si fa riferimento nel sopraddetto articolo recita al primo paragrafo: «Gli Stati membri hanno la facoltà di decidere, anteriormente al 1º agosto 2013, di applicare il regime di pagamento di base a livello regionale. In tal caso essi definiscono le regioni secondo criteri oggettivi e non discriminatori, quali le caratteristiche agronomiche ed economiche e il potenziale agricolo regionale o la struttura istituzionale o amministrativa».

È un dato di fatto che le regioni e gli stessi Stati membri presentano, a tutti gli effetti, caratteristiche e differenze sostanziali tra di loro.

Ha la Commissione valutato la possibilità che non vi sia una ragione di principio per cui ogni ettaro di superficie dell'UE debba ricevere un pagamento di base uniforme, considerato che la produttività della terra e dei costi di produzione del cibo e la distribuzione di servizi ambientali varia enormemente da una zona all'altra e il valore dei servizi prodotti cambia da regione a regione?

Risposta data da Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(2 marzo 2012)

È diventato sempre più difficile giustificare le notevoli differenze individuali nel livello del sostegno per ettaro determinate dall'uso di riferimenti storici o dalla qualità dei fattori di produzione. Il sostegno diretto al reddito dovrebbe pertanto essere distribuito in maniera più equa.

Tuttavia, poiché permangono disparità sostanziali, è stata proposta una formula per ridurre le attuali differenze tra gli Stati membri.

La proposta prevede inoltre la possibilità per gli Stati membri di applicare il regime di pagamento di base a livello regionale, onde poter differenziare il valore dei diritti all'aiuto in modo da venire incontro alle preoccupazioni espresse dall'onorevole parlamentare.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000829/12
to the Commission
Giancarlo Scottà (EFD)
(1 February 2012)

Subject: Hectarage in the PAC reform

Article 22(5) of the draft regulation on establishing rules for direct payments to farmers under support schemes within the framework of the common agricultural policy states: 'As of claim year 2019 at the latest, all payment entitlements in a Member State or, in case of application of Article 20, in a region, shall have a uniform unit value'.

Article 20(1), as referred to in the aforementioned article, reads : 'Member States may decide, before 1 August 2013, to apply the basic payment scheme at regional level. In that case, they shall define the regions in accordance with objective and non-discriminatory criteria such as their agronomic and economic characteristics and their regional agricultural potential, or their institutional or administrative structure'.

It is a fact that regions and, in turn, Member States have markedly specific characteristics and substantial differences.

Has the Commission considered the possibility that there is no fundamental reason why every hectare in the EU should receive the same uniform basic payment, given that soil productivity rates and food production costs, as well as the provision of environmental services, vary enormously from one area to another, and that the value of services produced varies from one region to another?

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

It has become increasingly difficult to justify the presence of significant individual differences in the level of support per hectare resulting from the use of historical references or the quality of production factors. Therefore, direct income support should be more equitably distributed.

However, due to the fact that currently substantial differences still exist, a formula has been proposed that would even out the existing differences among Member States to a certain extent.

In addition, the proposal contains also the possibility for Member States to apply the basic payment scheme at a regional level, whereby Member States can differentiate the value of the payment entitlements in a way to meet the Honourable Member's concerns.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000834/12
to the Commission
Nicole Sinclaire (NI)
(1 February 2012)

Subject: SMEs and job creation

President Barroso has suggested that the EU's unemployment problem could be solved if every SME employed one more person.

Is the Commission aware that EU regulations, such as the Agency Workers Directive, the Parental Leave Directive and the Pregnant Workers Directive, are causing added costs for SMEs and preventing them from expanding their workforces?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(14 March 2012)

EU legislation applies the principles of smart regulation and the 'think small first' approach to avoid imposing any unnecessary regulatory burden, in particular on SMEs. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its latest report on the subject ([1]), which recommends reviewing EU legislation to adapt it to the specific circumstances of SMEs. It also advocates for assessing the possibility of exempting micro-enterprises from the scope of EU legislation, without prejudice to the overall public policy objectives and unless the proportionality of their being covered can be demonstrated.

Exempting SMEs from the scope of Directive 2008/104/EC ([2]) on temporary agency work would reduce the degree of protection of the workers concerned, introduce distortion of competition and exclude the companies concerned from benefiting from the review of restrictions on the use of temporary agency work.

As far as the Parental Leave Directive 2010/18/EU ([3]) is concerned, Member States may already authorise special arrangements to meet the operational and organisational requirements of small undertakings. However, exempting SMEs from the scope of the Pregnant Workers Directive ([4]) would run counter to the basic health and safety, equality and social public policy objectives that the EU has worked for since it was established.

The Commission recently has taken key initiatives which resulted in simplifying the preparation of annual accounts for Europe's smallest companies in February 2012 and looks forward to the Council and Parliament swiftly agreeing its proposals from October 2011 that amend the Accounting Directives to reduce burdens for all SMEs ([5]).

([1]) 'Minimising regulatory burden for SMEs: Adapting EU regulation to the needs of micro-enterprises' (COM(2011) 803 of 23 November 2011).
([2]) Directive 2008/104/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 November 2008 on temporary agency work, OJ L 327, 5.12.2008.
([3]) Council Directive 2010/18/EU of 8 March 2010 implementing the revised Framework Agreement on parental leave concluded by BUSINESSEUROPE, UEAPME, CEEP and ETUC and repealing Directive 96/34/EC, OJ L 68, 18.3.2010.
([4]) Council Directive 92/85/EEC of 19 October 1992 on the introduction of measures to encourage improvements in the safety and health at work of pregnant workers and workers who have recently given birth or are breastfeeding, OJ L 348, 28.11.1992.
([5]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/12/125&format=HTML&aged=0&language=en&guiLanguage=en.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000836/12
aan de Commissie
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(1 februari 2012)

Betreft: Emissiestandaarden Euro 5 en Euro 6 voor dieselwagens

Sinds 2009 moeten voertuigen voldoen aan de Euro 5-emissiestandaard. Recent onderzoek heeft aangetoond dat er zich een probleem stelt op het vlak van dieselvoertuigen wat betreft de uitstoot van stikstofoxiden (NO_x). De uitstoot hiervan die wordt gemeten in de Europese testcyclus zou tot drie maal lager liggen dan de reële uitstoot in het verkeer. In werkelijkheid liggen de gemiddelde snelheid, het aantal accelleraties en de druk op de motor immers hoger dan in de Europese testcyclus wordt gesimuleerd. Dit blijkt ook uit een artikel van Martin Weiss e.a. (Joint Research Centre) in Environmental Science and Technology, 45.

Ook voor de Euro 6-norm die in september 2014 van kracht wordt, dreigt dit probleem te blijven bestaan. De negatieve gevolgen voor het milieu zijn evident. De ambitie van de Euro 5- en Euro 6-verordening om bij te dragen tot EU-doelstellingen inzake luchtkwaliteit in de lidstaten komt hiermee ernstig in het gedrang.

Is de Commissie op de hoogte van het probleem?

Heeft de Commissie plannen om een aanvullende testcyclus in te voeren voor dieselvoertuigen?

Op welke manier denkt de Commissie dit probleem aan te pakken? Welke tijdpad heeft ze daarbij voor ogen?

Antwoord van de heer Tajani namens de Commissie
(21 maart 2012)

Onderzoek van de Commissie (uitgevoerd door het JRC en op verzoek van DG ENTR) heeft er in grote mate toe bijgedragen dat men zich bewust is geworden van het genoemde probleem, zoals blijkt uit verschillende publicaties ([1]).

De Commissie is van mening dat dit probleem beter kan worden aangepakt door een testprocedure voor emissies in reële rijomstandigheden in te stellen dan door bijkomende testcycli voor dieselmotoren in te voeren.

Een testprocedure voor emissies in reële rijomstandigheden zou de huidige typegoedkeuringsprocedure aanvullen door de emissies van voertuigen in een groot aantal normale rijomstandigheden te bepalen volgens het „not-to-exceed"-principe.

De emissiewaarden die het resultaat zijn van een dergelijke testprocedure, mogen een vooraf bepaalde waarde, die wordt berekend door de desbetreffende wettelijke emissiegrenswaarde te vermenigvuldigen met een tolerantiefactor groter dan maar dichtbij 1, niet overschrijden. De tolerantiefactor wordt gebruikt om statistische onzekerheden van de procedure op te vangen. Een voorbeeld van een dergelijke procedure is het op de weg meten van verontreinigende emissies door middel van draagbare emissiemeetsystemen, die al zijn voorgeschreven in Verordening (EU) nr. 582/2011 van de Commissie van 25 mei 2011 (Euro VI).

Voor de testprocedure voor emissies in reële rijomstandigheden van lichte bedrijfsvoertuigen heeft de Commissie een werkgroep van deskundigen onder leiding van het JRC en het DG ENTR opgericht die, in nauwe samenwerking met de belanghebbende partijen, momenteel de uitvoerbaarheid van twee mogelijke typegoedkeuringsprocedures aan het beoordelen is: (i) emissietests in een laboratorium met willekeurig gegenereerde testcycli en (ii) emissietests op de weg met behulp van draagbare emissiemeetsystemen.

De testprocedure voor emissies in reële rijomstandigheden wordt momenteel ontwikkeld door het JRC, in nauwe samenwerking met de belanghebbende partijen. Deze procedure zal zo spoedig mogelijk na de data waarop Euro 6 verplicht wordt, volledig worden toegepast.

([1]) Weiss M, Bonnel P, Hummel R, Manfredi U, Provenza A. On-road Emissions of Light-duty Vehicles in Europe. ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE and TECHNOLOGY 45 (19); 2011. blz. 8575-8581. JRC65638.
Weiss M, Bonnel P, Hummel R, Manfredi U, Colombo R, Lanappe G, Le Lijour P, Sculati M. Analyzing on-road Emissions of Light-duty Vehicles with Portable Emission Measurement Systems (PEMS). EUR 24697 EN. Luxemburg (Luxemburg): Bureau voor publicaties van de Europese Unie; 2011. JRC62639.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000836/12
to the Commission
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(1 February 2012)

Subject: Euro 5 and Euro 6 emission standards for diesel cars

Vehicles have had to comply with the Euro 5 emission standard since 2009. Recent research has indicated that there is a problem with diesel vehicles in terms of nitrogen oxides (NOx) emissions. The NOx emission levels measured in the European test cycle appear to be up to three times lower than the on-road emissions. This is due to the fact that, in traffic, the average speed, the number of accelerations and the engine load are higher than those simulated during the European test cycle. This is also stated in an article by Martin Weiss et al (Joint Research Centre) in Environmental Science and Technology, 45.

This is likely to remain a problem for the Euro 6 standard, which is coming into effect in September 2014. The negative impact on the environment is obvious. This seriously undermines the ambition of the Euro 5 and Euro 6 Regulation to help achieve EU targets on air quality in Member States.

Is the Commission aware of this problem?

Is the Commission planning to introduce an additional test cycle for diesel vehicles?

How does the Commission intend to address this issue? Which time frame does it have in mind?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(21 March 2012)

The Commission's own research (performed by the JRC and requested by DG ENTR) has largely contributed to the awareness of the mentioned problem as demonstrated by several publications ([1]).

The Commission considers that the best way to address the issue is by implementing a 'real driving emissions test procedure (RDETP)' rather than by introducing additional test cycles for diesel vehicles.

A RDETP would complement the current type approval procedure by assessing the emissions of vehicles under a wide range of normal driving conditions according to the not-to-exceed principle.

The emission values resulting from such a test procedure should not exceed a pre-defined value established by multiplying the relevant regulatory emission limit with a compliance factor greater than but close to 1. The compliance factor can be considered for absorbing statistical uncertainties associated with the procedure. An example for such procedure is the measurement on the road of pollutant emissions by means of portable emission measurement systems (PEMS) already prescribed by the Commission Regulation No 582/2011 of 25 May 2011 (Euro VI).

As far as the real driving emission test procedure for light duty vehicles is concerned, the Commission has initiated an expert working group under the leadership of the JRC and DG ENTR that, in close collaboration with the stakeholders, is currently assessing the feasibility of two candidate test procedures for type approval: (i) emission tests in the laboratory with randomly generated test cycles and (ii) on-road emission testing with PEMS.

The real driving test procedure is currently being developed by the JRC in close collaboration with stakeholders, with full implementation as close as possible to the mandatory Euro 6 dates.

([1]) Weiss M, Bonnel P, Hummel R, Manfredi U, Provenza A. On-road emissions of light-duty vehicles in Europe. *Environmental Science and Technology* 45 (19); 2011. p. 8575-8581. JRC65638.
Weiss M, Bonnel P, Hummel R, Manfredi U, Colombo R, Lanappe G, Le Lijour P, Sculati M. Analysing on-road emissions of light-duty vehicles with Portable Emission Measurement Systems (PEMS). EUR 24697 EN. Luxembourg (Luxembourg): Publications Office of the European Union; 2011. JRC62639.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000839/12
alla Commissione
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(3 febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: La Martinica e la concorrenza nei trasporti aerei

La Martinica è un'isola dei Caraibi orientali, nonché la seconda più grande tra le Antille francesi.

Stante che il territorio fa parte dei Dipartimenti d'oltremare francesi, i molti visitatori che ogni anno si recano sull'isola non hanno molta varietà di scelta quanto a compagnie aeree in quanto le uniche a effettuare la tratta sono Air France, Air Caraibes e Corsairfly, tutte compagnie francesi.

Si tratta solo di un esempio, ma se si osserva la legislazione dell'UE in materia di concorrenza nei trasporti aerei, emergono chiaramente le differenze con il trasporto ferroviario e quello marittimo dove la liberalizzazione è stata maggiore.

Cosa intende fare la Commissione per colmare le lacune di un settore dei trasporti chiaramente in crescita e che può altresì contribuire a facilitare l'integrazione europea?

Risposta data da Siim Kallas a nome della Commissione
(7 marzo 2012)

Fin dalla creazione del mercato unico sull'aviazione negli anni '90, le politiche condotte dall'Unione europea hanno profondamente trasformato l'industria del trasporto aereo creando i presupposti della competitività e assicurando qualità del servizio e massimo livello di sicurezza. Di ciò hanno beneficiato i consumatori, le compagnie aeree, gli aeroporti e gli addetti del settore: le politiche dell'UE hanno incrementato l'attività, offerto una più ampia possibilità di scelta, fatto scendere i prezzi e migliorato la qualità generale del servizio.

In questo contesto, al fine di mantenere servizi aerei di linea adeguati su tratte che, pur non essendo redditizie, sono essenziali per lo sviluppo economico della regione che servono, gli Stati membri hanno la possibilità di imporre su queste tratte obblighi di servizio pubblico. I principali beneficiari di questi obblighi di servizio pubblico, resi possibili dalla legislazione UE, sono state le regioni ultraperiferiche. Nel caso della Martinica, tra il territorio francese situato sul continente europeo e Fort-de-France operano tre compagnie aeree.

Non è appropriato considerare l'assenza di collegamenti aerei diretti tra altre città dell'UE e Fort-de-France come una lacuna della liberalizzazione del trasporto aereo. È difficile stabilire tratte di lungo raggio tra Fort-de-France e città dell'UE che possano eguagliare i legami privilegiati esistenti tra la Martinica e il territorio francese situato sul continente europeo. Per le tratte provenienti dall'Europa, la Martinica è inoltre in concorrenza con altre destinazioni turistiche nella regione dei Caraibi, un altro fattore che incide sullo sviluppo delle rotte tra le città dell'UE e la Martinica.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000839/12
to the Commission
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(3 February 2012)

Subject: Martinique and air transport competition

Martinique is the second largest island of the French Antilles, in the eastern Caribbean.

As Martinique is a French Overseas Department, and the only carriers that operate services to it are French companies, Air France, Air Caraibes and Corsairfly, the many visitors who travel to the island every year do not have a wide choice of flights.

While this is only one example, a brief look at the EU legislation on air transport competition shows there to be clear differences between this sector and the rail and maritime transport sectors, where liberalisation has gone further.

What does the Commission intend to do to remedy this shortcoming in a rapidly growing transport sector which can also promote European integration?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(7 March 2012)

Since the creation of a single market for aviation in the 1990s, European policy has profoundly transformed the air transport industry by creating the conditions for competitiveness and ensuring both quality of service and the highest level of safety. Consumers, airlines, airports and employees have all benefited as this policy has led to more activity, new routes and airports, greater choice, low prices and an increased overall quality of service.

As part of this policy, in order to maintain appropriate scheduled air services on routes which are not profitable but vital for the economic development of the region they serve, Member States have the possibility to impose public service obligations (PSOs) on these routes. Ultra peripheral regions have been primary beneficiaries of these PSOs allowed by EC law. In the case of Martinique, three companies operate on routes between the French metropole and Fort-de-France.

The absence of direct air liaisons between other EU cities and Fort-de-France should not be considered as a shortcoming in air transport liberalisation. It is difficult to establish long-haul routes from other EU cities that would match the strong ties between Martinique and the French metropole. In addition, Martinique is in competition with other touristic destinations in the Caribbean region from Europe. This has also an impact on routes development between EU cities and Martinique.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000853/12
aan de Commissie
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(2 februari 2012)

Betreft: EU wil ook scheepvaart dwingen om voor CO_2 uitstoot te betalen

De Europese Commissie heeft vorige week een publieke consultatie gelanceerd ter voorbereiding van maatregelen om de uitstoot van CO_2 door de scheepvaart te beperken ([1]). Dit in navolging van het emissiehandelsschema (ETS) voor de luchtvaart dat 1 januari jl. onder hevig protest van de luchtvaartsector en verschillende grote landen zoals de Verenigde Staten is ingevoerd. Ook de scheepvaart dreigt nu te worden gedwongen zich te onderwerpen aan Europese CO_2-standaarden, met alle negatieve gevolgen van dien. De Europese scheepvaartsector zal op een achterstand worden gezet en Europa dreigt met deze plannen opnieuw een handelsoorlog te ontketenen.

1. Kan de Commissie aangeven hoe vergevorderd de plannen zijn om een emissiehandelsschema voor de scheepvaartsector in te voeren? Zo neen, waarom niet?

2. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat gezien de dreigende handelsoorlog en de internationale beroering als gevolg van Europa's eenzijdige invoering van ETS voor de luchtvaart, het volstrekt onzinnig is om nu een vergelijkbaar regime voor de scheepvaart voor te stellen? Zo neen, waarom niet?

3. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat ETS überhaupt zinloos is en dat het plan om ETS op te leggen aan de scheepvaartsector bij voorbaat de prullenbak in kan. Zo neen, waarom niet?

Antwoord van mevrouw Hedegaard namens de Commissie
(12 maart 2012)

Het internationaal zeevervoer is de enige vervoersector die niet onder de verbintenis van de EU valt om de broeikasgasemissies te beperken. De scheepvaartemissies vormen ongeveer 4 % van de totale broeikasgasemissies van de EU en zullen naar verwachting stijgen als er niets wordt ondernomen.

In Richtlijn 2003/87/EG inzake de EU-regeling voor de handel in broeikasgasemissierechten (ETS) en Beschikking 406/2009/EG inzake de gezamenlijke inspanningen wordt er de nadruk op gelegd dat de Commissie, indien er uiterlijk op 31 december 2011 binnen de internationale fora geen internationale overeenkomst is goedgekeurd waarbij de emissies van de internationale zeescheepvaart in de reductiestreefcijfers worden opgenomen, een voorstel moet doen om deze emissies in de reductieverbintenis van de Gemeenschap op te nemen.

In 2011 heeft de Internationale Maritieme Organisatie (IMO) maatregelen genomen om emissies van nieuwe schepen die vanaf 2015 zullen worden gebouwd, te beperken, maar zij moet de aanzienlijke emissies van de bestaande vloot nog aanpakken. In het werkprogramma van de Commissie voor 2012 is voorzien in een wetgevingsvoorstel inzake de opname van emissies van het zeevervoer in de verbintenis van de EU tot vermindering van de uitstoot van broeikasgassen. Het vaststellen en uitvoeren van eventuele EU-wetgeving moet gericht zijn op het bevorderen van een wereldwijd akkoord.

De Commissie bereidt een effectbeoordeling voor en raadpleegt belanghebbenden over diverse beleidsopties, niet alleen over een regeling voor de handel in emissierechten. Er is nog geen besluit genomen over welk wetgevingsvoorstel of bijzonder beleidsinstrument zal worden voorgesteld.

Indachtig dat de beste optie zou zijn dat er internationaal overeenstemming wordt bereikt over een maatregel om broeikasgasemissies van de scheepvaart te beperken, werkt de EU verder aan een akkoord over wereldwijde maatregelen binnen de IMO en het Raamverdrag van de Verenigde Naties inzake klimaatverandering.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/clima/consultations/0014/index_en.htm
http://www.businessgreen.com/bg/news/2140997/eu-launches-attempt-deliver-shipping-emissions-trading- scheme.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000853/12
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(2 February 2012)

Subject: EU wants to make the shipping sector pay for CO_2 emissions too

The European Commission launched a public consultation last week on possible measures to reduce CO_2 emissions from ships ([1]). This follows on from the Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) for aviation which was introduced on 1 January of this year amidst strong protests from the aviation sector and various big countries, such as the United States. It looks as if the shipping sector may be forced to submit to the European CO_2 standards too, with all their negative consequences. This will put the European shipping sector at a disadvantage and Europe may provoke another trade war with these plans.

1. Can the Commission indicate how advanced the plans are for the introduction of an emissions trading scheme for the shipping sector? If not, why?

2. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that, taking into account an imminent trade war and international protests brought on by Europe's unilateral introduction of the ETS for aviation, it makes no sense whatsoever to now be proposing a similar regime for the shipping sector? If not, why?

3. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that the ETS is pointless anyway and that the plan to impose the ETS on the shipping sector can be binned in advance? If not, why not?

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

International maritime transport is the only transport sector not covered by EU's commitment to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The shipping emissions account for about 4% of the EU's total GHG emissions and are expected to increase if no action is taken.

Directive 2003/87/EC on the EU Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) and the Effort Sharing Decision 406/2009/EC stress that if no international agreement which includes international maritime emissions in its reduction targets has been approved within the international fora by 31 December 2011, the Commission should make a proposal to include these emissions in the Community reduction commitment.

In 2011 the International Maritime Organisation (IMO) adopted measures to reduce emissions from new ships build as of 2015, but has yet to address the significant emissions of the existing fleet. The 2012 Commission's work programme foresees a legislative proposal on the inclusion of maritime transport emissions in the EU's GHG reduction commitment. Agreeing and implementing a possible EU legislation should aim to incentivise a global deal.

The Commission is preparing an impact assessment and is consulting stakeholders on several policy options, not only an emissions-trading system. A decision on a legislative proposal or the specific policy instrument to be proposed has not been taken yet.

Mindful that the best option would be to agree internationally on a measure to reduce GHG emissions from shipping, the EU will continue work for agreement on global measures within the IMO and United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/clima/consultations/0014/index_en.htm
http://www.businessgreen.com/bg/news/2140997/eu-launches-attempt-deliver-shipping-emissions-trading- scheme.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-000910/12
alla Commissione
Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)
(14 febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: Ciclo dei rifiuti nel Lazio — Discarica/inceneritore a Pizzo del Prete

La Regione Lazio, in vista della chiusura della discarica di Malagrotta, ha redatto il documento «Analisi preliminare d'individuazione di aree idonee alla realizzazione di discariche di rifiuti non pericolosi nella provincia di Roma». Tra i siti individuati rientra la località di Pizzo del Prete (Fiumicino, Roma), su cui sembra si voglia creare un inceneritore e/o una discarica. Quest'area sembra essere considerata «preferenziale» rispetto alle altre individuate, anche se soggetta a vincoli paesistici e archeologici e anche se non vi sia stata una fase di consultazione con la direzione regionale per i Beni culturali e paesaggistici del Lazio nonché con le Soprintendenze, perché caratterizzata dalla «possibilità di trasporto intermodale» che consentirebbe un afflusso dei rifiuti più facilitato.

Inoltre, il sito di Pizzo del Prete è di proprietà dell'Azienda Agricola che, per la realizzazione di un centro zootecnico (domanda n. 8475903131), ha beneficiato su circa 800 000 euro spesi dall'azienda per un piano di filiera corta del 30-35 % di fondi provenienti dal Fondo europeo agricolo per lo sviluppo rurale (l'Europa investe nelle zone rurali) in virtù del Regolamento (CE) n. 1698/2005 del Consiglio del 20.9.2005 (misura 121 — Pif RL014).

Può la Commissione far sapere:

— se sia possibile impedire un probabile spreco di fondi europei giacché, se la scelta del sito fosse confermata, la proprietà dell'azienda zootecnica sarà espropriata;

— se l'individuazione dei siti sulla base della loro possibile capienza sia un modo rispettoso del principio di prevenzione che è alla base della direttiva 2008/98/CE;

— se saranno adottati provvedimenti per assicurare la partecipazione del pubblico al processo di autorizzazione, come previsto dalla decisione di esecuzione della Commissione 2011/632/UE che definisce il questionario da utilizzare per le relazioni concernenti l'applicazione della direttiva 2000/76/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio sull'incenerimento dei rifiuti?

Risposta data da Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(12 marzo 2012)

La Commissione non ha ricevuto notifica di espropri nella Regione Lazio a danno di beneficiari di fondi provenienti dal Fondo europeo agricolo per lo sviluppo rurale. Gli Stati membri possono riconoscere l'esproprio come circostanza eccezionale in cui non sono tenuti a richiedere il rimborso totale o parziale degli aiuti percepiti, purché sia stato rispettato il disposto dell'articolo 47 del regolamento (CE) n. 1974/2006 ([1]).

Anche se la prevenzione dei rifiuti è uno degli obiettivi principali secondo la gerarchia della gestione dei rifiuti di cui alla direttiva 2008/98/CE ([2]), gli Stati membri devono assicurare la creazione di una rete integrata e adeguata di impianti di trattamento e recupero/smaltimento. La scelta del tipo di impianto di trattamento e della sua ubicazione spetta alle autorità competenti dello Stato membro interessato, le quali sono tenute a valutare i rischi connessi all'apertura di nuovi impianti di trattamento dei rifiuti. La Commissione non può interferire nella decisione delle autorità nazionali in merito all'ubicazione e alle caratteristiche di queste infrastrutture, purché le decisioni siano prese in conformità con la normativa ambientale dell'UE.

([1]) Regolamento (CE) n. 1974/2006 della Commissione, del 15 dicembre 2006 , recante disposizioni di applicazione del regolamento (CE) n. 1698/2005 del Consiglio sul sostegno allo sviluppo rurale da parte del Fondo europeo agricolo per lo sviluppo rurale (FEASR), GU L 368 del 23.12.2006.
([2]) GU L 312 del 22.11.2008.

In questa fase la Commissione non è in grado di dire «se saranno adottati provvedimenti per assicurare la partecipazione del pubblico al processo di autorizzazione, come previsto dalla decisione di esecuzione della Commissione 2011/632/UE ([3]) che definisce il questionario da utilizzare per le relazioni concernenti l'applicazione della direttiva 2000/76/CE ([4])». Le relazioni da presentare a norma della predetta decisione coprono il periodo compreso tra il 1° gennaio 2012 e il 31 dicembre 2013 e dovranno essere trasmesse alla Commissione entro il 30 settembre 2014. Inoltre, tali relazioni sono di natura generale e non riguardano singoli casi. La Commissione può adottare provvedimenti di esecuzione per assicurare la partecipazione del pubblico al processo di autorizzazione soltanto in caso di violazione della normativa dell'UE.

([3]) GU L 247 del 24.9.2011.
([4]) GU L 332 del 28.12.2000.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000910/12
to the Commission
Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)
(14 February 2012)

Subject: Waste cycle in Lazio — Pizzo del Prete waste disposal site/incinerator

In view of the closure of the Malagrotta waste disposal site, the Lazio Region drafted a document entitled 'Preliminary analysis to identify suitable areas for the establishment of non-hazardous waste disposal sites in the province of Rome'. One of the sites identified is Pizzo del Prete (Fiumicino, Rome), where it appears that there are plans for an incinerator and/or a waste disposal site. This site seems to be considered 'preferential' compared to the other ones identified, despite the fact that it is situated in a landscape and architectural conservation area and that no consultation took place with Lazio's Cultural and Environmental Heritage Regional Office and Departments, because it has 'intermodal transport potential' that would allow easier access for waste deliveries.

Moreover, the Pizzo del Prete site belongs to a farm which, in connection with the establishment of a livestock centre (request No 8475903131), obtained 30-35% funding from the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development based on Council Regulation (EC) 1698/2005 of 20 September 2005 (Measure 121 — Pif RL014) for a EUR 800 000 short supply chain project.

Can the Commission state:

— Whether it is possible to prevent a potential waste of EU funds, since, if this choice of site is confirmed, the property of the livestock centre will be expropriated?

— Whether the identification of potential sites based on potential capacity is a method that complies with the prevention principle that underpins Directive 2008/98/EC?

— Whether measures to ensure public participation in the authorisation process will be taken, as envisaged by Commission Implementing Decision 2011/632/EU that sets out the questionnaire to be used for reports pertaining to the implementation of Directive 2000/76/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the incineration of waste?

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

The Commission did not receive notification of expropriations of beneficiaries in Lazio Region receiving support from the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development. Member States may recognise expropriation as an exceptional circumstance, in which they will not require the partial or full reimbursement of aid received, where Article 47 of Regulation (EC) No 1974/2006 ([1]) has been complied with.

While prevention of waste is a leading objective under the waste management hierarchy set out in Directive 2008/98/EC ([2]), Member States need to ensure an integrated and adequate network of waste treatment and recovery/disposal installations. The choice and location of waste treatment installations is to be taken by the competent authorities of a Member State. They need to evaluate the risks related to the opening of new waste management installations. The Commission cannot interfere with national authorities as to the location and the features of these infrastructures, insofar as decisions are taken in compliance with Community environmental law.

The Commission cannot state at this stage **'**whether measures to ensure public participation in the authorisation process will be taken**, as** envisaged by Commission Implementing Decision 2011/632/EU ([3]) that sets out the questionnaire to be used for reports' under Directive 2000/76/EC ([4]). The reports to be submitted under this decision shall cover the period from 1 January 2012 to 31 December 2013 and are due to be sent to the Commission only by 30 September 2014. In addition, such reports are of general nature, not focusing on individual cases. The Commission can take enforcement actions to ensure public participation in the authorisation only in case of breach of relevant EC law.

([1]) Commission Regulation (EC) No 1974/2006 of 15 December 2006 laying down detailed rules for the application of Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005 on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD), OJ L 368, 23.12.2006.
([2]) OJ L 312, 22.11.2008.
([3]) OJ L 247, 24.9.2011.
([4]) OJ L 332, 28.12.2000.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-000940/12
Komisijai
Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)
(2012 m. vasario 3 d.)

Tema: Žaliųjų viešųjų pirkimų tinklas

Didelį susirūpinimą Baltijos jūros regione kelia blogėjanti aplinkos būklė – neracionalus gamtos išteklių naudojimas, pramonės įmonių keliama tarša. Norint pasiekti esminių pokyčių gerinant aplinkos kokybę, reikia visuminio požiūrio, kuris apimtų visas žmogaus veiklos sritis.

Viena iš priemonių yra žalieji viešieji pirkimai. Jie įgauna vis didesnę reikšmę, ypač kovojant su klimato kaita ir kuriant pažangią Baltijos jūros ekonomiką. Tačiau daugelyje regiono šalių dar nepakankamai gerai vykdomi šie pirkimai. Valstybių pastangos turėtų būti efektyviau koordinuojamos.

Ar Komisija galėtų pateikti informaciją, kokia pažanga pasiekta kuriant žaliųjų viešųjų pirkimų tinklą, kuriame dalijamasi gerąja praktika ir patirtimi?

Kas pasiekta steigiant ryšių centrus, skirtus žinių gilinimui ir informacijos sklaidai, visose Baltijos jūros regiono valstybėse narėse?

Komisijos nario J. Potočniko atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2012 m. kovo 14 d.)

Komisija, siekdama, kad visose valstybėse narėse būtų aktyviau vykdomi žalieji viešieji pirkimai (ŽVP), jau paskelbė 19 prioritetinių produktų grupių bendruosius kriterijus. Be to, 2009-2010 m. ji organizavo mokymo kursus pirkėjams 19 valstybių narių, įskaitant keturias naujas Baltijos jūros regiono valstybes nares.

Komunikate „Regioninės politikos įnašas į tvarų augimą įgyvendinant strategiją „Europa 2020““ ([1]) ŽVP buvo nurodyti kaip viena iš pagrindinių priemonių, kurią regionų ir vietos valdžios institucijos galėtų taikyti augimui skatinti. Komunikate pabrėžiama, kad pareigūnai, atsakingi už viešųjų pirkimų organizavimą, galėtų būti mokomi ir informuojami įgyvendinant regioninę politiką.

Įgyvendindama ES Baltijos jūros regiono strategijos veiksmus Baltijos jūros regione, Komisija sukūrė ŽVP tinklą, kad būtų galima keistis patirtimi ir skatinti žinių kaupimą ir sklaidą per svarbiausius valstybių narių viešųjų pirkimų organizavimo centrus. Tinkle, kuris veikia nuo 2010 m., dalyvauja aštuonių šalių atstovai. Jau įvyko trys susitikimai, kuriuose buvo pristatyta ir aptarta geroji patirtis ir konkrečių projektų idėjos.

Be to, tinklo dalyviai pradėjo specialų Baltijos jūros regiono programos finansuojamą projektą „Žaliųjų pirkimų pajėgumų kūrimas ir įgyvendinimas Baltijos jūros regione“. Įgyvendinant 2011 m. rugsėjo mėn. pradėtą dvejų metų projektą, bus sukurta ŽVP pajėgumų kūrimo viešųjų pirkimų institucijose programa, pagrįsta Danijos, Norvegijos, Švedijos, Suomijos ir Vokietijos viešųjų pirkimų organizacijų bendrąja mokomąja medžiaga ir viešųjų pirkimų veiksmais. Veiklą stebi asocijuotieji nariai iš Estijos, Lietuvos ir Lenkijos.

([1]) COM(2011) 17 galutinis.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000940/12
to the Commission
Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)
(3 February 2012)

Subject: The Green Public Procurement Network

Great concern is generated in the Baltic Sea Region by the worsening state of the environment: through imprudent use of natural resources and through the pollution generated by industrial enterprises. In order to achieve fundamental change in improving the quality of the environment, an all-embracing approach is required, one which takes in all areas of human activity.

One of the means (of achieving this) is through Green Public Procurements. These are acquiring an ever greater significance, especially in combating global warming and in creating a successful Baltic Sea economy. However, in many of the countries of the Region these procurements are not sufficiently well implemented. The efforts of the state must be more effectively coordinated.

Can the Commission supply any information as to what success has been achieved in establishing a Green Public Procurement Network, in which good practice and expertise is shared?

What has been achievements have there been in setting up regional centres dedicated to enhancing knowledge and distributing information in all the member countries of the Baltic Sea Region?

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

In order to increase the uptake of Green Public Procurement (GPP) in all Member States, the Commission has, to date, published common criteria for 19 priority product groups. Furthermore, in 2009-2010, it organised training events for procurers in 19 Member States, including the four new Member States of the Baltic Sea Region.

In the communication 'Regional policy contributing to sustainable growth in Europe 2020' ([1]), GPP has been identified as one of the key instruments for regional and local authorities to boost sustainable growth. The communication underlines that regional policy can help tackle the challenge of training and informing officials in charge of public purchasing.

As regards the Baltic Sea Region, the Commission has established a GPP network within the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region in order to exchange experiences and to promote knowledge gathering and dissemination of information through focal points in the Member States. The network includes participants from eight countries and started its activities in 2010. Three meetings have taken place so far where good practice and ideas for specific projects have been presented and discussed.

The network has, moreover, initiated a specific project 'Green Public Procurement capacity building and implementation in the Baltic Sea Region', funded by the Baltic Sea Region Programme. The two-year project, initiated in September 2011, will establish a capacity building programme on GPP within procurement institutions, based on common training materials and purchasing actions of procurement organisations in Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Finland and Germany. The activities are followed by associate partners in Estonia, Lithuania and Poland.

([1]) COM(2011) 17 final.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-000982/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(3 de fevereiro de 2012)

Assunto: Portagens nas SCUT em Portugal

Tendo em conta que:

— A União proporciona aos seus cidadãos, nos termos do artigo 3.°, n.° 2, do TUE, «um espaço de liberdade, segurança e justiça sem fronteiras internas, em que seja assegurada a livre circulação de pessoas (…)» e, nos termos do artigo 26.°, n.° 2, do TFUE, «um espaço sem fronteiras no qual a livre circulação das mercadorias (…) é assegurada (…)»;

— A recente implementação em Portugal de portagens nas antigas SCUT, autoestradas sem custos para os utilizadores, no Algarve, Beira Interior, Interior Norte e Beira Litoral/Beira Alta, impõe aos utilizadores, sem alternativas, um sistema de cobrança automático, e, caso o utente não tenha este dispositivo automático, é penalizado em 25 cêntimos mais IVA na modalidade pós-pagamento;

— Para a execução do princípio utilizador-pagador, a introdução destes meios eletrónicos específicos cria uma discriminação entre os utentes frequentes e os esporádicos, uma vez que não existe um modo de pagamento manual sem custos adicionais, e, simultaneamente, contra os veículos de matrícula estrangeira, uma vez que têm de pagar uma caução correspondente ao preço de venda ou aluguer do dispositivo e carregar um mínimo de 50 euros e/ou 100 euros para os veículos pesados;

— O governo português criou um regime de discriminação positiva para as populações e empresas locais, em particular nas regiões mais desfavorecidas, com a aplicação de isenções e descontos nas taxas de portagem;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Considera que este dispositivo eletrónico aplicado nas ex-SCUT põe em causa o princípio basilar da UE de livre circulação de pessoas e mercadorias? A questão centra-se na discriminação entre utentes frequentes e utentes esporádicos, bem como no acesso à discriminação positiva tendo em conta critérios de residência.

2. Tem conhecimento da aplicação desta medida? Já recebeu alguma queixa por parte das entidades espanholas e/ou das federação dos transportes espanhóis e portugueses, uma vez que, segundo fontes jornalísticas, as duas últimas pediram a intervenção da CE contra o que consideram um «problema fronteiriço»? Caso a resposta seja negativa, pretende analisar esta questão tendo em conta o ordenamento jurídico europeu?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(14 de março de 2012)

1. A Comissão não considera que a aplicação do sistema de portagem eletrónica nas antigas autoestradas SCUT em Portugal não seja conforme com o princípio fundamental da UE de livre circulação de pessoas e mercadorias. De acordo com os elementos de que dispõe, o novo sistema de portagem prevê um número suficiente de métodos de pagamento para os utilizadores esporádicos, essencialmente não-residentes, incluindo um sistema de títulos. As condições aplicadas aos residentes e aos não-residentes são uniformes no tocante à caução reembolsada quando da devolução do dispositivo automático/unidade instalada no veículo, bem como ao método de pré-pagamento. O método de pós-pagamento manual, que não exige a instalação no veículo de nenhum dispositivo e no âmbito do qual a liquidação pode ser efetuada em dinheiro no prazo de 5 dias, apenas está disponível para residentes porque o sistema se baseia na leitura da placa de matrícula do veículo. De momento, este sistema não pode ser aplicado aos não-residentes porque, em caso de infração das regras de pagamento, não é possível consultar imediatamente os sistemas de matrícula nacionais dos veículos de outros Estados-Membros, situação que compromete a fiscalização. Todavia, os outros métodos de pós-pagamento estão disponíveis em condições uniformes para residentes e não-residentes. As isenções e reduções concedidas às pessoas singulares e coletivas com residência ou sede nas zonas especificadas atravessadas pelas antigas autoestradas SCUT só são aplicáveis até 30 de junho de 2012.

Sugere-se ainda ao Senhor Deputado a consulta da resposta à pergunta E-001287/12 ([1]).

([1]) (http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/search.do?language=PT).

2. Em abril de 2011, a Comissão decidiu abrir um processo por infração contra Portugal devido à transposição incorreta para o Direito português da Diretiva Eurovinheta ([2]). Uma vez avaliada a resposta recebida das autoridades portuguesas em janeiro de 2012, a Comissão tomará as medidas necessárias para assegurar o cumprimento da legislação da UE, conforme previsto no Tratado sobre o Funcionamento da União Europeia.

([2]) Diretiva 1999/62/CE, relativa à aplicação de imposições aos veículos pesados de mercadorias pela utilização de certas infraestruturas (JO L 187 de 20.7.1999, p. 42), alterada pela Diretiva 2006/38/CE (JO L 157 de 9.6.2006, p. 8).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000982/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(3 February 2012)

Subject: Tolls on SCUT motorways in Portugal

The Union offers its citizens, under Article 3(2) of the TEU, an 'area of freedom, security and justice without internal borders, in which the free movement of persons is ensured (…)' and, under Article 26(2) of the TFEU, an 'area without frontiers in which the free movement of goods (…) is ensured (…)'.

The recent introduction in Portugal of tolls on the former SCUT motorways (which were free of charge for all users) in the Algarve, Beira Interior, Northern Interior and Beira Litoral/Beira Alta, has imposed on users an automatic collection system, to which there are no alternatives. In the event that users do not have the necessary automatic device, they are required to pay a penalty of 25 cents plus VAT afterwards.

In seeking to implement the 'user pays' principle, the introduction of these special electronic measures creates a form of discrimination between regular and sporadic users, since there is no manual payment method that does not incur additional costs, and at the same time against foreign registered vehicles, since they have to pay a deposit equal to the price payable for the purchase or hire of the device and, in the case of heavy goods vehicles, to make a minimum prepayment of EUR 50 and/or EUR 100.

The Portuguese Government has introduced positive discrimination arrangements for local residents and companies, particularly in the more disadvantaged areas, by granting toll fee exemptions and discounts.

The Commission is asked to answer the following:

1. Does it consider that the decision to use this electronic device on the former SCUT motorways runs contrary to the fundamental EU principle of free movement of people and goods, with reference to the discrimination between frequent users and sporadic users, as well as the positive discrimination, based on residence criteria?

2. Is it aware that this measure has been taken? Has it received any complaint from the Spanish authorities and/or the Spanish and Portuguese transport federations, given that, according to press reports, the two latter bodies requested the EC's intervention in what they consider to be a 'border problem'? If not, does it intend to examine this issue in the light of EU legal requirements?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(14 March 2012)

1. The Commission does not consider the application of the electronic tolling system on former SCUT motorways in Portugal as not compliant with the fundamental EU principle of free movement of persons and goods. According to the information available to the Commission, the new tolling system enables sufficient payment methods for occasional users, mainly non-residents, including a ticketing system. There are uniform conditions applied to residents and non-residents concerning the deposit refunded upon return of the automatic device/on-board unit and the 'pre-pay' method. The manual 'post-pay' method, where no on-board unit is required and the payment can be carried out by cash within 5 days, is available only to residents because this system is based on scanning vehicles registration number. For the time being, such system can not be applied to non-residents due to ineffective enforcement — there is no possibility to consult immediately national registers of vehicles of other Member States in case of non-compliance with payment rules. Nevertheless, the other 'post-pay' methods are available to residents and non-residents under uniform conditions. Exemptions and discounts for natural and legal persons having residence or registered address in specific area through which the former SCUT motorways pass will only be applied until 30 June 2012.

In addition, the Honourable Member is referred to reply to Question E-001287/12 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/search.do.

2. In April 2011, the Commission decided to open an infringement case against Portugal concerning the incorrect transposition of the Eurovignette Directive ([2]) into Portuguese law. In light of the assessment of the reply provided by the Portuguese authorities in January 2012, the Commission will take all the measures necessary to enforce the EC law as foreseen by the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

([2]) Directive 1999/62/EC on the charging of heavy goods vehicles for the use of certain infrastructures (OJ L 187/42, 20.7.1999) as amended by Directive 2006/38/EC (OJ L 157/8, 9.6.2006).

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-000999/12
lill-Kummissjoni
David Casa (PPE)
(6 ta' Frar 2012)

Suġġett: L-impjieg ta' dawk b'diżabilità

Il-Kummissjoni taqbel mat-tħassib li tqajjem mill-Forum Ewropew dwar id-Diżabilità li l-persuni b'diżabilità huma dawk l-aktar milquta b'mod sinifikattiv f'termini ta' impjieg minħabba fil-kriżi ekonomika?

Jekk iva, u meta jitqiesu t-termini ta' referenza llimitati tal-Kummissjoni f'dan il-qasam, qed jittieħdu xi miżuri sabiex jiġi żgurat li tibqa' fis-seħħ għajnuna finanzjarja għal persuni b'diżabilità fil-livell tal-Istati Membru?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Reding f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(28 ta' Marzu 2012)

Il-Kummissjoni qiegħda f'kuntatt regolari mal-Forum Ewropew dwar id-Diżbilità u tinsab ukoll imħassba dwar l-impatt tal-kriżi ekonomika fuq l-impjiegi tal-persuni b'diżabilità. Il-Kummissjoni qed tistenna b'ħerqa li, fit-tieni sitt xhur tal-2012, tirċievi mingħand Eurostat ir-riżultati tal-iktar modulu riċenti dwar id-diżabilità fl-Istħarriġ dwar il-Forza tax-Xogħol li se jipprovdi dejta kumprensiva dwar is-sitwazzjoni tal-impjiegi għal persuni b'diżabilità.

Il-kompetenza ewlenija fil-qasam tal-assistenza finanzjarja lill-persuni b'diżabilità qiegħda f'idejn l-awtoritajiet nazzjonali jew lokali. Kif spjegat fl-Istrateġija Ewropea tad-Diżabilità 2010-2020 ([1]) il-Kummissjoni tkompli tindirizza dawn il-kwistjonijiet permezz tal-Pjattaforma Ewropea kontra l-Faqar. Dan se jinkludi l-valutazzjoni tal-adegwatezza u s-sostenibilità tas-sistemi ta' protezzjoni soċjali u l-appoġġ permezz tal-Fond Soċjali Ewropew (FSE). Fl-2010 biss, kważi 600 000 persuna b'diżabilità rċevew l-appoġġ tal-FSE. Skont il-proposta tal-Kummissjoni għall-perjodu ta' programmazzjoni li jmiss tal-Fondi Strutturali, kull Stat Membru se jwarrab 20% tar-riżorsi tal-FSE għall-promozzjoni tal-inklużjoni soċjali. Dan l-objettiv tematiku għall-inklużjoni soċjali jinkludi prijorità ta' investiment għall-ġlieda kontra d-diskriminazzjoni abbażi tad-diżabilità. Barra minn hekk, il-promozzjoni tal-opportunitajiet indaqs, inkluż l-aċċessibilità, se tkun integrata u implimentata permezz ta' azzjonijiet speċifiċi tal-FSE. Madanakollu, għandu jkun innutat li f'konformità mal-prinċipji tal-ġestjoni kondiviża, r-responsabilità biex ikunu identifikati l-azzjonijiet propji, jintagħżlu l-operazjonijiet, u jkunu determinati l-miżuri meħtieġa biex tinkiseb integrazzjoni aħjar tal-persuni b'diżabilità, qiegħda fuq l-Istati Membri.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0636:FIN:MT:PDF.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-000999/12
to the Commission
David Casa (PPE)
(6 February 2012)

Subject: The employment of those with disabilities

Does the Commission agree with concerns raised by the European Disability Forum that persons with disabilities are the most significantly affected in terms of employment due to the economic crisis?

If so, and given the Commission's limited terms of reference in this area, are any measures being taken to ensure that financial assistance for people with disabilities remains in place at Member State level?

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

The Commission is in regular contact with the European Disability Forum and is also concerned about the impact of the economic crisis on the employment of persons with disabilities. The Commission is looking forward to receiving, in the second half of 2012, from Eurostat the results of the most recent ad hoc module on disability of the Labour Force Survey that will provide comprehensive data on the employment situation of persons with disabilities.

The main competence in the area of financial assistance to persons with disabilities lies with national or local authorities. As outlined in the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 ([1]), the Commission continues to address these issues through the European Platform against Poverty. This will include assessing the adequacy and sustainability of social protection systems and support through the European Social Fund (ESF). In 2010 alone, almost 600 000 disabled persons received ESF support. According to the Commission's proposal for the next Structural Funds programming period, each Member States shall earmark 20% of its ESF resources to promoting social inclusion. This thematic objective for social inclusion includes an investment priority on combating discrimination based on disability. Furthermore, the promotion of equal opportunities, including accessibility shall be mainstreamed and implemented through specific actions of the ESF. However, it should be noted that in line with the principles of shared management, responsibility for identifying the actual actions, selecting the operations and determining the measures needed to achieve better integration of disabled persons, lies with the Member States.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0636:FIN:EN:PDF.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001023/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE)
(7 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Γενόσημα και δημόσια υγεία

Ένας από τους βασικούς στόχους και δεσμεύσεις της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης είναι η μείωση της φαρμακευτικής δαπάνης. Σύμφωνα με εκτιμήσεις αναφέρεται ότι μπορεί να υπάρξει και νέα μείωση κατά 1,2 δισ. ευρώ σε βάθος χρόνου. Σε αυτή τη βάση, προτείνεται η εφαρμογή της συνταγογράφησης με βάση τη δραστική ουσία και όχι την εμπορική ονομασία του φαρμάκου.

Σύμφωνα με τα ανωτέρω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Εφαρμόζεται η συνταγογράφηση με βάση τη δραστική ουσία σε άλλες χώρες μέλη;

2. Έχουν εκφραστεί έντονες ανησυχίες ότι η αντικατάσταση των πρωτότυπων φαρμάκων από γενόσημα έχει αυξήσει τη θνησιμότητα, κυρίως των ευαίσθητων κοινωνικών ομάδων; Διαθέτει συγκεκριμένα στοιχεία σχετικά με τις συνέπειες της χρήσης γενόσημων στη δημόσια υγεία; Τα στοιχεία σχετικά με τη χρήση γενόσημων στην Ελλάδα επιβεβαιώνουν ή διαψεύδουν αυτούς τους ισχυρισμούς;

3. Είναι γνωστό ότι οι υποχρεώσεις του παρασκευαστή του γενόσημου, προκειμένου αυτό να λάβει άδεια κυκλοφορίας, περιορίζονται στο να αποδείξει τη βιοϊσοδυναμία του με το πρωτότυπο επώνυμο προϊόν και ότι δεν αποκλείεται να υπάρχουν μικρές διαφοροποιήσεις μεταξύ του πρωτότυπου φαρμάκου και του γενόσημου στα συστατικά που δεν αποτελούν τη δραστική ουσία. Μπορεί η Επιτροπή να διαβεβαιώσει ότι τα γενόσημα είναι άκρως ασφαλή για όλους τους εν δυνάμει χρήστες;

4. Με δεδομένο ότι η ελληνική φαρμακοβιομηχανία αποτελεί τον δεύτερο σε κατάταξη εξαγωγικό τομέα της χώρας μας, έχει συνυπολογιστεί και το ενδεχόμενο συνολικό κόστος για την εγχώρια οικονομία;

Απάντηση του κ. Dalli εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(16 Μαρτίου 2012)

1. Μέτρα που συνιστούν στους ιατρούς ή τους υποχρεώνουν να συνταγογραφούν φάρμακα με βάση τη δραστική ουσία και όχι την εμπορική ονομασία τους, δεν εμπίπτουν στο πεδίο εφαρμογής της νομοθεσίας τη Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης για τα φάρμακα ([1]). Στην Εσθονία, Γαλλία, Λιθουανία, Πορτογαλία, Ισπανία και Μεγάλη Βρετανία οι ιατροί υποχρεούνται να συνταγογραφούν με βάση τη δραστική ουσία. Πρόσφατα το Βέλγιο και η Ιταλία θέσπισαν παρόμοια υποχρέωση. Στη Δανία, Φινλανδία, Γαλλία, Γερμανία, Ιταλία Λετονία, Λιθουανία, Πορτογαλία, Ισπανία και Σουηδία οι φαρμακοποιοί είναι υποχρεωμένοι να χρησιμοποιούν γενόσημα υποκατάστατα.

2. Στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, όλα τα εγκεκριμένα φάρμακα, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των γενόσημων, έχουν αξιολογηθεί ως προς την ποιότητα, την ασφάλεια, την αποτελεσματικότητα και τη θετική σχέση ωφέλειας/κινδύνου τους. Η Επιτροπή δεν διαθέτει οιαδήποτε στοιχεία που να υποδηλώνουν ότι η χρήση γενόσημων συνέβαλε στην αύξηση της θνησιμότητας των ασθενών.

3. Δεδομένου ότι τα γενόσημα είναι κατ' ουσίαν τα ίδια με τα πρωτότυπα ως προς την αποτελεσματικότητα και την ασφάλεια, επιτρέπεται η έγκρισή τους εφόσον αποδειχθεί η βιοϊσοδυναμία τους με το εγκεκριμένο προϊόν αναφοράς, σύμφωνα με τις απαιτήσεις της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Άλλα συστατικά του γενόσημου εκτός από τη δραστική ουσία δεν είναι απαραίτητο να είναι τα ίδια με εκείνα του προϊόντος αναφοράς· αν όμως οι διαφοροποιήσεις επηρεάζουν τη σχέση ασφάλειας/αποτελεσματικότητας του προϊόντος, τότε απαιτούνται πρόσθετα στοιχεία.

4. Από τις 450 φαρμακευτικές εταιρείες που λειτουργούν στην Ελλάδα, οι 350 περίπου παράγουν γενόσημα. Συνεπώς αναμένεται ότι η συνταγογράφηση φαρμάκων με βάση τη δραστική ουσία τους, θα έχει μάλλον θετική επίδραση στην ανάπτυξη της ελληνικής φαρμακοβιομηχανίας και δεν θα βλάψει την εξαγωγική της ικανότητα.

([1]) Οδηγία 2001/83/ΕΕ του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της 6ης Νοεμβρίου 2001, περί κοινοτικού κώδικος για τα φάρμακα που προορίζονται για ανθρώπινη χρήση. ΕΕ L 311 της 28.11.2001.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001023/12
to the Commission
Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE)
(7 February 2012)

Subject: Generic medicines and public health

One of the main objectives and commitments of the Greek Government is reducing spending on pharmaceuticals. It is estimated that further cuts of EUR 1.2 billion may be necessary in the long term. It is accordingly being proposed that medical prescriptions be made out for active substances instead of brand medicines.

In view of this:

1. Can the Commission say whether prescriptions are made out for active substances in other Member States?

2. Are there grave concerns that the substitution of original medicines for generic ones has increased mortality, mainly in vulnerable social groups? Does the Commission have specific information regarding the impact on public health of using generic medicines? Does the data regarding the use of generic medicines in Greece corroborate or refute these allegations?

3. It is known that, in order to obtain marketing authorisation, generic medicine manufacturers are only required to demonstrate the bioequivalence of the product to the branded original product and that minor variations between the original medicine and the generic one cannot be excluded with regard to ingredients not constituting the active substance. Can the Commission give assurances that generic medicines are eminently safe for all potential users?

4. Given that the Greek pharmaceutical industry is the country's second largest export sector, has the potential overall cost to the national economy been taken into account?

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

1. Measures, recommending or obliging doctors to prescribe medicinal products on the basis of the active substance and not brand names, do not fall in the scope of the Union legislation on medicinal products ([1]). In Estonia, France, Lithuania, Portugal, Spain and the United Kingdom doctors are obliged to prescribe on the basis of active substance. Recently, Belgium and Italy introduced this obligation too. In Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Portugal, Spain and Sweden generic substitution is compulsory for pharmacists.

2. All medicinal products authorised in the EU, including generics have been assessed for their quality, safety and efficacy and must have a positive benefit/risk balance. The Commission is not aware of any data indicating that the use of generics has increased mortality of patients.

3. Given that generics are essentially the same as the branded originals regarding efficacy and safety, they can be approved when their bioequivalence with the reference product that had been authorised according to the EU requirements is demonstrated. Constituents other than the active substance do not have to be the same in the generic and the reference product; if the differences would impact the safety/efficacy profile, additional data would be required.

4. About 350 out of 450 pharmaceutical companies in Greece are generic-producing. Therefore, it can be expected that the prescription of medicines by active substance would have a rather positive effect on the evolution of the Greek pharmaceutical industry rather than a damaging impact on its exporting capacity.

([1]) Directive 2001/83/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 November 2001 on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use, OJ L 311, 28.11.2001.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001082/12
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE), Francesco De Angelis (S&D), Alfredo Pallone (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), David-Maria Sassoli (S&D) e Marco Scurria (PPE)
(7 febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: Sigma-Tau di Pomezia: possibile violazione delle norme a tutela dei lavoratori e dei livelli occupazionali in caso di dismissioni

Nelle scorse settimane la società farmaceutica italiana Sigma-Tau di Pomezia ha annunciato la volontà di ricorrere alla cassa integrazione guadagni straordinaria a zero ore per ben 569 addetti su un totale di 1 500 lavoratori. Oltre a ciò, ha effettuato la messa in liquidazione dei centri di ricerca di Milano e Caserta, dove erano impiegate 110 persone, facendo presagire un progressivo disimpegno del Gruppo Sigma-Tau dall'intero territorio nazionale.

Eppure, tale realtà industriale, che comprende decine di società sparse in tutto il mondo, rappresenta un polo fondamentale in termini economici, sociali ed occupazionali per tutto il territorio di Pomezia: basti pensare che ben il 16 % del'intero fatturato è stato reinvestito in questi ultimi anni in ricerca, facendo consolidare un patrimonio di know-how, tecniche e professionalità di altissimo livello e che oggi rischiano di scomparire, sebbene i bilanci della holding fossero nel 2010 positivi.

Eppure, nonostante la disponibilità, già dimostrata dalle organizzazioni sindacali e prospettata dalle autorità locali, a sostenere la produzione e ricercare soluzioni alternative che evitino la (futura chiusura) probabile dismissione dello stabilimento, la Sigma-Tau nei giorni scorsi è rimasta sulle proprie posizioni, ricorrendo alla CIGS che sta coinvolgendo centinaia di dipendenti. Inoltre, tutto ciò porterà ad un ridimensionamento della realtà produttiva di tutta l'area di Pomezia, anche a causa della perdita di posti di lavoro di tutto l'indotto.

Tutto ciò premesso, si interroga la Commissione per sapere:

1. se la Sigma-Tau ha rispettato le disposizioni della direttiva 98/59/CE in materia di licenziamenti collettivi ed in particolare l'articolo 2;

2. se sono state rispettate le previsioni della direttiva 94/45/CE, modificata dalla direttiva 2009/38/CE, riguardante l'istituzione di un comitato aziendale europeo o di una procedura per l'informazione e la consultazione dei lavoratori; la direttiva 2002/14/CE, che istituisce un quadro generale relativo all'informazione e alla consultazione dei lavoratori; la direttiva 2001/23/CE, relativa al mantenimento dei diritti dei lavoratori, e la direttiva 2008/94/CE, relativa alla tutela dei lavoratori subordinati in caso d'insolvenza del datore di lavoro;

3. se la Sigma-Tau ha rispettato le disposizioni della direttiva 2006/54/CE che vieta, tra le altre misure, le discriminazioni dirette e indirette tra uomini e donne per quanto riguarda le condizioni di licenziamento;

4. se la società Sigma-Tau ha previsto l'utilizzo del Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione (EGF);

5. quali azioni possono essere intraprese a tutela e salvaguardia dei posti di lavoro oggi in pericolo.

Risposta data da László Andor a nome della Commissione
(20 marzo 2012)

La Commissione ribadisce che il cambiamento industriale deve essere gestito in modo proattivo e socialmente responsabile, in stretto partenariato con tutte le pertinenti parti interessate, compresi i rappresentanti dei lavoratori, al fine di mitigare le conseguenze negative che una ristrutturazione può comportare per i lavoratori, le loro famiglie e le regioni interessate. Nel gennaio 2012 la Commissione ha pubblicato sulla materia un Libro verde che ha avviato un dibattito pubblico ([1]).

La Commissione non è in condizione di valutare i fatti o di stabilire se un'impresa privata abbia o meno ottemperato alle disposizioni che attuano le direttive UE. Spetta alle autorità nazionali competenti, compresi i tribunali, assicurare che la legislazione nazionale che recepisce le direttive UE cui fanno riferimento gli onorevoli deputati sia applicata in modo corretto ed efficace dal datore di lavoro in questione, tenuto conto delle circostanze specifiche di ciascun caso.

([1]) «Ristrutturare e anticipare i mutamenti: quali insegnamenti trarre dall'esperienza recente?» (COM(2012) 7 del 17 gennaio 2012), reperibile all'indirizzo: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=782&newsId=1166&furtherNews=yes.

La Commissione ha avviato una procedura d'infrazione contro l'Italia in relazione alla direttiva 2009/38/CE ([2]) relativa al Comitato aziendale europeo, direttiva che non è stata ancora recepita nell'ordinamento giuridico nazionale.

La Commissione non è al corrente del fatto che l'Italia stia elaborando una richiesta di finanziamento del Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione relativa ai licenziamenti cui fanno riferimento gli onorevoli deputati.

Per quanto concerne le azioni volte a proteggere i posti di lavoro minacciati, la Commissione ritiene che la direzione aziendale e i rappresentanti dei lavoratori siano gli attori adatti per concordare strategie di ristrutturazione a livello aziendale e che, se del caso, interventi politici dovrebbero accompagnare una simile ristrutturazione in modo da evitare aggravi sociali e promuovere nuove abilità e posti di lavoro al fine di agevolare la riconversione economica e le transizioni verso nuovi posti di lavoro.

([2]) Direttiva 2009/38/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 6 maggio 2009, riguardante l'istituzione di un Comitato aziendale europeo o di una procedura per l'informazione e la consultazione dei lavoratori nelle imprese e nei gruppi di imprese di dimensioni comunitarie (rifusione), GU L 122 del 16.5.2009, pag. 28.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001082/12
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE), Francesco De Angelis (S&D), Alfredo Pallone (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), David-Maria Sassoli (S&D) and Marco Scurria (PPE)
(7 February 2012)

Subject: Sigma-Tau, Pomezia: possible breach of the rules on the protection of workers and employment levels in the event of closures

In recent weeks, the Italian pharmaceutical company Sigma-Tau in Pomezia has announced plans to place 569 out of its 1 500 employees on zero-hour contracts under the CIGS (extraordinary wages guarantee fund). It has also closed down its research centres in Milan and Caserta, which employed 110 people, a development which foreshadows the Sigma-Tau group's progressive withdrawal from Italian territory. Yet this industrial player, which comprises dozens of companies worldwide, plays a key economic, social and employment role for the whole of the Pomezia area. Some 16% of its entire turnover has been reinvested in research in recent years, thus consolidating a wealth of knowledge, technical skills and expertise of the highest level which are now at risk of disappearing, despite the holding company's 2010 accounts being positive.

Nevertheless, despite the unions' and local authorities' declared willingness to maintain production and seek alternative solutions to avoid the future closure and probable divestiture of the plant, Sigma-Tau has continued in recent days to follow the path of resorting to temporary lay-offs involving hundreds of employees. This will consequently lead to a scaling down of industrial production throughout Pomezia, partly due to the loss of jobs in associated fields.

In view of the foregoing,

1. Would the Commission state whether Sigma-Tau has complied with the provisions of Directive 98/59/EC on collective redundancies and, in particular, Article 2 thereof?

2. Would the Commission state whether Sigma-Tau has complied with the provisions of the following directives: Directive 94/45/EC, as amended by Directive 2009/38/EC, regarding the establishment of a European Works Council or a procedure for informing and consulting employees; Directive 2002/14/EC, establishing a general framework for informing and consulting employees; Directive 2001/23/EC, relating to the safeguarding of employees' rights and Directive 2008/94/EC, on the protection of employees in the event of insolvency of their employer?

3. Would the Commission state whether Sigma-Tau has complied with the provisions of Directive 2006/54/EC which prohibit, amongst other things, direct and indirect discrimination between men and women in relation to terms of dismissal?

4. Would the Commission state whether Sigma-Tau plans to use the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF)?

5. Would the Commission state what action could be taken to protect and safeguard jobs which are currently under threat?

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

The Commission stresses that industrial change needs to be anticipated and managed in a socially responsible way, in close partnership with all relevant stakeholders, including workers' representatives, with a view to mitigating the negative consequences of any restructuring on the workers, their families and the regions concerned. In January 2012 the Commission issued a Green Paper on the subject which has launched a public debate ([1]).

The Commission is not in a position to assess the facts or state whether a private company has or has not complied with any provisions implementing EU directives. It is for the competent national authorities, including the courts, to ensure that the national legislation transposing the EU directives referred to by the Honourable Member is correctly and effectively applied by the employer concerned, having regard to the specific circumstances of each case.

([1]) 'Restructuring and anticipation of change: What lessons from recent experience?' (COM(2012) 7 of 17 January 2012), at http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=782&newsId=1166&furtherNews=yes.

The Commission has initiated an infringement procedure against Italy with regard to Directive 2009/38/EC ([2]) on European Works Councils, which has not yet been transposed into its national legal order.

It is not aware of any application for funding from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund being prepared by Italy and relating to the redundancies to which the Honourable Members refer.

Concerning actions to protect jobs under threat, the Commission believes that management and workers' representatives are the key players to agree on restructuring strategies at the company level and that, if necessary, policy interventions should accompany such restructuring to avoid social hardship and to promote new skills and jobs in order to facilitate economic reconversion and professional transitions.

([2]) Directive 2009/38/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 May 2009 on the establishment of a European Works Council or a procedure in Community-scale undertakings and Community-scale groups of undertakings for the purposes of informing and consulting employees (recast), OJ L 122, 16.5.2009, p. 28.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001101/12
lill-Kummissjoni
David Casa (PPE)
(9 ta' Frar 2012)

Suġġett: Il-Potenzjal taż-Żejt fil-Libja

Il-Kummissjoni kkunsidrat il-potenzjal ta' interess mill-ġdid fir-riżorsi tal-enerġija tal-Libja ladarba s-sanzjonijiet tal-UE kontra l-Iran jidħlu fis-seħħ?

B'influwenza akbar fin-negozjati ma' intrapriżi multinazzjonali li qegħdin ifittxu li jinvestu fir-riżorsi tal-enerġija tal-Libja, x'effetti jista' jkollu dan fuq l-istabbiltà tal-gvern tranżizzjonali fil-Libja?

Hemm potenzjal għall-korruzzjoni, u jekk hu hekk, il-Kummissjoni kkunsidrat li tissorvelja din is-sitwazzjoni jew li tipproponi salvagwardji relatati mat-tmexxija sabiex jitnaqqsu r-riskji ta' korruzzjoni fil-gvern ġdid Libjan?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Oettinger f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(7 ta' Marzu 2012)

L-UE qed timmonitorja mill-qrib is-sitwazzjoni tal-produzzjoni tal-idrokarbur fil-Libja. Skont sorsi minn dan is-settur, il-produzzjoni taż-żejt fil-Libja qed tirkupra sew u laħqet il-miljun barmil kuljum, li hija 600 000 barmil inqas mill-produzzjoni ta' qabel ir-rewwixti fil-bidu tas-sena l-oħra. Is-sitwazzjoni politika ġdida x'aktarx toħloq opportunitajiet ġodda, iżda tista' ġġib magħha wkoll sfidi ġodda, bħall-inċertezza dwar il-futur tas-settur tal-enerġija u xi rwol se jkollhom l-impriżi barranin li ilhom stabbiliti.

Minbarra dan, il-Kummissjoni qed tippromwovi trasparenza akbar fis-settur taż-żejt u l-gass madwar id-dinja, speċjalment fil-pajjiżi mingħajr strutturi permanenti ta' gvern. Sabiex tiżdied it-trasparenza għall-pagamenti li jsiru lill-gvernijiet madwar id-dinja kollha, il-Kummissjoni pproponiet l-introduzzjoni ta' sistema ta' Rappurtar Pajjiż Pajjiż (Country-by-Country Reporting — CBCR). Il-kunċett ta' CBCR huwa differenti minn dak tar-rappurtar finanzjarju regolari peress li jippreżenta informazzjoni finanzjarja għal kull pajjiż li l-kumpanija tkun topera fih, minflok sett wieħed ta' informazzjoni fuq livell globali. Ir-rappurtar tat-taxxi, id-drittijiet u l-bonusijiet li kumpanija multinazzjonali tħallas lil gvern ospitanti se juri l-impatt finanzjarju tal-kumpanija f'dawk il-pajjiżi li topera fihom. Dan l-approċċ aktar trasparenti għandu jinkoraġġixxi negozji aktar sostenibbli.

Sabiex jiġu koperti tipi varji ta' kumpaniji attivi f'dawn l-industriji fl-ambitu tas-sistema CBCR, il-Kummissjoni pproponiet li tirrevedi kemm id-Direttiva dwar it-Trasparenza ([1]) sabiex tkopri l-kumpaniji elenkati kif ukoll id-Direttiva dwar il-Kontabbiltà ([2]) sabiex tkopri kumpaniji kbar mhux elenkati.

([1]) Id-Direttiva 2004/109/KE tal-Parlament Ewropew u tal-Kunsill tal-15 ta' Diċembru 2004 dwar l-armonizzazzjoni tar-rekwiżiti ta' trasparenza f'dak li għandu x'jaqsam ma' informazzjoni dwar emittenti li t-titoli tagħhom huma ammessi għall-kummerċ f'suq regolat u li temenda d-Direttiva 2001/34/KE, ĠU L 390, 31.12.2004.

([2]) Ir-Raba' Direttiva tal-Kunsill 78/660/KEE tal-25 ta' Lulju tal-1978 ibbażata fuq l-Artikolu 54(3)(g) tat-Trattat dwar il-kontijiet annwali ta' ċerti tipi ta' kumpanniji, ĠU L 222, 14.8.1978, u s-Seba' Direttiva tal-Kunsill 83/349/KEE tat-13 ta' Ġunju tal-1983 ibbażata fuq l-Artikolu 54(3)(g) tat-Trattat dwar il-kontijiet konsolidati, ĠU L 193, 18.7.1983.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001101/12
to the Commission
David Casa (PPE)
(9 February 2012)

Subject: Libyan Oil Potential

Has the Commission considered the potential for renewed interest in Libya's energy resources once the EU Iran sanctions come into effect?

With increased leverage to negotiate with multinational enterprises seeking to invest in Libya's energy resources, what effects on the stability of the transitional government in Libya might this have?

Is there a potential for corruption and, if so, has the Commission considered monitoring this situation or proposing governance-related safeguards so as to reduce the risks of corruption in the new Libyan government?

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

The EU is closely monitoring the situation with regard to hydrocarbon production in Libya. According to sector sources, the Libyan oil production is recovering steadily and has reached 1 million barrels per day, which is 600 000 barrels short of pre-uprising output early last year. The new political situation is likely to create new opportunities, but may also bring challenges, as there is uncertainty about the future of the energy sector and which role long-resident foreign firms will play.

Furthermore, the Commission is promoting increased transparency in the oil and gas sector worldwide, especially in countries without permanent governmental structures. In order to increase transparency for the payments made to governments all over the world, the Commission has proposed to introduce a system of Country-by-Country Reporting (CBCR). CBCR is a different concept from regular financial reporting as it presents financial information for every country that a company operates in, rather than a single set of information at a global level. Reporting taxes, royalties and bonuses that a multinational company pays to a host government will show a company's financial impact in host countries. This more transparent approach would encourage more sustainable businesses.

In order to cover the various types of companies active in these industries under the CBCR system, the Commission has proposed to revise both the Transparency Directive ([1]) to cover listed companies and the Accounting Directives ([2]) to cover large non-listed companies.

([1]) Directive 2004/109/EC of the Parliament and of the Council of 15 December 2004 on the harmonisation of transparency requirements in relation to information about issuers whose securities are admitted to trading on a regulated market and amending Directive 2001/34/EC, OJ L 390, 31.12.2004.

([2]) Fourth Council Directive 78/660/EEC of 25 July 1978 based on Article 54(3)(g) of the Treaty on the annual accounts of certain types of companies, OJ L 222, 14.8.1978 and Seventh Council Directive 83/349/EEC of 13 June 1983 based on Article 54(3)(g) of the Treaty on consolidated accounts, OJ L 193, 18.7.1983.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001112/12
to the Commission
Arlene McCarthy (S&D)
(8 February 2012)

Subject: The killing of caiman crocodiles in Cyprus

It has recently been brought to my attention that in late 2010 a consignment of 20 caiman crocodiles were killed in Cyprus after they were allegedly imported into the country by a citizen who lacked the required licence to keep or sell the crocodiles as pets.

The trading of caiman crocodiles, while legal, is subject to the provisions of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES). Under CITES, Cypriot authorities are obliged to ensure that the welfare of animals in their care is safeguarded.

A recent report by the Animal Protection Agency concluded that there are serious concerns surrounding the method of euthanasia used by the Cypriot authorities: an injection of a drug known as T-61, which — studies have proven — causes pain and suffering.

— Is the Commission aware of this case and of the effects of T-61 on animals?

— What action will the Commission take in order to investigate whether Cypriot authorities breached European or international law regarding animal welfare in this case?

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

Spectacled caiman crocodiles are listed in Annex B of Council Regulation (EC) No 338/97 ([1]) and therefore can be moved within the European Union accompanied with documents certifying the legal origin of the specimens.

It is up to Member States to establish appropriate measures and actions to ensure a proper implementation of the CITES Convention, including on the way to dispose of seized specimens. According to Resolution 10.17 (Rev CoP15) on disposal of confiscated live specimens, it is up to the Party to decide the appropriate measure that will be taken, including euthanasia.

Further questions referring to the case at stake should therefore be addressed to the Cypriot CITES authorities.

Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment
Department of Environment
Nicosia 1498
Telex: 4660 cy
Cable: MINAGRI NICOSIA
Fax: +357 (22) 77 49 45
a) Mrs Elena Stylianopoulou
Tel: +357 (22) 40 89 29
Email: estylianopoulou@environment.moa.gov.cy
b) Mrs Elena Erotokritou
Tel.: +357 (22) 40 89 21
Email: eerotokritou@environment.moa.gov.cy

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 338/97 of 9 December 1996 on the protection of species of wild fauna and flora by regulating trade therein, OJ L 61, 3.3.1997.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001119/12
do Komisji
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(9 lutego 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Protest głodowy białoruskiego opozycjonisty

Siarhiej Kawalenka, działacz opozycyjnej konserwatywno-chrześcijańskiej Partii BNF w Witebsku, został skazany w 2010 r. na tzw. „chatnią chimię" – rodzaj aresztu domowego – za to, że 7 stycznia tegoż roku wywiesił biało-czerwono-białą flagę (symbol niepodległej Białorusi) na miejskiej choince w Witebsku. 19 grudnia ubiegłego roku został zatrzymany za złamanie warunków „chatniej chimii", a następnie skazany na grzywnę 140 tys. rubli za to, że naubliżał milicjantom, którzy go pilnowali. Podczas postępowania nawet milicjanci zaprzeczyli zarzutom. Za naruszenie warunków odbywania wyroku Siarhiejowi Kawalence grozi do trzech lat więzienia.

W chwili obecnej nie został jeszcze wyznaczony termin rozprawy sądowej. Przez cały ten czas Siarhiej Kawalenka znajduje się w areszcie w Witebsku, gdzie od 20 grudnia 2011 r. po dzień dzisiejszy prowadzi głodówkę na znak protestu. Rodzina boi się, że Siarhiej Kawalenka może nie dożyć procesu. Jest jedynym żywicielem rodziny, ma dwójkę małych dzieci.

— Czy Komisji znana jest sprawa Siarhieja Kawalenki?

— Czy do tej pory podjęto kroki w celu pomocy temu białoruskiemu opozycjoniście?

— Czy w związku z pogarszającą się sytuacją opozycjonistów na Białorusi Komisja ma zamiar podjąć interwencję w ich sprawie?

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001120/12
do Komisji
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(9 lutego 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Zaostrzenie kary dla Dzmitrija Bandarenki

Władze kolonii karnej w Mohylewie podjęły decyzję o zaostrzeniu rygoru odbywania kary wobec Dzmitrija Bandarenki, skazanego na dwa lata kolonii karnej w związku z demonstracją po wyborach 19 grudnia 2010 r. Od 30 stycznia ten więzień polityczny nie będzie mógł korzystać z laski i obuwia ortopedycznego. Bandarenka nie będzie również mógł leżeć w dzień, zmuszony natomiast będzie do wykonywania „lekkich" prac. Taka sytuacja zagraża nie tylko zdrowiu, ale również życiu Dzmitrija Bandarenki. Przypomnę, że Bandarenka w lipcu 2011 r. przeszedł poważną operację kręgosłupa, wymagającą długotrwałej rehabilitacji. Lekarze stanowczo podkreślali wtedy, że nie może on wykonywać żadnych prac fizycznych, a jeśli nie zapewni mu się odpowiednich warunków do rekonwalescencji, Bandarence grozi inwalidztwo.

Fala represji białoruskich władz wobec więźniów politycznych narasta. Pragnę zauważyć, że kilkanaście dni temu władze kolonii karnych podjęły decyzję o zaostrzeniu rygoru odbywania kary dla dwóch więźniów politycznych: Mykoły Autuchowicza i Mykoły Statkiewicza. Obaj zostali przeniesieni do zamkniętych więzień.

W związku z tym, pragnę zapytać Komisję, czy ma zamiar podjąć interwencję w sprawie zaostrzenia rygoru odbywania kary wobec Dzmitrija Bandarenki i wyrazić stanowczy sprzeciw wobec działań białoruskich władz?

Wspólna odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Komisji Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(10 kwietnia 2012 r.)

Komisja jest w pełni świadoma sprawy Siarhieja Kawalenki oraz sprawy Źmiciera Bandarenki i pozostaje głęboko zaniepokojona faktem przetrzymywania w więzieniu i złego traktowania, zarówno tych osób, jak i innych więźniów politycznych na Białorusi.

UE będzie w dalszym ciągu wywierać silny nacisk na władze białoruskie w tej kwestii. Dnia 18 grudnia 2011 r. Wysoka Przedstawiciel UE/Wiceprzewodnicząca Komisji Catherine Ashton oraz sekretarz stanu USA Hillary Clinton we wspólnym oświadczeniu ([1]) wezwały do niezwłocznego uwolnienia i rehabilitacji wszystkich więźniów politycznych. UE wdrożyła również szereg środków ograniczających wobec osób odpowiedzialnych za prześladowania na Białorusi.

Ponadto UE będzie nadal wspierać działania organizacji społeczeństwa obywatelskiego na Białorusi, m.in. udzielając dalszej pomocy ofiarom represji i ich rodzinom. Ostatnio, w dniu 7 marca 2012 r., komisarz ds. rozszerzenia i polityki sąsiedztwa wysłał pismo do Siarhieja Kawalenki, oferując osobiste wsparcie i apelując, aby zaprzestał strajku głodowego.

([1]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/127034.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001119/12
to the Commission
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(9 February 2012)

Subject: Hunger strike by Belarusian opposition activist

Syarhei Kavalenka, an opposition activist and member of the Belarusian Conservative Christian Party-Belarusian Popular Front in Vitebsk, was sentenced to a form of house arrest in 2010 for raising the white-red-white flag that symbolises an independent Belarus on a Christmas tree in Vitebsk on 7 January of that year. On 19 December 2011 he was arrested for infringing the conditions of his house arrest. He was subsequently ordered to pay a fine of 140 000 roubles for insulting the police officers who were guarding him. During the investigation even the police themselves denied the allegations made against Mr Kavalenka, who faces up to three years in prison for infringing the house arrest conditions.

No date has yet been set for the court case. For the whole of the intervening period Mr Kavalenka has been imprisoned in Vitebsk. Since 20 December 2011 he has been on hunger strike in protest. Mr Kavalenka's family fear that he may not live to see his case go to court. He is the only breadwinner in the family, and has two small children.

— Is the Commission aware of Mr Kavalenka's case?

— Have any steps been taken to date to support Mr Kavalenka?

— In view of the worsening situation for opposition activists in Belarus, does the Commission intend to intervene on their behalf?

Question for written answer E-001120/12
to the Commission
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(9 February 2012)

Subject: Imposition of more stringent conditions on the sentence being served by Dzmitry Bandarenka

The authorities of the Mahilyou penal colony have decided to impose more stringent conditions on the sentence being served by Dzmitry Bandarenka, who is serving two years in a penal colony in connection with a demonstration held following the elections of 19 December 2010. As of 30 January, Bandarenka, a political prisoner, will not be permitted to use a walking stick or wear orthopaedic footwear. In addition, he will not be allowed to lie down during the day, and will be obliged instead to undertake so-called light work. This places not only his health, but also his very life at risk. It should be borne in mind that in July 2011 Bandarenka underwent major spinal surgery, which requires lengthy post-operative therapy. The doctors made it very clear at the time that Bandarenka must not undertake any physical work whatsoever, and that he is in danger of becoming a lifelong invalid if he is not allowed to convalesce in the appropriate conditions.

Repressive onslaughts by the Belarusian authorities against political prisoners are intensifying. I would also highlight the fact that a couple of weeks ago the penal colony authorities decided to impose more stringent conditions on the sentences being served by two other political prisoners, namely Mikalai Autukhovich and Mikalai Statkievich. Both men have been transferred to closed prisons.

I would therefore like to ask the Commission if it intends to take any action in response to the imposition of more stringent conditions on the sentence being served by Dzmitry Bandarenka, and if it intends to express its strong condemnation of the actions by the Belarusian authorities?

Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2012)

The Commission is well aware of the cases of Mr Kavalenka and Mr Bandarenka, and remains deeply concerned by the continued imprisonment and poor treatment of these, and other, political prisoners in Belarus.

The EU will continue to strongly press the Belarusian authorities on this issue. On 18 December 2011, the High Representative/Vice-President Ashton and United States Secretary of State Clinton called in a joint statement ([1]) for all political prisoners to be immediately released and rehabilitated. The EU has also implemented a range of restrictive measures against those responsible for the crackdown in the country.

In addition, the EU will continue its efforts to support the work of civil society organisations in Belarus, including through continued assistance to victims of repression and their families. Most recently, on 7 March 2012, the Commissioner responsible for Enlargement and European Neighbourhood Policy sent a letter to Mr Kavalenka offering his personal support and urging him to end his hunger strike.

([1]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/127034.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001149/12
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(8. Februar 2012)

Betrifft: Nachzahlungen an österreichische Pensionisten — EuGH, Rechtssache C-123/10

Nachdem der EuGH in seiner Entscheidung C-123/10 einer Klage wegen Diskriminierung österreichischer Pensionisten stattgegeben hat, fordern nun geschätzte 500 000 österreichische Pensionisten eine dementsprechende Nachzahlung ein, die ihnen bis jetzt vom österreichischen Staat verweigert wurde. Der EuGH hat in seinem Urteil nicht die persönliche Situation der Kläger bewertet, vielmehr wurde auf die gesetzliche Grundlage abgestellt und diese als diskriminierend befunden. Tatsächlich betrifft die Entscheidung aber ca. 500 000 Pensionisten und nicht bloß jene 143 Pensionisten, die ihren Anspruch auf Nachzahlung auf dem Rechtsweg durchsetzen können.

1. Wie beurteilt die Kommission das besagte EuGH-Urteil im Allgemeinen?

2. Sollte in Österreich die Rechtslage an das gegenständliche Urteil angepasst werden, damit der Schaden für alle Betroffenen (nicht nur die Klageparteien) rückwirkend behoben wird?

3. Wie steht die Kommission zum Standpunkt des österreichischen Sozialministers, wonach er keinen Handlungsbedarf sehe, allen 500 000 Pensionisten eine Nachzahlung zukommen zu lassen?

4. Wie bewertet die Kommission eine rückwirkende Auszahlung der Differenz zur korrekten Pensionshöhe an alle betroffenen Pensionisten in Österreich?

Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission
(9. März 2012)

Die Kommission hat von dem Urteil des Gerichtshofs der Europäischen Union in der Rechtsache C-123/10 (*Brachner*) vom 20. Oktober 2011 zur Auslegung der Richtlinie 79/7/EWG ([1]) Kenntnis genommen.

Die Mitgliedstaaten sind verpflichtet, EU-Recht gemäß der Auslegung des Gerichtshofs einzuhalten. Sie haben, wenn erforderlich, ihre interne Rechtsordnung entsprechend anzupassen.

Die Kommission wird sich mit den österreichischen Behörden zwecks weiterer Informationen in Verbindung setzen, um prüfen zu können, ob eine Änderung des österreichischen Gesetzes zur Erhöhung von Pensionen erforderlich ist, um der Richtlinie 79/7/EWG gemäß der Auslegung des Gerichtshofs in der oben genannten Rechtsprechung nachzukommen, und inwieweit rückwirkende Zahlungen zu erfolgen haben.

([1]) Richtlinie 79/7/EWG des Rates vom 19. Dezember 1978 zur schrittweisen Verwirklichung des Grundsatzes der Gleichbehandlung von Männern und Frauen im Bereich der sozialen Sicherheit, ABl. L 6 vom 10.1.1979, S. 24.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001149/12
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(8 February 2012)

Subject: Payment of arrears to Austrian pensioners — European Court of Justice, Case C-123/10

Following the acceptance by the European Court of Justice of an application by Austrian pensioners on grounds of discrimination (judgment in Case C-123/10), an estimated 500 000 Austrian pensioners are now demanding payment of arrears previously refused by the Austrian state. In its judgment, the ECJ did not assess the personal situation of the plaintiffs, but rather based its decision on the legal position and found this to be discriminatory. However, the decision actually affects approximately 500 000 pensioners, not just the 143 who have had their entitlement to payment of arrears upheld by the Court.

1. What is the Commission's general assessment of this ECJ judgment?

2. Should the law in Austria be amended in line with this judgment so that all those affected (rather than just the applicants) receive retrospective compensation?

3. How does the Commission view the attitude of the Austrian Minister for Social Affairs, who stated that he saw no need to pay arrears to all 500 000 pensioners?

4. What is the Commission's opinion as to a retrospective payment to all affected pensioners in Austria to make up the shortfall in their pensions?

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

The Commission took note of the judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union in Case C-123/10 (*Brachner*) of 20 October 2011 on the interpretation of Directive 79/7/EEC ([1]).

Member States have the obligation to comply with EC law, as interpreted by the Court of Justice, and have to adapt their internal legal order if necessary.

The Commission will contact the Austrian authorities for further information, to be able to examine whether the Austrian legislation on pension increases needs to be amended to comply with Directive 79/7/EEC, as interpreted by the Court of Justice in the abovementioned case-law, and to what extent retroactive payments will have to be made.

([1]) Council Directive 79/7/EEC of 19 December 1978 on the progressive implementation of the principle of equal treatment for men and women in matters of social security, OJ L 6, 10.1.1979, p. 24.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita P-001209/12
à Comissão
Mário David (PPE)
(8 de fevereiro de 2012)

Assunto: Acordo UE-Marrocos respeitante às medidas de liberalização recíprocas em matéria de produtos agrícolas, de produtos agrícolas transformados, de peixe e de produtos da pesca

A Comissão do Comércio Internacional do Parlamento Europeu aprovou na semana passada um projeto de recomendação que aprova o acordo supracitado entre o Reino de Marrocos e a UE.

Embora saudando todos os acordos que visem a uma aproximação maior entre a União Europeia e os seus países vizinhos, nomeadamente os acordos firmados com o Reino de Marrocos, diversas dúvidas têm sido levantadas sobre as implicações económicas deste acordo especifico para os agricultores da União Europeia (em especial pela Comissão da Agricultura e do Desenvolvimento Rural no seu parecer sobre o Acordo), nomeadamente no que diz respeito:

1. À capacidade do sistema comunitário para controlar e fazer respeitar os calendários e os contingentes pautais;

2. Ao respeito pelos padrões comunitários no domínio da proteção do ambiente, das condições dos trabalhadores, da proteção sindical, da legislação anti-dumping e da segurança alimentar;

3. Às indicações geográficas (IG);

4. Aos problemas de competitividade, causados pelas diferenças do custo da mão-de-obra entre a União Europeia e Marrocos;

5. À contra sazonalidade das importações de Marrocos, que poderão implicar alguma volatilidade nos preços de alguns produtos na Europa (*v.g.*, do tomate);

A Decisão do Conselho prevê, contudo, no seu artigo segundo, a adoção de medidas de salvaguarda ao abrigo das disposições aplicáveis às importações de países terceiros. Gostaria por isso de perguntar à Comissão:

1. Existe algum estudo de impacto económico, desagregado por regiões ou Estados-Membros, com os impactos da entrada em vigor deste acordo na UE, em especial sobre o emprego, o «output» do setor agrícola e os preços dos produtos agrícolas em causa ao longo do ano?

2. Como se propõe a Comissão monitorizar o respeito pelos padrões comunitários anteriormente referidos no ponto 2? E quanto ao controlo dos contingentes pautais e do calendário?

3. Para quando um Acordo sobre as IG à semelhança do recente Acordo com a Geórgia no âmbito da Parceira Oriental?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(9 de março de 2012)

A Comissão não dispõe de provas que indiquem que o esforço suplementar de liberalização acordado por ambas as partes no âmbito do acordo a que o Senhor Deputado se refere é suscetível de originar graves perturbações da produção da UE de frutos e produtos hortícolas ou um nível mais elevado de desemprego nas zonas rurais do sul da UE.

O acordo prevê unicamente pequenos aumentos dos contingentes pautais preferenciais para as importações de produtos sensíveis de Marrocos. Por conseguinte, nenhum modelo econométrico pode fiavelmente quantificar o impacto de, por exemplo, um aumento de 52 000 toneladas de tomate na produção da UE, que é de 6 de milhões de toneladas (0,8 % da produção da UE), sobretudo quando esse aumento é faseado ao longo de quatro anos e repartido numa base mensal.

Em segundo lugar, o acordo prevê explicitamente que todas as importações originárias de Marrocos terão necessariamente de continuar a respeitar as normas sanitárias e fitossanitárias (SPS) da UE. As inspeções recentemente efetuadas pela UE a instalações marroquinas dão conta de um bom cumprimento das nossas normas sanitárias e fitossanitárias. Marrocos assinou, e está a aplicar, a maior parte das convenções relevantes da OIT sobre as condições de trabalho e a liberdade de associação, incluindo na agricultura. A Comissão apoia e continuará a apoiar Marrocos nas suas ações de reforço da capacidade de aplicação da legislação e da proteção do ambiente através do Acordo de Associação.

A Comissão continuará a controlar atentamente as quantidades importadas, de modo a assegurar que os limites de contingentes pautais para os produtos agrícolas marroquinos são respeitados, como tem sido o caso até à data.

Por último, mas não menos importante, o acordo prevê, no prazo de três meses a contar da data da sua entrada em vigor, a abertura das negociações para um acordo bilateral sobre a proteção das indicações geográficas.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001209/12
to the Commission
Mário David (PPE)
(8 February 2012)

Subject: EU-Morocco Agreement concerning reciprocal liberalisation measures for agricultural products, processed agricultural products, and fish and fishery products

The European Parliament International Trade Committee last week endorsed the draft recommendation approving the above agreement between the Kingdom of Morocco and the EU.

While welcoming all agreements aiming at closer ties between the European Union and its neighbouring countries, including the agreements signed with the Kingdom of Morocco, many doubts have been raised regarding the economic implications of this particular agreement for farmers in the European Union (and in particular by the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development in its opinion on the Agreement), namely as regards:

1. The capacity of the Community system to monitor and enforce schedules and tariff quotas;

2. Compliance with Community standards in the field of environmental protection, working conditions, protection of trade unions, anti-dumping legislation and food safety;

3. Geographical indications (GI);

4. Problems of competitiveness, caused by the differences in the cost of manpower between the European Union and Morocco;

5. Different seasons in the case of imports from Morocco, which may lead to some volatility in the prices of certain products in Europe (e.g. tomatoes);

Nevertheless, Article 2 of the Council Decision provides for the adoption of safeguard measures in accordance with the provisions applicable to imports from third countries. The Commission is therefore called upon to answer the following questions:

1. Is there any economic impact study, broken down by regions or Member States, showing the impact that the entry into force of this agreement will have in the EU, and particularly on employment, on the output of the agricultural sector and on the prices of the agricultural products in question throughout the year?

2. How will the Commission monitor compliance with the Community standards mentioned in point 2? How will it monitor tariff quotas and schedules?

3. When will there be an agreement on geographical indications similar to the agreement recently signed with Georgia within the framework of the Eastern Partnership?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(9 March 2012)

The Commission has no evidence indicating that the extra effort of liberalisation agreed by both parties in the framework of the Agreement to which the Honourable Member refers is likely to lead to serious disturbances of EU production of fruits and vegetables, or a higher level of unemployment in rural areas in the south of the EU.

The Agreement provides for only minor increases in preferential Tariff Rate Quotas for imports of sensitive products from Morocco. Therefore, no econometric model can reliably quantify the impact of, for example, an increase of 52 000 tons of tomatoes on the EU output of 6 million tons (0.8% of the EU production), particularly when the increase is staged over 4 years and spread out on a monthly basis.

Secondly, the Agreement provides explicitly that all the imports originating in Morocco will need to continue respecting the EU SPS standards. Recent EU inspections of Moroccan facilities reported positively on its compliance with our SPS standards. Morocco has signed and is implementing most of the relevant ILO conventions on working conditions and freedom of association, including in agriculture. The Commission is and will continue supporting Morocco in strengthening its enforcement capacity and cooperating on environmental protection through the Association Agreement

The Commission will continue its close monitoring of the quantities imported so as to ensure that relevant tariff quota limits for Moroccan agricultural goods are respected, as has been the case to date.

Last but not least, the Agreement foresees, within three months of its entry into force, the opening of negotiations for a bilateral agreement on protection of geographical indications.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita P-001211/12
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(8 de fevereiro de 2012)

Assunto: Crime ambiental: Construção da Barragem da Ribeira das Cortes, Covilhã

Encontra-se prevista a construção de uma barragem designada «Ribeira das Cortes» nas freguesias de Cortes do Meio e Cantar Galo, concelho da Covilhã, distrito de Castelo Branco, na Região Centro (sub-região da Cova da Beira), em Portugal. A nova barragem localizar-se-á a cerca de 3 km a jusante da barragem da Lagoa do Viriato, próximo das Penhas da Saúde e aproximadamente a 4 km da cidade da Covilhã, na ribeira do mesmo nome. Este projeto conta com o apoio do Programa Operacional de Valorização do Território (POVT), no âmbito do Quadro de Referência Estratégico Nacional (QREN), tendo recentemente a câmara da Covilhã lançado concurso para a pré-qualificação das empresas que irão apresentar propostas para a sua construção.

No entanto, a ser construída tal como está prevista, a barragem põe em causa património importante e irrecuperável da Serra da Estrela, tanto natural e hidrológico, paisagístico e arquitetónico, como etnográfico e histórico, pela sua ligação à história cultural e literária contemporânea de Portugal. Estão particularmente em causa duas casas modernistas do escritor e intelectual António Alçada Baptista, uma das quais ligada às obras de José Cardoso Pires e palco de reuniões políticas no período do Estado Novo, bem como o sistema hidráulico de meados do século XIX, usado para abastecer campos agrícolas e de pastoreio. Existem outras alternativas para aproveitamento dos recursos hídricos da região que poderiam salvaguardar mais adequadamente o património sem que o mesmo fosse lesado.

Em 2010, a Ordem dos Arquitetos Portugueses e a Associação Portuguesa dos Arquitetos Paisagistas manifestaram a sua preocupação à então Ministra da Cultura de Portugal quanto à prossecução deste projeto, manifestando a opinião de que era essencial «salvaguardar» o património para «as futuras gerações do país». Profissionais de diferentes áreas como Ana Tostões, Siza Vieira, Gonçalo Byrne, Nuno Portas, Guilherme d'Oliveira Martins e Rui Vilar subscrevem esta mesma posição.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Pretende dar o seu apoio financeiro a uma obra que destrói completamente património único e irrecuperável? Não crê que, havendo alternativas viáveis para o abastecimento das populações, deve optar-se por conciliar a construção da barragem com um maior respeito pelo espaço envolvente?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(8 de março de 2012)

Com base nas informações fornecidas pela autoridade de gestão, a construção da barragem «Ribeira das Cortes», no concelho da Covilhã, foi efetivamente aprovada para cofinanciamento no âmbito do Programa Operacional de Valorização do Território.

No contexto do princípio da gestão partilhada, no âmbito da qual é administrada a política de coesão, os Estados-Membros são responsáveis pela execução dos programas e projetos no terreno. Neste contexto, as autoridades nacionais competentes têm de garantir que todos os procedimentos pertinentes, bem como a legislação nacional e da UE, são respeitados. Tal inclui a conformidade com a legislação em matéria de ambiente (Diretiva relativa à avaliação do impacto ambiental ([1]), Diretiva «Habitats» ([2]) e Diretiva-quadro relativa à água ([3])). A Comissão sugere, pois, que o Senhor Deputado entre diretamente em contacto com as autoridades portuguesas responsáveis pela gestão do programa em causa, nomeadamente a:

Autoridade de Gestão do POVT
Programa Operacional Temático de Valorização do Território
Avenida D. João II, lote 1.07.2.1 — 2.°
1998-014 Lisboa
Tel (+351) 211 545 000
Fax (+351) 211 545 099
E-mail: povt@povt.qren.pt
www.povt.qren.pt

([1]) Diretiva 2011/92/UE, JO L 26 de 28.1.2012, p. 1.
([2]) Diretiva 92/43/CEE, JO L 206 de 22.7.1992, p. 7.
([3]) Diretiva 2000/60/CE, JO L 327 de 22.12.2000, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001211/12
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(8 February 2012)

Subject: Environmental crime: Construction of the Ribeira da Cortes dam, Covilhã

There is a plan for the construction of a dam known as 'Ribeira da Cortes' in the parishes of Cortes do Meio and Cantar Galo, Covilhã municipality, Castelo Branco district, Central Region (subregion of Cova da Beira) in Portugal. The new dam is situated approximately 3 km downstream from the Lagoa do Viriato dam, close to Penhas da Saúde and approximately 4 km away from the town of Covilhã, on the stream of the same name. This project is receiving support from the Operational Programme for Territorial Development (POVT), within the scope of the National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF), and the municipal council of Covilhã has recently invited bids for the pre-qualification of the companies that will present proposals for its construction.

However, if constructed as planned, the dam will place the important and irrecoverable heritage of Serra da Estrela at risk, both natural and hydrological, landscape and architectural, as well as ethnographic and historical, because of its connection to the cultural and literary history of Portugal. At risk are in particular two modernist houses belonging to the writer and intellectual António Alçada Baptista, one of which is linked to the works of José Cardoso Pires and was the scene of political meetings at the time of the Second Republic. The dam will also pose a threat to a water supply system dating back to the mid-19th century, used to supply fields and pastures. There are other alternatives which could make use of the region's water resources while protecting the heritage more appropriately, and without damaging it.

In 2010, the Portuguese Order of Architects and the Portuguese Landscape Architects' Association expressed their concern to the then Portuguese Minister for Culture regarding the implementation of this project, expressing the opinion that it was essential to 'safeguard' heritage for 'the future generations of the country'. Professionals working in different areas such as Ana Tostões, Siza Vieira, Gonçalo Byrne, Nuno Portas, Guilherme d'Oliveira Martins and Rui Vilar also subscribe to this point of view.

Can the Commission say:

— Does it intend to provide financial support for construction work that will completely destroy unique and irrecoverable heritage? Does it not believe that, since there are viable alternatives to meet supply needs, we should opt for reconciling the construction of the dam with greater respect for the surrounding area?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(8 March 2012)

On the basis of information provided by the managing authority, the construction of the Ribeira da Cortes dam in Covilha municipality has indeed been approved for co-financing under the Programme Territorial Development.

In the context of the shared management principle under which cohesion policy is administered, the Member States are responsible for the implementation of programmes and projects on the ground. In this context, the competent national authorities have to ensure that all relevant procedures and national and EU legislation are respected. This includes compliance with environmental legislations (Environmental Impact Assessment Directive ([1]), Habitats Directive ([2]) and Water Framework Directive ([3])). The Commission would therefore suggest the Honourable Member contacts directly the Portuguese authorities in charge of managing the programme concerned, namely:

Autoridade de Gestão do POVT
Programa Operacional Temático Valorização do Território
Avenida D. João II, lote 1.07.2.1 — 2°
1998-014 Lisboa
Tel. (+351) 211 545 000
Fax (+351) 211 545 099
E-mail: povt@povt.qren.pt
www.povt.qren.pt

([1]) Directive 2011/92/EU, OJ 26, 28.1.2012, p. 1.
([2]) Directive 92/43/EEC, OJ L 206, 22.7.1992, p. 7.
([3]) Directive 2000/60/EC, OJ L 327, 22.12.2000, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001236/12
to the Commission
George Lyon (ALDE)
(9 February 2012)

Subject: Organic farming — automatic fulfilment of greening criteria under the first pillar of the CAP and WTO green box compatibility

Given that:

— the organic farming premium under the second pillar of the CAP is calculated on the basis of additional costs and the income foregone, as per the WTO green box requirements for 'payments under environmental programmes';

— the greening layer of the CAP direct payments proposed by the Commission has been designed to fulfil the WTO green box requirements of 'decoupled income support' payments (unrelated to the type of production undertaken in any year after the base period), and therefore does not compensate for income foregone,

has the Commission examined whether the automatic fulfilment of the greening criteria by organic farmers, as proposed in Article 29(4) of the proposal for a regulation on direct payments to farmers (COM(2011) 0625/3), will be compatible with the WTO green box requirements, or could compromise the WTO green box status of the two respective payments, given the conditions stated above?

Question for written answer E-001237/12
to the Commission
George Lyon (ALDE)
(9 February 2012)

Subject: Organic farming — automatic fulfilment of greening criteria in the first Pillar of the CAP (double funding)

Can the Commission explain why, and under what circumstances, the fact that organic farmers automatically receive 30% of their direct payments precisely because they use organic production methods, according to Article 29(4) of the proposal for a regulation on direct payments to farmers (COM(2011) 0625/3), would not constitute double funding (prohibited in all other respects under Article 29 of the proposal for a regulation on the financing, management and monitoring of the CAP (COM(2011) 0628/3)) for the same measures as those supported under the second pillar of the CAP compensating organic farmers for income foregone following the use of exactly the same organic production methods, according to Article 30 of the proposal for a regulation on rural development (COM(2011) 0627/3)?

Joint answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(4 April 2012)

The two questions of the Honourable Member refer to Article 29(4) of the proposal for a regulation on direct payments ([1]), which qualifies organic farming methods in compliance with Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 ([2]) as compatible with the greening requirements.

The Commission has paid attention to the WTO green box requirements when preparing the CAP legislative proposals, including with respect to the greening criteria.

Because organic farming is considered beneficial for the environment, it is included among the practices benefiting from the payment under 'greening' layer in the proposed regulation on direct payments. It is the observation of the environmentally-friendly production method which is required and rewarded under the 'greening' payment. Distinction should be made between the notions of production method or practice on the one hand, and of the type of production on the other hand. On this basis, the Commission does not consider that including organic farming endangers the Green Box compliance of the greening payment in any way, which remains a fully decoupled measure.

([1]) COM(2011) 625/3.
([2]) Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91; OJ L 189, 20.7.2007, p. 1.

Furthermore, these payments are not double funded by the first and the second pillars of the CAP. The reasoning for the classification of payments for organic production under the second pillar of the CAP is distinct and not affected by the reference to organic farming in the greening provisions: these payments are based on the cost incurred/income foregone calculation as required under paragraph 12 of Annex A to the WTO Agreement on Agriculture.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001250/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(9 febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: Grandi pesci in via di estinzione: colpa della medicina

Non bastano gli squali, e gli orsi della bile, ora la medicina cinese prende di mira le mante. Secondo un rapporto dell'Ong «Sharks Savers», dopo la famiglia degli squali, anche la manta entra a far parte delle specie di grandi pesci a serio rischio di estinzione, a causa del sempre più massiccio uso delle branchie nella medicina cinese.

La sostanza presente in queste branchie sarebbe capace di rinforzare il sistema immunitario aiutando quindi il paziente a guarire da malattie gravi come il cancro o dai problemi legati all'infertilità. Sfortunatamente, la manta è un animale già fisicamente molto vulnerabile all'aggressione della pesca. Impiega infatti circa dieci anni a raggiungere la maturità sessuale e le femmine partoriscono un singolo cucciolo solo ogni due o tre anni. Il loro commercio deruba le economie e l'ambiente di una delle creature più carismatiche dell'oceano. Ogni esemplare può far guadagnare un milione di dollari all'anno grazie all'ecoturismo.

Considerando che il mercato delle branchie, concentrato in alcune regioni della Cina, vale 11 milioni di dollari l'anno e che la sperimentazione nel settore di tali medicinali scatena spesso proteste e danni all'ambiente e alla fauna, si chiede alla Commissione: intende implementare i controlli sui medicinali che provengono dalla Cina al fine di proteggere il consumatore dal mercato illegale e contraffatto dei medicinali?

Risposta data da John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(16 aprile 2012)

Per quanto concerne le regole a tutela delle specie, nel novembre 2011, con il sostegno dell'UE, la 10ª riunione delle parti aderenti alla convenzione relativa alla conservazione delle specie migratrici appartenenti alla fauna selvatica ha deciso di conferire una protezione integrale alla manta gigante in ambiente naturale, ne ha proibito la cattura e ha approvato misure per conservarne l'habitat.

Per quanto concerne la regolamentazione sui medicinali, la legislazione dell'Unione europea prevede un'autorizzazione obbligatoria pre-commercializzazione per i prodotti medicinali per uso umano nonché il loro controllo all'importazione (articoli 6 e 51 della direttiva 2001/83/CE [1]). Se i prodotti descritti dall'onorevole deputato sono prodotti medicinali, tale legislazione unionale si applica ad essi. Rientra nella responsabilità degli Stati membri assicurare che prodotti illegali non vengano immessi sul mercato dell'UE.

[1] GU L 311 del 28.11.2001.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001250/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(9 February 2012)

Subject: Large fish facing extinction: medicine to blame

Sharks and moon bears are not enough. Chinese medicine is now targeting manta rays. According to a report published by the NGO 'Shark Savers', after the shark family the manta ray has now joined the list of large fish species at serious risk of extinction, due to the increasingly massive use of their gills in Chinese medicine.

The substance present in their gills is believed to strengthen the immune system, helping patients to recover from serious illnesses such as cancer or from problems linked to infertility. Unfortunately, manta rays are already physically very vulnerable to overfishing. They take around 10 years to reach sexual maturity, and females give birth to a single pup only once every two or three years. The manta ray trade is robbing the economy and the environment of one of the ocean's most charismatic creatures. Each specimen can generate a million dollars a year as a result of ecotourism.

Considering that the gill market, which is concentrated in certain Chinese regions, is worth 11 million dollars a year and that experimentation in the field of such medicines often sparks protests and causes damage to the environment and fauna, can the Commission state whether it intends to implement controls on Chinese medicines in order to protect consumers from the illegal and counterfeit medicine market?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(16 April 2012)

Regarding rules to protect species, in November 2011, with EU support, the 10th Meeting of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals decided to give full protection to the giant manta ray in the wild, prohibit its taking and conserve its habitat.

Regarding the laws on medicines, European Union legislation provides for an obligatory pre-marketing authorisation for medicinal products for human use, as well as their control upon importation (Articles 6 and 51 of Directive 2001/83/EC ([1])). If the products described by the Honourable Member are medicinal products, this Union legislation applies to them. It falls within the responsibility of Member States to ensure that no illegal products are entering the EU market.

([1]) OJ L 311, 28.11.2001.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001254/12
alla Commissione
Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE)
(2 febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: Licenza a punti

L'interrogante esprime la propria profonda preoccupazione per la situazione di tensione che si sta creando in questi giorni in diverse marinerie italiane, francesi, spagnole e portoghesi. Il centro nevralgico del confronto è costituito dal regolamento comunitario sui controlli (regolamento (CE) n. 1224/2009) e in particolare dalle misure legate alla licenza a punti.

Con la licenza a punti, la scomparsa dei contributi europei per le demolizioni dei pescherecci e il caro gasolio, l'Italia sta per mettere in liquidazione l'intero settore della pesca.

La patente a punti, introdotta all'inizio dell'anno, impone ai pescatori una perdita di punti per ogni infrazione, fino al ritiro definitivo della licenza di pesca. Si va dalla pesca di esemplari sottotaglia (5 punti), al mancato rispetto della distanza minima dalla costa (6 punti), all'utilizzo di reti o attrezzi non regolamentari (4 punti). Si tratta di regole davvero stringenti, difficilmente applicabili, limitative della libertà di impresa e soprattutto che non penalizzano il comando dell'imbarcazione ma che svalutano direttamente l'impresa.

Non crede la Commissione che bisognerebbe modificare i criteri di penalizzazione, in quanto la responsabilità delle infrazioni grava sull'armatore del peschereccio e non su chi effettivamente compie l'infrazione?

Risposta data da Maria Damanaki a nome della Commissione
(15 marzo 2012)

Con il regolamento 1224/2009 ([1]) e le relative diposizioni di applicazione, la riforma del sistema di controllo della pesca ha introdotto un importante strumento per promuovere la cultura del rispetto delle norme della politica comune della pesca, ossia un sistema a punti per le infrazioni gravi commesse dai titolari di una licenza. Il nuovo regime impone altresì agli Stati membri di stabilire un sistema a punti per i comandanti di pescherecci.

Il numero di punti da assegnare a ogni infrazione grave è stato stabilito a seguito di intense discussioni tra gli Stati membri e riflette, in particolare, la gravità dell'infrazione. Ad esempio, il sistema non si applica a infrazioni di minore entità. Gli Stati membri godono di un certo margine di discrezionalità nel qualificare un'infrazione come grave e, nel farlo, possono tenere in considerazione le circostanze specifiche di ogni singolo caso. Inoltre, la licenza di pesca viene sospesa una prima volta in seguito a almeno due ispezioni nel corso delle quali siano state constatate almeno tre infrazioni gravi. La revoca a titolo definitivo avviene dopo almeno quattro precedenti sospensioni per almeno tredici infrazioni gravi.

Un'altra misura prevista nell'ambito del sistema a punti per scoraggiare le attività illegali è agire direttamente sul valore economico della licenza; com'è infatti noto, la pratica della pesca illegale è spesso il frutto di logiche economiche.

Per di più, il sistema a punti contiene misure intese ad incentivare il rispetto delle norme e prevede l'annullamento di tutti i punti di penalità figuranti sulla licenza se nei tre anni successivi all'ultima infrazione grave non ne viene commessa nessun'altra.

Pertanto, secondo la Commissione, il sistema a punti introdotto dal regolamento 1224/2009 è, nella sua forma attuale, ben equilibrato e contribuirà a dissuadere i potenziali trasgressori dal commettere infrazioni, contribuendo così a creare e sviluppare la cultura del rispetto delle norme.

([1]) GU L 343 del 22.12.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001254/12
to the Commission
Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE)
(2 February 2012)

Subject: Point-based licences

I am very concerned about the tense situation that is currently building up in various Italian, French, Spanish and Portuguese fishing communities. The main cause of tension is the Community rules on checks (Regulation (EC) No 1224/2009) and, more specifically, the measures relating to point-based licences.

The combination of point-based licences, the abolition of European contributions towards the scrapping of fishing vessels and the high cost of diesel fuel is leading the entire Italian fisheries sector into ruin.

With point-based licences, introduced at the beginning of the year, fishermen lose points each time they commit an offence, until their fishing licence is withdrawn permanently. Offences range from the fishing of undersized specimens (5 points) to non-compliance with the minimum distance from the coast (6 points) and the use of nets or gear not conforming to the regulations (4 points). These are very stringent rules, which are difficult to apply and limit free enterprise. Above all, they do not penalise ships' masters, but instead directly lower the value of business.

Does the Commission therefore not agree that the penalty criteria need to be reassessed, given that it is the fishing vessel owners that are held liable for the infringements, rather than the actual offenders?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(15 March 2012)

As an important element to develop a culture of compliance with the rules of the common fisheries policy, the reform of the fisheries control system (Regulation 1224/2009 [1]) and its implementing provisions) introduced for fishing licences holders a point system for serious infringements It also obliges Member States to establish a point system for masters of fishing vessels.

The number of points to be assigned for each serious infringement is the result of intensive discussions with Member States, and it reflects, in particular, the gravity of the infringement. For instance, the system does not apply to minor infringements. Member States have some discretion to qualify an infringement as serious and can, in that context, take account of the circumstances of the individual case. Furthermore, for a fishing licence to be suspended for a first time, it would take at least two inspections having detected at least three serious infringements, and to be permanently withdrawn, at least four previous temporary suspensions for at least thirteen serious infringements.

Another mechanism through which the point system discourages illegal activities is by affecting the economic value of the licence, as it is known that illegal fishing activities are often the result of an economic calculation.

The point system includes also incentives for compliance and foresees that all points are deleted when no other serious infringement has been committed within three years after the last serious infringement.

The Commission therefore considers that in its current set-up, the point system resulting from Regulation 1224/2009 is well balanced and will help discourage potential offenders from committing wrongdoings, thereby contributing to creating and developing a culture of compliance.

[1] OJ L 343, 22.12.2009.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001269/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(10 febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Delitto d'onore in Canada

Mohammad Shafia, 59 anni, sua moglie Tooba Yahya, 42, e il loro secondogenito Hamed, 21, di origine afghana ma residenti in Canada, sono stati condannati all'ergastolo per l'assassinio delle tre figlie e della prima moglie dell'uomo.

Zainab, 19 anni, Sahar, 17, Geeti, 13 sono state affogate in un canale insieme alla cinquantenne Rona Moahammad Amir, prima moglie del padre delle ragazze, solo perché avevano infangato l'onore familiare, scegliendo fidanzati sbagliati. La prima moglie dell'uomo è stata uccisa per timore che potesse svelare il segreto del delitto d'onore.

Zainab e Sahar, le due figlie più grandi, si erano fidanzate con ragazzi che non erano quelli decisi dai genitori. Zainab si era anche sposata, ma il matrimonio era stato annullato il giorno dopo. La goccia che avrebbe fatto scattare il piano omicida, però, sarebbe stata la fuga di Zainab e il timore che la ragazza potesse rivelare anni di maltrattamenti e presunti abusi familiari. La prima moglie dell'uomo e la figlia più piccola, invece, sarebbero state uccise perché considerate pericolose.

Si chiede pertanto:

1. Il Vice-Presidente/Alto Rappresentante è al corrente di questa vicenda?

2. Quali azioni ha intrapreso il Vice-Presidente/Alto Rappresentante per evitare casi come quello delle tre figlie uccise in Canada?

Risposta data dall'alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(27 marzo 2012)

Il cosiddetto «delitto d'onore», assieme a tutte le forme di violenza ad esso collegate, è fonte di apprensione ovunque si verifichi. L'Unione ritiene che il miglior modo per affrontarlo sia promuovere i diritti delle donne tramite politiche a favore dell'istruzione e dello sviluppo. Decisamente attiva in questi ambiti, l'UE eroga finanziamenti considerevoli per progetti nei paesi in via di sviluppo, soprattutto quelli dove il delitto d'onore continua ad essere particolarmente radicato, e intrattiene scambi con paesi quali il Canada per affrontare sfide comuni.

L'Unione esprime soddisfazione per la condanna pronunciata di recente dai giudici canadesi che considera una prova dell'impegno del Canada a tutelare le donne e altri gruppi vulnerabili contro qualsiasi forma di violenza e a perseguirne gli autori.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001269/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(10 February 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Honour crime in Canada

Mohammad Shafia, 59, his wife Tooba Yahya, 42, and their second-born son Hamed, 21, all of Afghan origin but resident in Canada, have been sentenced to life imprisonment for the murder of Mohammed Shafia's three daughters and first wife.

Zainab, 19, Sahar, 17 and Geeti, 13, were drowned in a canal together with 50-year-old Rona Moahammad Amir, the first wife of the girls' father, for tainting their family honour by choosing the wrong partners. The man's first wife was killed for fear that she might reveal the secret honour crime.

Zainab and Sahar, the two eldest daughters, were engaged to men who had not been chosen by their parents. Zainab was also married, but the marriage was annulled the following day. The final straw that triggered the murderous plan, however, was Zainab's escape and the fear that she would reveal years of mistreatment and alleged family abuse. The man's first wife and the youngest daughter, however, were killed because they were considered dangerous.

In view of this:

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of this incident?

2. What action has the Vice-President/High Representative taken to prevent cases such as that of the three daughters killed in Canada?

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

So called 'honour-based' killing, and indeed all related violence, is a matter for concern wherever it occurs. The EU has taken the view that the problem is best addressed through education and development, promoting the rights of women. The EU is very active in these areas and provides considerable amounts of financing for projects in developing countries. The EU engages with countries where 'honour-based' violence remains a preoccupation, and has exchanges with countries such as Canada on shared challenges.

The EU welcomes the result of the recent court case in Canada, which demonstrates Canada's commitment to protecting women and other vulnerable persons from all forms of violence, and to holding offenders accountable for their acts.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001280/12
to the Commission
Struan Stevenson (ECR)
(10 February 2012)

Subject: Preservation and restoration of blue carbon ecosystems

Despite the current furore surrounding renewable energy and climate change targets in many EU Member States, the role of 'blue carbon' in preventing climate change has gone unnoticed. Marine and coastal ecosystems such as mangroves, seagrasses and tidal marshes act as a carbon sponge, in a similar way to onshore peatlands. In fact, one square mile of these coastal ecosystems can store and remove more carbon from oceans and the atmosphere than a square mile of mature tropical forest.

However, coastal and marine systems are facing serious threats from pollution, coastal activities and unsustainable management practices. Ironically, attempts by certain Member States to promote the spread of renewable energy technologies such as tidal, wave and offshore wind power will only cause further destruction of Europe's invaluable blue carbon ecosystems, leading to large amounts of carbon dioxide being released into the atmosphere.

1. What steps is the Commission taking to ensure that the preservation and restoration of these ecosystems is fully integrated into all climate change mitigation strategies and biodiversity policies?

2. How will the Commission ensure that, when constructing renewable energy schemes such as tidal, wave and offshore wind power in order to meet the mandatory EU 2020 targets, Member States do not inadvertently destroy important blue carbon ecosystems?

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

The deployment of renewable energy generation installations, including installations deployed in a marine environment such as tidal, wave and offshore wind power plants is subject to environmental impact assessments in accordance with EU ([1]) and national legislation in force. For designated Natura 2000 sites, the Birds and Habitats Directives ([2]) ensure that specific safeguards apply to ensure the integrity of those sites if energy-related or other activities are carried out.

The Commission has issued guidelines on wind energy and Natura 2000 which clarify the relevant provisions as well as promote good practice ([3]).

Directive 2008/56/EC of the European parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2000 establishing a framework for Community action in the filed of marine environmental policy (Marine Strategy Framework Directive) constitutes the environmental pillar of the Integrated Maritime Policy of the EU and requires Member States to take measures to achieve good environmental status in EU marine waters by 2020.

Moreover, through its 7th Framework Programme as well as the Intelligent Energy Europe Programme, the EU is financing research into all aspects of ocean energy technologies, including their environmental impact and mitigation strategies ([4]).

The abovementioned instruments should ensure that the development of renewable energy resources remains wholly sustainable.

([1]) Council Directive 85/337/EEC on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment, OJ L 175, 5.7.1985, last amended by Directive 2009/31/EC.
([2]) Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, OJ L 20, 26.1.2010, 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.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/Wind_farms.pdf
([4]) For a recent overview and summary, see the recent ORECCA project (www.orecca.eu).

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-001325/12
komissiolle
Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE)
(13. helmikuuta 2012)

Aihe: Sikojen suojelun vähimmäisvaatimuksista annetun neuvoston direktiivin 2001/88/EY EU:n laajuinen täytäntöönpano

Neuvoston direktiivissä 2001/88/EY kielletään pitämästä kantavia emakoita ja nuoria emakoita erillisissä karsinoissa 1. tammikuuta 2013 lähtien.

Tietääkö komissio lainsäädännön täytäntöönpanoa koskevasta tilanteesta eri jäsenvaltioissa?

Mihin toimiin komissio on ryhtynyt varmistaakseen, että jäsenvaltiot panevat direktiivin vaatimukset täytäntöön ennen säädettyä määräaikaa?

Tiedetään, että yleensä parhaiten toimivat tehokkaat seuraamukset, kuten kielto saattaa markkinoille lihaa tiloilta, joilla vaatimuksia ei noudateta. Mitä toimenpiteitä on suunniteltu vaatimusten noudattamatta jättämisen varalta?

John Dallin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(14. maaliskuuta 2012)

Arvoisan parlamentin jäsenen kannattaa tutustua vastaukseen, jonka komissio on antanut kirjalliseen kysymykseen P-001310/2012 ([1]).

Jäsenvaltiot ovat ensisijaisesti vastuussa eläinten hyvinvointia koskevan EU-lainsäädännön täytäntöönpanosta. Virallista valvontaa koskevan asetuksen (EY) N:o 882/2004 ([2]) 54 artiklassa edellytetään, että kun jäsenvaltion toimivaltainen viranomainen toteaa, että säännöksiä ei noudateta, sen on toteutettava toimenpiteitä sen varmistamiseksi, että toimija korjaa tilanteen. Lisäksi asetuksen 55 artiklassa säädetään, että jäsenvaltioiden on annettava eläinten hyvinvoinnin suojelua koskevien unionin säännösten rikkomisesta määrättäviä seuraamuksia koskevat säännöt sekä toteutettava kaikki tarvittavat toimenpiteet varmistaakseen niiden täytäntöönpanon. Seuraamusten on oltava tehokkaita, oikeasuhteisia ja varoittavia.

Tähän mennessä 20 jäsenvaltiota on toimittanut komission pyytämät tiedot seuraamuksista, joita sovelletaan, jos emakoiden ryhmäkasvatusta koskevia säännöksiä ei noudateta.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB.
([2]) EUVL L 191, 28.5.2004, s. 1, asetus sellaisena kuin se on muutettuna.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001325/12
to the Commission
Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE)
(13 February 2012)

Subject: EU-wide implementation of Council Directive 2001/88/EC on specific minimum welfare requirements for the protection of pigs

Council Directive 2001/88/EC prohibits the use of individual stalls for pregnant sows and gilts from 1 January 2013 onwards.

Is the Commission aware of the situation that exists in the different Member States concerning the implementation of this legislation?

What actions has the Commission taken to ensure that the Member States implement the directive's requirements before the set deadline?

Knowing that effective sanctions, such as banning the marketing of meat from farms where the requirements are not met, usually work best, what measures have been planned for non-compliance?

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

Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question P-001310/2012 ([1]).

Member States are primarily responsible of the implementation of EU animal welfare legislation. Article 54 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 on official controls ([2]) requires that when the competent authority of a Member State identifies non-compliance, it shall take action to ensure that the operator remedies the situation. In addition, Article 55 of this regulation provides that Member States shall lay down the rules on sanctions applicable to infringements to Union provisions relating to animal welfare and shall take all measures necessary to ensure that they are implemented. The sanctions provided for must be effective, proportionate and dissuasive.

Upon request from the Commission, 20 Member States so far provided information on the sanctions applicable in case of non-compliance with group housing of sows.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB.
([2]) OJ L 191, 28.5.2004, p. 1 as amended.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001380/12
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(14 February 2012)

Subject: Sustainable energy sources

Can the Commission indicate in its proposals how it plans to promote sustainable energy sources across the European Union, in particular with regard to wind energy on the European Union Atlantic coast?

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

Directive 2009/28/EC ([1]) sets mandatory national targets for the use of renewable energy to be achieved by the Member States in 2020. Wind energy, both onshore and offshore, is a key energy source to achieve those targets. According to the National Renewable Energy Action Plans (NREAPs) ([2]) electricity from wind power is projected to increase from 70.4 TWh in 2005 to 494.6 TWh in 2020. The production of offshore wind energy in particular is to rise from a level of 1.9 TWh to 133.3 TWh in the same time frame.

The Commission is also financing projects in the area of wind energy development, notably through funding made available under the 7th Research Framework Programme ([3]), the Intelligent Energy Europe Programme ([4]), the European Energy Programme for Recovery ([5]), as well as the NER300 reserve ([6]).

([1]) Directive 2009/28/EC of the Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2009 on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources and amending and subsequently repealing Directives 2001/77/EC and 2003/30/EC, OJ L 140, 5.6.2009.
([2]) Available at the Commission Renewable Energy Transparency Platform, http://ec.europa.eu/energy/renewables/transparency_platform/action_plan_en.htm
([3]) http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/energy/
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/energy/intelligent/
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/energy/eepr/owe/owe_en.htm
([6]) http://www.ner300.com/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001382/12
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(14 February 2012)

Subject: Violence in Europe

Can the Commission indicate its proposals for tackling violence and abuse in Europe, with regard to sexual violence against women and illegal use of firearms?

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

The Commission is committed to a strong policy response to combat all forms of violence against women, including sexual abuse, 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 Daphne III Programme provides financial support for the implementation of transnational projects in this area.

The Commission is also taking measures in the criminal justice area and has put in place legislation on human trafficking ([1]), on sexual abuse and sexual exploitation of children ([2]) and on the rights of victims of crime. In May 2011, it presented the Victims' Package including a proposal for the directive on the rights of victims of crime that builds on existing EU legislation and strengthens the rights of victims. The proposal includes the right to respect and recognition, the right to provide and receive information, and right to protection. It also aims at ensuring that the needs of victims are individually assessed and that the most vulnerable including victims of sexual violence receive specific treatment appropriate to their requirements ([3]). The Victims' Package also includes a proposal for a regulation on mutual recognition of protection measures in civil matters, which complements the recently adopted European Protection Order (which applies in criminal matters). These two instruments will ensure that protection measures issued in one Member State can be recognised in another Member State to avoid that the victims loses their protection if they move or travel.

([1]) Directive 2011/36/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 April 2011 on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2002/629/JHA, OJ L 101, 15.4.2011, p. 1-11.

([2]) Directive 2011/92/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on combating the sexual abuse and sexual exploitation of children and child pornography, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2004/68/JHA, OJ L 335, 17.12.2011, p. 1-14.

([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/policies/criminal/victims/docs/com_2011_275_en.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001408/12
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(14. Februar 2012)

Betrifft: EU-Logos für die Kennzeichnung von Lebensmitteln als „vegetarisch" und „vegan"

In seiner Antwort auf die Anfrage E-010599/2011 von Hans-Peter Martin schreibt Kommissionsmitglied Dalli im Namen der Kommission: „Die verschiedenen [freiwilligen] Kennzeichnungsverfahren [für vegetarische/vegane Lebensmittel] scheinen jedoch in der Praxis inkohärent und mitunter verwirrend zu sein."

1. Ist die Kommission der Meinung, dass die Einführung EU-weit einheitlicher Logos für die Kennzeichnung von Lebensmitteln als „vegetarisch" und „vegan" — ähnlich dem eingeführten EU-Bio-Logo — den erkannten Missstand der teilweise verwirrenden und inkohärenten Lage beheben und Verbrauchern die Auswahl von vegetarischen und veganen Lebensmitteln erleichtern würde?

2. Wird die Kommission eine entsprechende Verordnung vorschlagen?

Antwort von Herrn Dalli im Namen der Kommission
(2. März 2012)

Wie in der Antwort der Kommission auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-010599/2011 ([1]) bereits dargelegt, verpflichtet die neue Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1169/2011 ([2]) die Kommission, Durchführungsrechtsakte zu erlassen, mit denen gewährleistet wird, dass Informationen über die Eignung von Lebensmitteln für Vegetarier oder Veganer nicht irreführend, zweideutig oder verwirrend für die Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher sind. Die Verordnung legt jedoch nicht fest, bis wann solche Maßnahmen erlassen werden sollen.

Gemäß der genannten Verordnung muss die Kommission auch Verpflichtungen nachkommen, für die feste Fristen gesetzt wurden. Die Kommission wird diese Maßnahmen prioritär behandeln und sich mit den von dem Herrn Abgeordneten vorgebrachten Bedenken im Anschluss befassen.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB.

([2]) Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1169/2011 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 25. Oktober 2011 betreffend die Information der Verbraucher über Lebensmittel und zur Änderung der Verordnungen (EG) Nr. 1924/2006 und (EG) Nr. 1925/2006 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates und zur Aufhebung der Richtlinie 87/250/EWG der Kommission, der Richtlinie 90/496/EWG des Rates, der Richtlinie 1999/10/EG der Kommission, der Richtlinie 2000/13/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates, der Richtlinien 2002/67/EG und 2008/5/EG der Kommission und der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 608/2004 der Kommission, ABl. L 304 vom 22.11.2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001408/12
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(14 February 2012)

Subject: EU logos for labelling foods as 'vegetarian' and 'vegan'

In his reply to Question E-010599/2011 from Hans-Peter Martin, Commissioner Dalli writes the following on behalf of the Commission: 'However, the various [voluntary] labelling methods [for vegetarian/vegan foods] in practice seem to be inconsistent and sometimes confusing.'

1. Is the Commission of the opinion that the introduction of EU-wide uniform logos for labelling foods as 'vegetarian' and 'vegan' — similar to the EU organic logo already introduced — would resolve the problem of a sometimes confusing and inconsistent situation and make it easier for consumers to choose vegetarian and vegan foods?

2. Does the Commission intend proposing such a regulation?

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

As indicated in the Commission's reply to Written Question E-010599/2011 ([1]), the new Regulation 1169/2011 ([2]) obliges the Commission to adopt implementing acts to ensure that information related to the suitability of foods to vegetarians or vegans is not misleading, ambiguous or confusing for the consumer. The regulation does not specify, however, by when such measures should be adopted.

The abovementioned legislation also imposes obligations on the Commission for which firm deadlines had been specified. The Commission will tackle these actions as a priority. Therefore, the concern raised by the Honourable Member would be tackled by the Commission subsequently.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB.

([2]) Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2011 on the provision of food information to consumers, amending Regulations (EC) No 1924/2006 and (EC) No 1925/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council, and repealing Commission Directive 87/250/EEC, Council Directive 90/496/EEC, Commission Directive 1999/10/EC, Directive 2000/13/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council, Commission Directives 2002/67/EC and 2008/5/EC and Commission Regulation (EC) No 608/2004, OJ L 304, 22.11.2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001434/12
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(14 February 2012)

Subject: State pensions and proof of life requirements for those exercising their freedom of movement

Article 48 TFEU provides for the coordination of Member States' rules in the field of social security, including mandatory pensions.

Pensioners in receipt of a Portuguese state pension are required to provide, on an annual basis, 'proof of life' for purposes of continuation of payment. Those exercising their freedom of movement under the Treaty are normally required to attend a Consulate-General in person for this 'proof of life' exercise to be conducted. In the UK, Portugal has consulates in London and Edinburgh.

The Portuguese authorities have conceded for my constituent that she could provide her signature in front of a Public Notary (in England usually known as a Commissioners for Oaths), although it is likely a fee will be chargeable for this service. In addition, the relevant forms required by Portugal for purposes of continuation of pension are only provided in Portuguese. My constituent will have either to engage the services of a translator so that the notarial services understand what they are attesting, or to rely on the goodwill of the consular official.

Is the Commission aware of these difficulties? What steps is it taking to ensure that pensioners who exercise their right to freedom of movement are not put at a disadvantage in receiving their pensions?

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

The EU provisions on the coordination of social security systems ([1]) ensure that EU nationals who are entitled to a pension from a Member State other than that in which they reside can receive it outside the territory of the paying State. Counterbalancing that obligation on the Member States to make such cross-border pension payments, Regulation (EC) 883/2004 ([2]) requires recipients of pensions falling within its scope to provide certain information: in particular, Article 76(4) imposes 'a duty of mutual information and cooperation to ensure the correct implementation' of the regulation on persons and institutions covered by it. That duty includes the provision by recipients of benefits of the information needed to prove to the paying institution that they continue to meet the conditions for entitlement to the benefit. In the case of old-age pensions, this will include compliance with the relevant life certification procedures.

In principle, therefore, the requirement for recipients of pensions to provide the paying institution with a life certificate is in conformity with EC law.

Following the introduction in 2014 of the planned full electronic exchange of social security information between the Member States in connection with the coordination of social security systems, it will be possible to exchange information electronically at EU level to confirm whether a person is alive. Work is under way on setting up the information exchange system, which will eventually do away with the need for paper-based life certification procedures while complying with data protection requirements.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the coordination of social security systems (OJ L 166, 30.4.2004, p. 1) and Regulation (EC) No 987/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 September 2009 laying down the procedure for implementing Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 on the coordination of social security systems (OJ L 284, 30.10.2009, p. 1).

([2]) OJ L 166, 30.4.2004.

(Eestikeelne versioon)

Kirjalikult vastatav küsimus E-001437/12
komisjonile
Kristiina Ojuland (ALDE)
(7. veebruar 2012)

Teema: VP/HR — Liidu välisasjade ja julgeolekupoliitika kõrge esindaja ja komisjoni asepresident — Pakistan

1. Hiljutine pommiplahvatus 6. jaanuaril 2012 Afganistanis tekitab mitmeid küsimusi, sest paljude kohalike allikate sõnul on nende rünnakutega seotud Pakistani sõjavägi ning see võib olla kättemaks 24 Pakistani sõduri tapmise eest 26. novembril 2011.

2. Hiljutise juhtumi kohta, kus NATO väed tapsid 24 Pakistani sõdurit, on väidetud, et NATO rünnak oli suunatud võitlejate vastu, kuid samas usutakse, et sihtmärgiks olnud alal paiknes mitu Pakistani sõjaväeposti. Kas kõrge esindaja näeb selles järjekordset märki selle kohta, et Pakistani sõjaväe— ja julgeolekujõud mängivad piirkonnas kaksikmängu ning toetavad samaaegselt NATO vägesid ja võitlejaid?

3. Arvestades Euroopa Liidu märkimisväärset rahalist toetust ja humanitaarabi Pakistanile, kas kõrge esindaja peab vajalikuks muuta sellise abi andmise tingimused rangemaks, eelkõige seoses naiste olukorraga Pakistanis, ja anda Gilgit-Baltistani piirkonna elanikele poliitilised õigused?

4. Konverents „Bonn 2" osutus väga edukaks ning seal anti uusi ja uuendatud lubadusi. Kas kõrge esindaja võib kinnitada, et ELi rahalist abi antakse nii, et Pakistani sõjavägi sellest kasu ei saa?

Komisjoni nimel vastanud asepresidendi Ashtoni vastus
(19. aprill 2012)

Kõrge esindaja ning komisjoni asepresident Ashton tegi pärast 2011. aasta novembris NATO rünnakus toimepandud 24 Pakistani sõduri tapmist avaliku avalduse, milles avaldas kaastunnet Pakistani valitsusele ja rahvale intsidendist põhjustatud traagiliste inimkaotuste ja vigastuste üle. ELi seisukoht on olnud toetada nii Pakistani kui ka NATO ametivõimude püüdlusi juhtumi uurimisel. Ajakirjandusele

22. detsembril 2011 edastatud USA sõjalise uurimisrühma järeldustes märgiti, et eksisid mõlemad pooled. EL ei saa spekuleerida Pakistani sõjaväe rolli üle.

Arengukoostöö rahastamisvahendi meetmete raames ei ole ette nähtud üldise tingimuslikkuse põhimõtet, aga inimõigusi jälgitakse kõigis koostöötegevustes. Lisaks toetab EL EIDHRi ([1]) raames konkreetseid inimõigustealaseid projekte, millega edendatakse nii poliitilisi õigusi kui ka naiste õigusi. EIDHRi eelarvest eraldatakse Pakistanile 900 000 eurot aastas. Peale selle on ettevalmistamisel erimeede, millega suurendada Pakistani valitsuse ja administratsiooni suutlikkust inimõiguste küsimuste käsitlemisel. Selleks on eraldatud viis miljonit eurot.

Vastavalt arengukoostöö rahastamisvahendi määrusele kasutatakse rahalisi vahendeid eranditult tsiviilsektoris. Afganistani puhul keskendub komisjon maaelu arengu sektoritele, sotsiaalvaldkondadele ja valitsemistavale/õigusriigile.

Euroopa humanitaarabi puhul lähtutakse üksnes abi vajavate inimeste vajadustest ja haavatavusest, etnilistest, rahvuslikest või usulistest kaalutlustest sõltumata ja ühtegi konfliktiosalist diskrimineerimata ega soosimata.

([1]) Demokraatia ja inimõiguste Euroopa rahastamisvahend.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001437/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Kristiina Ojuland (ALDE)
(7 February 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Pakistan

1. The recent bomb blast on 6 January 2012 in Afghanistan is raising several questions, as many local sources are pointing to the involvement of the Pakistani Army in the attacks as possible retaliation for the killing of 24 Pakistani soldiers on 26 November 2011.

2. As regards the recent killing of the 24 Pakistani soldiers by NATO troops, it is alleged that NATO fire was targeting militants, while it is also believed that the targeted area contained several Pakistani military posts. Does the High Representative interpret this as a further sign that the Pakistani military and security forces are playing a double game in the area and simultaneously giving support to NATO troops and to the militants?

3. In the light of the considerable financial support and humanitarian assistance which the European Union is giving Pakistan, does the High Representative regard it as necessary to strengthen conditionality for that aid, in particular as regards the situation of women in Pakistan, and give political rights to the people of Gilgit-Baltistan?

4. The Bonn 2 conference ended with great success, with new and renewed promises. Can the High Representative give an assurance that EU financial assistance will be provided in ways that do not benefit the Pakistani Army?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(19 April 2012)

With regard to the killing of 24 Pakistani soldiers in a NATO ([1]) attack in November 2011, the High Representative/Vice-President issued a public statement offering condolences to the Government and people of Pakistan for the tragic loss of life and injuries resulting from the incident. The position of the EU has been to support efforts by both the Pakistani and NATO authorities to investigate the incident. The findings of the US military investigation team — communicated to the press on 22 December 2011 — stated that mistakes had been made on both sides. The EU is not in a position to speculate on the role of the Pakistani military in these circumstances.

There is no general conditioning of the DCI ([2]) activities; instead human rights are mainstreamed across all cooperation activities. Apart from this the EU supports specific human rights projects from the EIDHR ([3]) that promote political rights as well as women's rights. The EIDHR budget for Pakistan is EUR 900 000 annually. Additionally a specific action to support the capacity of the Pakistani Government and administration to address human rights issues is under preparation. An allocation of EUR 5 million has been made for this purpose.

In line with the DCI regulation, the funds are exclusively spent in civilian sectors. In the case of Afghanistan the Commission focuses on the sectors rural development, social sectors and governance/rule of law.

As for European humanitarian assistance, it is guided exclusively by the scale of the needs and the vulnerability of the people affected, without any ethnic, national or religious consideration and without discrimination of any kind or bias towards any particular side in a conflict.

([1]) North Atlantic Treaty Organisation.
([2]) Development Cooperation Instrument.
([3]) European initiative for democracy and human rights.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-001441/12
komissiolle
Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE)
(14. helmikuuta 2012)

Aihe: ”Kompostoidun” vaarallisten ja vaarattomien jätteiden sekoituksen käsittely Unkarin punaliejujätealtaassa: vesialan lainsäädännön ja Natura 2000 -lainsäädännön noudattaminen

Unkarin Almásfüzitõssa, aivan Tonavan rannalla ja näin ollen Slovakian rajalla, on suuri punaliejujäteallas. Kyseinen alue on Natura 2000 -alueen vieressä (Tonavan ranta – HUD120034). Veden ollessa korkealla Tonavan ranta nousee jätealtaan patoon asti. Almásfüzitõn punaliejujäteallas ei ole kunnolla eristetty.

Toimivaltaisen viranomaisen toimittamien kahden asiakirjan mukaan alueen pohjavesien saastepitoisuus on korkea punaliejujätealtaan vuoksi (esim. arseenipitoisuus on yli 0,4 mg/l, H-8212-2/2010 ja H-7423-25/2011).

Unkarin toimivaltainen viranomainen (pohjoisen Transdanubian ympäristönsuojelun, luonnonsuojelun ja vesihallinnon tarkastuslaitos) antoi 22. huhtikuuta 2010 Tatai Környezetvédelmi Zrt -yhtiölle luvan lisätä 132 000 t/a vaarallista jätettä ja 280 000 t/a vaaratonta jätettä ”kompostiksi” sen päälle (viite 392-6/2010) ([1]). Saatavilla on myös asiantuntijan lausunto Almásfüzitõn punaliejujätealtaan peittämisestä ([2]).

Lupa sisältää luettelon 166 vaarallisesta jätetyypistä, myös useista epäorgaanisista jätteistä, ja 244 vaarattomasta jätetyypistä, joilla väitetään toteutettavan biokonvertointi ”kompostoimalla”.

1. Mikäli vaarallisista ja vaarattomista jätteistä muodostuvan seoksen ”kompostin” käyttäminen punaliejujätealtaan katteena on laillista, voiko komissio tarkastella, onko toimivaltaisten viranomaisten velvoitteena huolehtia lähialueen pohjaveden seurannasta?

2. Jos lähialueen pohjaveden seurantaa edellytettäisiin, olisiko toimivaltaisten viranomaisten seurattava punaliejujätealtaasta peräisin olevien saasteiden lisäksi myös sen katteeksi lisätystä ”kompostista” peräisin olevia saasteita?

3. Katsooko komissio, että toimivaltaisen viranomaisen olisi pitänyt tarkastella kateoperaation mahdollisia vaikutuksia läheiseen Natura 2000 -alueeseen (Tonavan ranta – HUD120034) ennen luvan myöntämistä?

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-001442/12
komissiolle
Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE)
(14. helmikuuta 2012)

Aihe: ”Kompostoidun” vaarallisten ja vaarattomien jätteiden sekoituksen käsittely Unkarin punaliejujätealtaassa: jätelainsäädännön, IPPC-direktiivin ja Reach-asetuksen noudattaminen

Unkarin Almásfüzitõssa, aivan Tonavan rannalla ja näin ollen Slovakian rajalla, on suuri punaliejujäteallas. Almásfüzitõn punaliejujäteallas ei ole kunnolla eristetty.

Toimivaltaisen viranomaisen toimittamien kahden asiakirjan mukaan alueen pohjavesien saastepitoisuus on korkea punaliejujätealtaan vuoksi (esim. arseenipitoisuus on yli 0,4 mg/l, H-8212-2/2010 ja H-7423-25/2011).

Unkarin toimivaltainen viranomainen (pohjoisen Transdanubian ympäristönsuojelun, luonnonsuojelun ja vesihallinnon tarkastuslaitos) antoi 22. huhtikuuta 2010 Tatai Környezetvédelmi Zrt -yhtiölle luvan lisätä 132 000 t/a vaarallista jätettä ja 280 000 t/a vaaratonta jätettä ”kompostiksi” sen päälle (viite 392-6/2010) ([3]). Saatavilla on myös asiantuntijan lausunto Almásfüzitõn punaliejujätealtaan peittämisestä ([4]).

Lupa sisältää luettelon 166 vaarallisesta jätetyypistä, myös useista epäorgaanisista jätteistä, ja 244 vaarattomasta jätetyypistä, joilla väitetään toteutettavan ”tuotteen” biokonvertointi ”kompostoimalla”.

([1]) http://greenpeace.hu/up_files/1319446062Almasfuzito_egyseges_kornyezethasznalati_es_mukodesi_engedely.pdf
([2]) http://greenpeace.hu/up_files/13192002851318517072Lorber_szakvelemeny_angol_20111013.pdf
([3]) http://greenpeace.hu/up_files/1319446062Almasfuzito_egyseges_kornyezethasznalati_es_mukodesi_engedely.pdf
([4]) http://greenpeace.hu/up_files/13192002851318517072Lorber_szakvelemeny_angol_20111013.pdf

1. Katsooko komissio, että tästä näin erilaisten vaarallisten ja vaarattomien jätteiden seoksesta syntyvän ”kompostin” käyttö jätealtaan ”katemateriaalina” on IPPC-direktiivin, jätteidenkäsittelyä koskevan BREF 0806 -asiakirjan ja erityisesti jätteitä koskevan puitedirektiivin ja vaarallisia aineita koskevan direktiivin mukaista?

2. Jos tämä biokonversio on edellä mainitun lainsäädännön mukaista, kuuluuko toimijalle Reach-asetuksen nojalla joitakin velvoitteita niin kutsutun kompostoinnin osalta?

Janez Potočnikin komission puolesta antama yhteinen vastaus

(22. maaliskuuta 2012)

Komissio on arvioinut arvoisan parlamentin jäsenen toimittamat tiedot. Vaikuttaa siltä, että pohjaveden tilaa olisi seurattava yhteisön vesipolitiikan puitteista annetun direktiivin 2000/60/EY ([5]) 8 artiklan mukaisesti. Lisäksi vaikuttaa siltä, että toimivaltaisten viranomaisten olisi pitänyt arvioida hankkeen vaikutukset Natura 2000 -alueeseen, ennen kuin ne myönsivät luvan hankkeelle.

Komissio pyytää toimivaltaisilta viranomaisilta lisätietoja arvioidakseen, onko yritykselle Tatai Környezetvédelmi Zrt myönnetty lupa sovellettavan EU:n lainsäädännön mukainen.

([5]) EYVL L 327 , 22.12.2000.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001441/12
to the Commission
Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE)
(14 February 2012)

Subject: Disposal of 'composted' mixed hazardous and non-hazardous waste on Hungarian red mud tailings pond: compliance with water and Natura legislation

There is a major red mud tailings pond in Almásfüzitõ (Hungary), right next to the Danube and, therefore, the border with Slovakia. This site borders a Natura 2000 area (the Danube river bank — HUD120034). During high water, the dam of the tailing pond becomes the bank of the Danube. The red mud tailings in Almásfüzitõ are not properly sealed.

According to two documents supplied by the competent authority, there is a high level of groundwater contamination of the area, thanks to pollution from the red mud tailing pond (e.g. concentration of arsenic is above 0.4mg/l, H-8212-2/2010 and H-7423-25/2011).

On 22 April 2010, the competent authority in Hungary (the Inspectorate for Environmental Protection, Nature Protection and Water Management of Northern Transdanubia) granted a permit to the company Tatai Környezetvédelmi Zrt for the addition of 132 000 t/a of hazardous waste and 280 000 t/a of non-hazardous waste as 'compost' to cover the site (reference 392-6/2010) ([1]). An expert opinion on the covering of the Almásfüzitõ red mud tailings pond is available ([2]).

The permit includes a list of 166 hazardous waste types, including several inorganic ones, and 244 non-hazardous waste types, for alleged bioconversion by 'composting'.

1. Should the cover of the red mud tailings with this 'compost' resulting from a mixture of hazardous and non-hazardous waste be lawful, would the Commission consider that the competent authorities are obliged to ensure monitoring of the groundwater nearby?

2. If groundwater monitoring nearby were required, would the competent authorities have to monitor not only relevant pollutants from the red mud tailings, but also those from the 'compost' added as a cover?

3. Does the Commission consider that the competent authority should have considered the potential effects of the cover operation on the adjoining Natura 2000 area (the Danube river bank — HUD120034) before granting the permit?

Question for written answer E-001442/12
to the Commission
Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE)
(14 February 2012)

Subject: Disposal of 'composted' mixed hazardous and non-hazardous waste on Hungarian red mud tailing pond: compliance with waste legislation, IPPC and REACH

There is a major red mud tailings pond in Almásfüzitõ (Hungary), right next to the Danube, and, therefore, the border with Slovakia. The red mud tailings in Almásfüzitõ are not properly sealed.

According to two documents supplied by the competent authority, there is a high level of groundwater contamination of the area, thanks to pollution from the red mud tailing pond (e.g. concentration of arsenic is above 0.4mg/l, H-8212-2/2010 and H-7423-25/2011).

On 22 April 2010, the competent authority in Hungary (the Inspectorate for Environmental Protection, Nature Protection and Water Management of Northern Transdanubia) granted a license to the company Tatai Környezetvédelmi Zrt for the addition of 132 000 t/a of hazardous waste and 280 000 t/a of non-hazardous waste as 'compost' to 'cover' the site (reference 392-6/2010) ([3]). An expert opinion on the covering of the Almásfüzitõ red mud tailings pond is available ([4]).

([1]) http://greenpeace.hu/up_files/1319446062Almasfuzito_egyseges_kornyezethasznalati_es_mukodesi_engedely.pdf
([2]) http://greenpeace.hu/up_files/13192002851318517072Lorber_szakvelemeny_angol_20111013.pdf
([3]) http://greenpeace.hu/up_files/1319446062Almasfuzito_egyseges_kornyezethasznalati_es_mukodesi_engedely.pdf
([4]) http://greenpeace.hu/up_files/13192002851318517072Lorber_szakvelemeny_angol_20111013.pdf

The license includes a list of 166 hazardous waste types, including several inorganic ones, and 244 non-hazardous wastes types, for alleged bioconversion to a 'product' by 'composting'.

1. Does the Commission consider that the use of the 'compost' resulting from the mixture of such diverse hazardous and non-hazardous waste as a 'cover' material for the tailing pond is in compliance with the IPPC Directive, Bref 0806 on waste treatment, and more specifically with the Waste Framework Directive and the directive on Hazardous Waste?

2. Should this bioconversion be in compliance with the above legislation, are there any obligations on the operator regarding the so-called 'compost' pursuant to REACH?

Joint answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(22 March 2012)

The Commission has assessed the information provided by the Honourable Member. It would seem that the groundwater status would have to be monitored according to Article 8 of Directive 2000/60/EC establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy ([5]). In addition, it appears that the competent authorities should have assessed impacts of the project on the Natura 2000 site before granting approval.

The Commission is requesting further information from the competent authorities to assess whether the license granted to the company Tatai Környezetvédelmi Zrt is compliant with applicable EU legislation.

([5]) OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001469/12
to the Commission
Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR)
(14 February 2012)

Subject: EU internal market rules on the free movement of goods

I have been contacted by one of my London constituents, who has asked whether there are EU internal market rules on the free movement of goods that prevent small quantities of alcohol and tobacco being sent in the post across EU borders as gifts to family members and friends. The courier company that my constituent works for has informed my constituent that it would need a licence to send such products. Could the Commission clarify what quantity of alcohol and tobacco can be sent across EU borders, both via courier and in the post, and whether any such licence is required?

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

The Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that under European Union fiscal legislation no licence is needed, nor specific quantity limitations are defined, to send small quantities of alcohol and tobacco by courier or post as a gift from one Member State to family members or friends established in another Member State, but the sender and/or the receiver of these goods must respect European Union and national tax legislation.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001508/12
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(8 februari 2012)

Betreft: Groeiende corruptie in Bulgarije

Volgens een verslag van de Bulgaarse Kamer van Koophandel is het onmogelijk om zonder corruptie in Bulgarije een overheidsopdracht of een Europese subsidie te krijgen. Het verslag is gebaseerd op beweringen van driekwart van 500 ondernemers die in dat land waren ondervraagd. In het verslag wordt gewezen op een toename van het betalen van steekpenningen, met name in de bouw- en energiesector van Bulgarije.

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van het betreffende verslag ([1])?

2. Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie het feit dat de corruptie in Bulgarije toeneemt?

3. Deelt de Commissie de opvatting van de Nederlandse Partij Voor de Vrijheid (PVV) dat de groeiende corruptie in Bulgarije een bedreiging vormt voor de landen in het Schengengebied? Zo niet, waarom niet?

4. Overweegt de Commissie maatregelen te nemen om de toenemende corruptie in Bulgarije of andere lidstaten tegen te gaan? Zo ja, welke maatregelen? Zo niet, waarom niet?

Antwoord van mevrouw Malmström namens de Commissie
(28 maart 2012)

De Commissie is vastbesloten om de strijd tegen corruptie binnen de EU op te voeren, aangezien deze schadelijk is voor de correcte toepassing van het EU-acquis in het algemeen. Zoals vermeld in haar antwoord op vraag E-012317/2011 ([2]), oefent de Commissie toezicht uit op Bulgarije in het kader van het mechanisme voor samenwerking en toetsing. Het verslag dat het geachte Parlementslid citeert maakt deel uit van een reeks bronnen waarmee de Commissie rekening houdt bij het beoordelen van de situatie in Bulgarije. Het laatste verslag van de Commissie kan u vinden via de volgende link: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat_general/cvm/index_nl.htm. De Commissie verwijst tevens naar haar antwoord op vraag E-012317/2011, waarin zij voorbeelden geeft van maatregelen om corruptie tegen te gaan in alle EU-lidstaten en waarin zij haar standpunt ten aanzien van Schengenlidmaatschap voor Bulgarije aangeeft.

([1]) De Volkskrant, 21 december 2011.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001508/12
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(8 February 2012)

Subject: Growing corruption in Bulgaria

According to a report from the Bulgarian Chamber for Industry, it is not possible to obtain a public contract or a European grant in Bulgaria without corruption. The report is based on claims made by three-quarters of 500 entrepreneurs who were interviewed in that country. The report highlights an increase in the payment of bribes, in particular in Bulgaria's construction and energy sectors.

1. Is the Commission familiar with the report in question ([1])?

2. How does the Commission view the fact the corruption in Bulgaria is increasing?

3. Does the Commission share the view of the Dutch Party for Freedom (PVV) that the growing corruption in Bulgaria poses a threat to the countries of the Schengen area? If not, why not?

4. Does the Commission intend to take measures to counter the increasing corruption in Bulgaria or any other Member States? If so, what measures? If not, why not?

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

The Commission is strongly committed to step up the fight against corruption within the EU as corruption is harmful for the correct application of the EU *acquis* in general. As mentioned in its reply to Question E-012317/2011 ([2]), the Commission is monitoring Bulgaria under the Cooperation and verification mechanism. The report quoted by the Honourable Member is part of the various sources the Commission is taking into account when assessing the situation in Bulgaria. The latest report of the Commission can be found through following link: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat_general/cvm/index_en.htm

The Commission also refers to its reply to Question E-012317/2011 illustrating measures to counter corruption in all EU Member States and as regards its position on Schengen membership for Bulgaria.

([1]) *De Volkskrant*, 21 December 2011.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001517/12
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(16 February 2012)

Subject: Forage crops

With reference to the Commission's legislative proposals for the CAP post-2013, in particular Article 31 of the proposal on establishing rules for direct payments, what constitutes permanent pasture and, specifically, what flexibility will be given to the Member States to alter this definition given that they have varying forage crops as a result of differing climatic conditions and traditional farming methods?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(22 March 2012)

Permanent grassland, which includes permanent pastures, is defined in Article 4(h) of the proposal ([1]) as 'land used to grow grasses or other herbaceous forage naturally (self-seeded) or through cultivation and that has not been included in the crop rotation of the holding for five years or longer; it may include other species suitable for grazing provided that the grasses and other herbaceous forage remain predominant'.

This extended definition provides already for flexibility as regards eligible species of forages.

Article 31(3) of the proposal foresees delegated powers to the Commission also as regards the criteria for renewal of permanent grassland. In this context it will be assessed how different reseeding practices in the Member States will be considered.

([1]) COM(2011) 625 final.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-001518/12
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(16 februarie 2012)

Subiect: Îmbunătățirea transparenței în ceea ce privește beneficiarii finali ai fondurilor acordate de UE

În răspunsul la întrebarea adresată comisarului Andor privind procedura de descărcare de gestiune 2010 se afirmă următoarele: „Cerințele privind transparența constituie o precondiție pentru delegarea sarcinilor de implementare a fondurilor acordate de UE. Comisia consideră că situația ar trebui să rămână neschimbată, deoarece sunt cei mai în măsură să dețină informații complete și fiabile privind beneficiarii fondurilor pe care le gestionează". Comisia continuă prin a afirma că „autoritățile de gestionare sunt responsabile pentru publicarea, în format electronic sau prin alte metode a listei cu beneficiarii, numele operațiunilor și sumele finanțărilor publice alocate operațiunilor".

În cadrul actual, aceste informații sunt puse la dispoziție numai în limbile naționale ale statelor membre vizate. Astfel, lipsa de transparență face imposibilă monitorizarea exactă a beneficiarilor fondurilor în cauză acordate de UE, în ce scop sunt folosite, precum și a modului de utilizare a acestora. Prin urmare, sistemul actual nu asigură cu adevărat transparența pentru toți cetățenii UE în ceea ce privește implementarea de către autoritățile naționale a fondurilor acordate de UE.

1. Ce mecanisme de verificare a implementat Comisia pentru a evalua dacă informațiile publicate de statele membre sunt exacte și bazate pe criterii comune și ce sancțiuni aplică dacă sunt detectate cazuri de incompatibilitate?

2. Ce acțiuni întreprinde Comisia pentru a asigura transparența completă la nivel european, de asemenea, prin publicarea informațiilor privind beneficiarii finali ai fondurilor acordate de UE în una dintre cele trei limbi de lucru ale UE, pe baza unui set de criterii comune care ar permite compararea și detectarea erorilor?

Răspuns dat de dl Andor în numele Comisiei
(29 martie 2012)

Astfel cum a menționat Comisia în Comunicarea sa „Acțiuni întreprinse în aplicarea Cărții verzi «Inițiativa europeană în materie de transparență»" ([1]), datele privind beneficiarii sunt colectate de către organismele cărora le este delegată gestionarea în statele membre. O verificare efectuată în 2010 a arătat că statele membre au respectat cerințele de transparență în ceea ce privește Fondul social european (FSE), Fondul european de dezvoltare regională (FEDER) și Fondul de coeziune.

Cu toate acestea, Comisia nu poate verifica acuratețea tuturor datelor publicate de statele membre. Acest lucru se datorează faptului că sumele publicate se referă la beneficiari, în timp ce informațiile financiare furnizate Comisiei prin cererile de plată prezintă totalurile defalcate pe axe prioritare.

Singura modalitate de a verifica aceste informații este prin controale la fața locului. În cazul în care un audit ar arăta că datele privind un beneficiar nu au fost publicate, s-ar declanșa procedura aplicabilă cheltuielilor neeligibile.

Comisia joacă un rol de coordonare, care presupune, în primul rând, facilitarea accesului la informațiile disponibile la nivel național. Pe site-ul web Europa ([2]), se găsesc linkuri către informații cu privire la contractanții și beneficiarii de granturi europene care primesc fonduri din partea UE.

Pentru Regulamentul privind fondurile structurale pentru perioada 2014-2020, Comisia a propus armonizarea formatelor de date. Acest lucru va facilita comparația între programe sau chiar între țări, întrucât datele cu privire la operațiuni vor putea fi ușor exportate și comparate de către cei interesați. Comisia a propus, de asemenea, ca „titlurile câmpurilor de date și denumirile operațiunilor să fie furnizate, de asemenea, în cel puțin o altă limbă oficială a Uniunii Europene".

([1]) COM(2007) 127 final, 21 martie 2007.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/contracts_grants/beneficiaries_ro.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001518/12
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(16 February 2012)

Subject: Increasing transparency regarding the final beneficiaries of EU funds

The answer to the question addressed to Commissioner Andor concerning the 2010 discharge states: 'The transparency requirements constitute a precondition for the delegation of implementation of EU funds. The Commission considers that it should remain so, as they are the best positioned to have full and reliable information regarding the beneficiaries of the funds they manage'. The Commission goes on to state that the 'managing authorities are responsible for the publication, electronically or otherwise, of the list of beneficiaries, the names of the operations and the amount of public funding allocated to the operations'.

Under the current framework, this information is made available only in the national languages of the Member States concerned. This lack of transparency makes it impossible to monitor precisely who benefits from the EU funds concerned and for what purposes, as well as how the funds are used. Therefore, the current system does not ensure real transparency for all EU citizens concerning the implementation of EU funds by national authorities.

1. What are the verification mechanisms put in place by the Commission to assess whether the information published by Member States is accurate and based on common criteria, and what sanctions are applied if inconsistency is detected?

2. What action is being taken by the Commission to ensure full transparency at European level, by also publishing information on the final beneficiaries of EU funds in one of the three working languages of the EU, on the basis of a set of common criteria which would allow the comparison and detection of errors?

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

As the Commission stated in its communication 'Follow-up to the Green Paper European Transparency Initiative' ([1]), data on beneficiaries are collected by the bodies to whom management is delegated in the Member States. A check conducted in 2010 showed that the Member States complied with the transparency requirements as regards the European Social Fund (ESF), the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and the Cohesion Fund (CF).

However, the Commission cannot verify the accuracy of all data published by the Member States. This is because the amounts published refer to beneficiaries, while the financial information provided to the Commission through payment claims gives totals per priority axis.

The only way to verify this information is by on-the-spot checks. Where an audit shows that data on a beneficiary were not published, the procedure applying to irregular expenditure would be triggered.

The Commission plays a coordinating role, which primarily involves facilitating access to information available at national level. Links to information on EU grant recipients and contractors receiving EU funds can be found on the Europa website ([2]).

For the 2014-2020 Structural Funds regulation the Commission has proposed a harmonisation of the data formats. This will facilitate a comparison across programmes or even countries, as the data about operations can easily be exported and compared by those interested. The Commission has also proposed that 'the headings of the data fields and the names of the operations shall be also provided in at least one other official language of the European Union'.

([1]) COM(2007) 127 final of 21 March 2007.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/contracts_grants/beneficiaries_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001523/12
to the Commission
Gay Mitchell (PPE)
(16 February 2012)

Subject: Driving and epilepsy

Directive 2009/112/EC ([1]), which covers driving and epilepsy, came into force in August 2009, with the Commission requiring all the Member States to implement it within a year of that date. The International Bureau for Epilepsy has surveyed its member organisations across the Member States a number of times to determine where things stand with regard to the implementation of the directive in each country. However, the results continue to be inconclusive, at best, and it is very unclear to what extent the directive has been taken on board in the different countries. The results from the eastern (and, to a lesser extent, central) states from the former Soviet bloc are of most concern, as many of these countries operated a blanket ban on driving for anyone who had ever had epilepsy.

— Is the Commission following the exact state of implementation of the directive in each Member State?

— What steps will the Commission take to ensure that directive 2009/112/EC is being correctly implemented?

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

The Commission has closely followed up the transposition of Directive 2009/112/EC ([2]) into the national law of Member States and has launched infringement procedures against Member States which had not transposed the directive on time.

If the Commission receives allegations that directive 2009/112/EC is being breached by a Member State, it will investigate the matter and undertake the necessary steps to rectify this situation.

It should however be mentioned that the fitness to drive requirements of Directive 2009/112/EC are minimum requirements. Member States may introduce stricter requirements if they deem it necessary. Therefore, differences may exist in the relevant national legislation throughout the European Union.

([1]) OJ L 223, 26.8.2009, p. 26.
([2]) Commission Directive 2009/112/EC of 25 August 2009 amending Council Directive 91/439/EEC on driving licences, OJ L 223, 26.8.2009, pp. 26-30.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001548/12
à Comissão
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(9 de fevereiro de 2012)

Assunto: Ameaça de despedimentos no Grupo Cabelte

Tomei conhecimento de que o Grupo Cabelte, uma empresa com unidades industriais situadas no Norte de Portugal, não vai renovar os contratos de trabalho a prazo na sua unidade de Arcozelo, em Vila Nova de Gaia. Esta medida abrange cerca de 25 trabalhadores e a empresa está a pressionar os trabalhadores com contrato a termo para os rescindirem por mútuo acordo. Esta empresa recebeu apoios do Estado português, no âmbito do Programa Compete, na ordem dos 2,8 milhões de euros e pratica uma política de despedimentos, numa região já muito fragilizada pelo flagelo do desemprego, aproveitado ainda para se desresponsabilizar dos seus compromissos sociais.

Assim, pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. A referida empresa recebeu quaisquer apoios comunitários? Com que fins foram concedidos e que compromissos assumiu aquando da concessão dos apoios?

2. Que medidas pensa tomar, tendo em conta os graves problemas sociais e económicos existentes em Portugal, com especial incidência no Norte, onde o desemprego não cessa de aumentar?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(2 de abril de 2012)

1. Segundo informações recebidas das autoridades portuguesas, o grupo Cabelte recebeu 93 936,03 euros de apoio financeiro do Fundo Social Europeu (FSE) no período de programação 1994/1999. Para o período de programação 2000/2006, foi aprovado um montante de 197 538,64 euros e, no âmbito do quadro de referência estratégico nacional (QREN) de 2007/2013, o financiamento do FSE ascendeu a 11 464, 24 euros.

No período de programação 1994/1999, o financiamento do FSE foi aprovado no âmbito do PEDIP (Programa Específico de Desenvolvimento da Indústria Portuguesa). Durante o período de programação anterior bem como do atual, o financiamento destinava-se a apoiar atividades de formação ligadas à formação profissional contínua, inovação e gestão com o objetivo de reforçar as potencialidades dos trabalhadores.

2. Em conformidade com o princípio da subsidiariedade, a política de emprego, incluindo as medidas destinadas a lutar contra o desemprego, constitui um domínio principalmente da competência dos Estados-Membros. As suas políticas de emprego, ensino e formação recebem apoio dos Fundos Estruturais, em especial do FSE. Acresce que no âmbito do Memorando de Entendimento assinado pelo Governo Português e a *Troika*, Portugal comprometeu-se a avançar com reformas estruturais em várias áreas, o que deverá em última análise contribuir para melhorar o acesso ao mercado de trabalho e aumentar a taxa de emprego no país numa perspetiva de médio a longo prazo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001548/12
to the Commission
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(9 February 2012)

Subject: Threatened redundancies at the Cabelte Group

I have learned that the Cabelte Group, a company with industrial units in the north of Portugal, will not be renewing fixed-term employment contracts of workers in its Arcozelo plant in Vila Nova de Gaia. This measure affects about 25 workers and the company is pressurising workers on fixed-term contracts to end them by mutual agreement. This company has received approximately EUR 2.8 million in state aid from Portugal, under the COMPETE programme, and is carrying out a policy of redundancies in a region already badly affected by the scourge of unemployment and even taking the opportunity to evade its social obligations.

1. Has this company received any kind of Community aid? For what purpose was the aid allocated and what undertakings were made when it was received?

2. Taking account of the serious social and economic problems in Portugal, particularly in the North, where unemployment is continuing to rise, what measures will the Commission take?

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

1. According to information from the Portuguese authorities, CABELTE Group has received financial support amounting to EUR 93 936.03 from the European Social Fund (ESF) in the programming period 1994-1999. During the programming period 2000-2006 a total amount of EUR 197 538.64 was approved and in the framework of the current National Strategic Reference Framework (2007-2013) the ESF funding amounted to EUR 11 464.24.

In the 1994-1999 programming period, ESF funding was approved in the framework of the 'Specific programme for development of the Portuguese industry'. During the previous and the current programming periods the funding concerned training activities linked to continuous professional training, innovation and management which aim to enhance the employees' potential.

2. In accordance with the principle of subsidiarity, employment policy, including measures to combat unemployment, is primarily a Member State competence. Member States policies in the fields of employment, education and training are supported by the Structural Funds, in particular by the ESF. In addition, also in the context of the memorandum of understanding signed by the Portuguese Government and the Troika, Portugal has made commitments for structural reforms in several areas which should finally contribute to improve access to the labour market and raise the employment rate across the country in the medium-to-long term.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001629/12
to the Commission
Nicole Sinclaire (NI)
(10 February 2012)

Subject: Electromagnetic fields

Has the Commission examined the cost implications to Member States of implementing the amended directive on the minimum health and safety requirements regarding the exposure of workers to the risks arising from physical agents (electromagnetic fields)?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(28 March 2012)

Before adopting proposals for legislation, the Commission performs an impact assessment to assess the social, economic and environmental impact of all policy options. This was the case for the Commission proposal ([1]) for a directive amending Directive 2004/40/EC.

The impact assessment report, and in particular Section 4 thereof, includes an analysis of seven policy options ([2]).

Section 5.2 gives the overall cost for the employers of each policy option, based on the compliance costs determined by the case studies referred to in Annex A. All these costs were estimated on the basis of data and figures reported by the stakeholders themselves.

Exposure to electromagnetic fields can be a risk for safety and health under certain conditions of exposure. This has always been given due consideration by the Council and the Parliament in the past, in particular for occupational activities. Therefore Member States are required to put in place the necessary means to verify that workers are sufficiently protected, e.g. by training of a number qualified labour inspectors, using adapted evaluation tools or measurement equipment. This is already now the case. The revision of Directive 2004/40/EC will not affect these costs, i.e. the verification costs for the labour inspectorates are similar irrespective of which of the options assessed in the impact assessment will ultimately be chosen. Therefore in the impact assessment Report no consideration was given to the costs borne by the Member States.

([1]) COM(2011) 348 final of 14 June 2011.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/ia_carried_out/docs/ia_2011/sec_2011_0750_en.pdf

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-001635/12
til Kommissionen
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(10. februar 2012)

Om: Sygedage i ferien

Ifølge Morgenavisen Jyllands-Posten — onsdag den 1. februar 2012 — har den danske regering med Helle Thorning Schmidt i spidsen sendt et lovforslag i høring, som vil kunne give landets lønmodtagere ret til en erstatningsferie i tilfælde af sygdom, eller hvis de falder og brækker benet under ferien.

Det betyder, at den tilskadekomne lønmodtager, hvis vedkommende kan fremvise en lægeerklæring, har ret til at kunne veksle sine sygedage til nye feriedage. Ifølge avisen er denne lovændring en direkte konsekvens af EU-lovgivningen.

Arbejdsgiverforeningen Dansk Erhverv frygter, at en lov som denne vil blive misbrugt af lønmodtagerne, og det kan blive dyrt for virksomhederne på den lange bane.

Kan Kommissionen bekræfte, at lovændringen er en konsekvens af EU-lovgivningen?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af László Andor
(28. marts 2012)

En arbejdstagers ret til betalt erstatningsferie på et andet tidspunkt, hvis vedkommende bliver syg under sin ferie, udspringer af EU-Domstolens dom i sag C-277/08 Pereda, hvor Domstolen fortolkede artikel 7 i direktiv 2003/88/EF ([1]). Det er op til medlemsstaterne gennem deres nationale lovgivning at bestemme, hvordan arbejdstageren ved lægeerklæring eller anden dokumentation skal godtgøre, at vedkommende er uarbejdsdygtig på grund af sygdom, og hvordan misbrug derved kan forebygges.

Direktiv 2003/88/EF er under revision. Efter en høring, som Kommissionen iværksatte i 2011, accepterede de tværfaglige arbejdsmarkedsparter på EU-plan at indgå forhandlinger med hinanden om denne revision.

([1]) Europa-Parlamentets og Rådets direktiv 2003/88/EF af 4. november 2003 om visse aspekter i forbindelse med tilrettelæggelse af arbejdstiden.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001635/12
to the Commission
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(10 February 2012)

Subject: Sick leave while on holiday

According to the Danish newspaper *Jyllands-Posten* on Wednesday 1 February 2012, the Danish Government under Helle Thorning-Schmidt has tabled a legislative proposal that would entitle the country's workers to compensatory leave if they became ill or if they fell and broke a leg while on holiday.

This means that injured workers would be entitled to replace their sick leave by new personal leave if they could produce a medical certificate. According to the newspaper, this legislative amendment is a direct consequence of EU legislation.

The Danish Chamber of Commerce fears that such a law would be abused by workers and that it could be expensive for businesses in the long term.

Can the Commission confirm that this legislative amendment is a consequence of EU legislation?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(28 March 2012)

The right of a worker, who is ill during the dates scheduled for his or her annual holidays, to take his or her paid annual leave at another time arises from the judgment of the European Court of Justice in Case C-277/08 *Pereda*, where the Court interpreted Article 7 of Directive 2003/88/EC ([1]). The proofs or medical certificates which a worker must produce to justify incapacity for work due to illness, and which could prevent abuses, are a matter for national law.

Directive 2003/88/EC is presently under review. In response to a consultation launched by the Commission in 2011, the EU cross-industry social partners accepted to negotiate between them on the terms of this review.

([1]) Directive 2003/88/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 4 November 2003 concerning certain aspects of the organisation of working time.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001662/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(10 de fevereiro de 2012)

Assunto: Apreensão de alimentos de origem asiática impróprios para consumo

Na semana passada foram apreendidas em Portugal pela Autoridade para a Segurança Alimentar e Económica (ASAE) mais de 320 toneladas de alimentos de origem asiática impróprios para consumo, avaliados em quase dois milhões de euros.

Segundo o vice-presidente desta instituição, arroz, massas, camarão, vegetais congelados, fruta fresca e enlatada faziam parte dos produtos apreendidos de «grande perigosidade para a saúde» dos consumidores e que deviam entrar no circuito das «lojas asiáticas e não só».

Pergunto à Comissão:

— Tem conhecimento desta situação? Como a avalia?

— Existe algum procedimento específico?

— A Comissão considera existirem mecanismos capazes de garantir a segurança alimentar, através da concreta fiscalização destes produtos, no momento da entrada no Espaço Territorial da U.E?

Resposta dada por John Dalli em nome da Comissão
(20 de março de 2012)

A Comissão não tinha conhecimento desta situação particular em Portugal, nem recebeu a notificação de Portugal através do Sistema de Alerta Rápido da União Europeia para os Géneros Alimentícios e Alimentos para Animais (RASFF) da UE.

A UE tem ao seu dispor um acervo legislativo completo destinado a garantir que os alimentos são seguros e que os géneros alimentícios importados para a União são conformes às normas de segurança vigentes. De referir, em especial, o Regulamento (CE) n.° 178/2002 ([1]) e o Regulamento (CE) n.° 882/2004 ([2]), dois dos principais instrumentos que concorrem para esse objetivo.

Cabe aos Estados-Membros a responsabilidade de fazer cumprir a legislação da UE em matéria de géneros alimentícios e alimentos para animais e de verificar, mediante a organização de controlos oficiais sobre os produtos nacionais e importados, que os requisitos pertinentes são cumpridos em todas as fases. Os controlos oficiais devem ser realizados regularmente, com base em critérios de risco, com frequência apropriada, devendo ser tomadas medidas adequadas para eliminar os riscos e garantir o cumprimento da legislação da UE no que respeita tanto aos produtos nacionais como aos produtos importados. Quando detetarem um risco, os Estados-Membros devem notificar a informação pertinente através do RASFF.

Uma lista dos alimentos para animais e dos géneros alimentícios de origem não animal que requerem controlos reforçados antes de serem introduzidos na UE foi estabelecida em 2010 (anexo I do Regulamento (CE) n.° 669/2009 ([3])). Este anexo é regularmente revisto com base nos dados e nas informações sobre todos os riscos conhecidos. Todas as remessas de produtos de origem animal importados para a UE devem ser submetidas a controlos documentais e de identidade apoiados por um programa de controlos físicos nas fronteiras da União. Estes requisitos estão previstos na Diretiva 97/78/CE do Conselho ([4]). Por último, quaisquer remessas consideradas suspeitas para a saúde humana ou animal, podem ser apreendidas e submetidas a controlos oficiais pelos Estados-Membros para verificar a conformidade com as regras e normas pertinentes.

([1]) Regulamento (CE) n.° 178/2000, do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 28 de janeiro de 2002, que determina os princípios e normas gerais da legislação alimentar, cria a Autoridade Europeia para a Segurança dos Alimentos e estabelece procedimentos em matéria de segurança dos géneros alimentícios (JO L 31 de 1.2.2002).

([2]) Regulamento (CE) n.° 882/2004 do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 29 de abril de 2004, relativo aos controlos oficiais realizados para assegurar a verificação do cumprimento da legislação relativa aos alimentos para animais e aos géneros alimentícios e das normas relativas à saúde e ao bem-estar dos animais (JO L 165 de 30.4.2004).

([3]) Regulamento (CE) n.° 669/2009 da Comissão, de 24 de julho de 2009, que dá execução ao Regulamento (CE) n.° 882/2004 do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho no que respeita aos controlos oficiais reforçados na importação de certos alimentos para animais e géneros alimentícios de origem não animal e que altera a Decisão 2006/504/CE (JO L 194 de 25.7.2009).

([4]) Diretiva 97/78/CE do Conselho, de 18 de dezembro de 1997, que fixa os princípios relativos à organização dos controlos veterinários dos produtos provenientes de países terceiros introduzidos na Comunidade (JO L 24 de 30.1.1998).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001662/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(10 February 2012)

Subject: Seizure of food products of Asian origin unfit for consumption

Last week, the Portuguese authority for food and economic security, the ASAE, seized more than 320 tonnes of food products of Asian origin unfit for consumption, estimated at around EUR 2 000 000.

According to the vice-president of this organisation, rice, pasta, prawns, frozen vegetables, and fresh and tinned fruit were among the products considered a major risk to the health of consumers and that were due to be delivered to stores in Asia and further afield.

I would ask the Commission to answer the following:

— Is it aware of this situation? What is its view of this?

— Is there a specific procedure to be followed?

— Is it aware of any mechanisms capable of ensuring food safety through the concrete monitoring of these products as soon as they enter into EU territory?

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

The Commission was not aware of this particular situation in Portugal and has not received a notification from Portugal through the EU's Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed (RASFF).

On food safety there is a comprehensive body of legislation to ensure that food is safe and that food imported into the Union complies with EU safety standards. Regulations (EC) No 178/2002 ([1]) and (EC) No 882/2004 ([2]) are two of the main tools used to achieve this.

Member States are responsible for the enforcement of EU feed and food law and verify, through the organisation of official controls on domestic and imported products, that the relevant requirements are fulfilled at all stages. Official controls must be carried out regularly, on a risk basis, at the appropriate frequency, and with appropriate measures taken to eliminate risk and ensure enforcement of EU food law in relation to both domestic and imported products. When detecting a risk, Member States must notify relevant information through the RASFF.

A list of food and feed commodities of non-animal origin which require an increased level of controls prior to introduction into the EU was established in 2010 (Annex I to Regulation (EC) 669/2009 ([3])). This is regularly reviewed on the basis of data and information on any known risks. All consignments of products of animal origin imported into the EU must undergo documentary and identity checks supported by a program of physical checks at Union borders. These requirements are set out in Council Directive 97/78/EC ([4]). Finally, any consignments suspected to be of risk to human or animal health may be detained and subject to official controls by Member States to ascertain compliance with relevant rules and standards.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 of the Parliament and of the Council of 28 January 2002 laying down the general principles and requirements of food law, establishing the European Food Safety Authority and laying down procedures in matters of food safety (OJ L 31, 1.2.2002).

([2]) Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules (OJ L 165, 30.4.2004).

([3]) Commission Regulation (EC) No 669/2009 of 24 July 2009 implementing Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards the increased level of official controls on imports of certain feed and food of non-animal origin and amending Decision 2006/504/EC (OJ L 194, 25.7.2009).

([4]) Council Directive 97/78/EC of 18 December 1997 laying down the principles governing the organisation of veterinary checks on products entering the Community from third countries (OJ L 24, 30.01.1998).

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001663/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(10 de fevereiro de 2012)

Assunto: Temporal destruiu 10 % das estufas de todo o Algarve

No passado mês de outubro, o temporal que abalou a região de Faro destruiu, pelo menos, 10 por cento das estufas de todo o Algarve — garantiu uma dirigente associativa de agricultores, que estimou em 10 a 12 hectares a área afetada.

As estufas em causa produziam vários tipos de frutos, legumes e leguminosas, como melão, tomate e feijão-verde.

A agricultora descreve o fenómeno meteorológico da madrugada de segunda-feira como «um risco que destruiu tudo o que encontrou, que começou no Alto de Santo António e foi avançando pela Penha e Rio Seco, acabando a vários quilómetros na via do Infante».

Ana Lopes lamenta que os seguros de colheitas não abranjam as estruturas das estufas e sublinhou que os agricultores «não sabem se vão ser ressarcidos dos prejuízos».

«Continua a haver seguro apenas para as colheitas, o que não se justifica. A estrutura é um complemento da cultura», disse, recordando que «quando apareceu o seguro de colheitas abrangia também as estruturas».

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que ajudas extraordinárias poderão ser concedidas a Portugal para fazer face a estes prejuízos?

— De que forma prevê que os agricultores possam ser compensados pela destruição das estruturas das estufas?

— Existe algum mecanismo previsto pela Comissão para fazer face a estas circunstâncias?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(21 de março de 2012)

A Comissão informa o Senhor Deputado de que, no quadro da política de desenvolvimento rural, o artigo 20.°, alínea b), subalínea vi), do Regulamento (CE) n.° 1698/2005 ([1]) prevê uma medida que visa o restabelecimento do potencial de produção agrícola afetado por catástrofes naturais e a introdução de medidas de prevenção adequadas. O Programa de Desenvolvimento Rural de Portugal Continental (Proder) para o período de 2007/2013 oferece atualmente esta possibilidade, com um financiamento público total de cerca de 20 milhões de euros, dos quais 15 milhões cofinanciados pelo Feader.

Ao abrigo do Proder podem ser concedidas ajudas aos agricultores que preencham os critérios de elegibilidade e cujos pedidos sejam selecionados pela autoridade de gestão após os procedimentos de seleção em vigor.

Como é do conhecimento do Senhor Deputado, cabe aos Estados-Membros, no âmbito da gestão dos programas de desenvolvimento rural, selecionar os projetos e efetuar os respetivos contratos e pagamentos. Para mais informações sobre o modo como realizar um determinado projeto, deve o Senhor Deputado contactar diretamente a autoridade de gestão do Proder, no seguinte endereço:

Rua Padre António Vieira, 1 — 8.° anda
1099-073 Lisboa
Telefone: 00 351 21 381 9318/19/20
Correio eletrónico: gabrielaventura@gpp.pt
Correio eletrónico geral: st.proder@gpp.pt

([1]) Regulamento (CE) n.° 1698/2005 do Conselho, de 20 de setembro de 2005, relativo ao apoio ao desenvolvimento rural pelo Fundo Europeu Agrícola de Desenvolvimento Rural (Feader), JO L 277 de 21.10.2005.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001663/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(10 February 2012)

Subject: Storm destroyed 10% of the greenhouses in the Algarve region

Last October, the storm that hit Faro destroyed at least 10% of the greenhouses throughout theAlgarve region, according to the director of a farmers' association who has estimated that between 10 to 12 hectares were affected.

The greenhouses in question produced various kinds of fruits, vegetables and pulses, such as melons, tomatoes and green beans.

The farmer described the meteorological phenomenon, which took place on early Monday morning, as a menace that destroyed everything in its path, commencing in the Alto de Santo António, progressing towards the Estrada da Penha and Rio Seco, and ending various kilometres from the Via do Infante.

Ana Lopes regrets that crop insurances do not cover greenhouse structures and emphasised that farmers do not know whether they will be compensated for the damage caused.

She also believes that insurance policies covering crops alone are unjustified because greenhouse structures are an integral part of farming. She also pointed out that crop insurance used to cover greenhouse structures when it was first introduced.

Therefore, in view of the above:

— What kind of extraordinary aid could be granted to Portugal for addressing these damages?

— How does the Commission envisage that farmers will be compensated for the destruction of their greenhouse structures?

— Does the Commission intend to establish some kind of mechanism for dealing with these situations?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(21 March 2012)

The Commission informs the Honourable Member that in the framework of the rural development policy, Article 20(b)(vi) of Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005 ([1]) provides for a measure aiming at restoring agricultural production potential damaged by natural disasters and introduces appropriate preventive actions. The Rural Development Programme of Mainland Portugal (Proder) for the period 2007-2013 currently offers this possibility, with a total public financing of around EUR 20 million, of which EUR 15 million co-financed by the EAFRD.

Aid can be granted under Proder to farmers who fulfil the eligibility criteria and whose applications are selected by the managing authority following the selection procedures in force.

As the Honourable Member is aware, in the framework of the management of Rural Development programmes, Member States are responsible for the selection, contracting and payments of projects. In order to have any information on how to carry out a specific project, the Honourable Member should contact directly the Managing Authority of the Proder at the following address:

Rua Padre António Vieira, 1 — 8° andar
1099-073 Lisboa
Tel.: 00 351 21 381 9318/19/20
Email: gabrielaventura@gpp.pt
Email geral: st.proder@gpp.pt

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005 of 20 September 2005 on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD), OJ L 277, 21.10.2005.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001697/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(13 febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: Maltrattamento di anatre al ristorante

Le immobilizzavano con il nastro adesivo, le chiudevano dentro a sacchetti di cellophane e, una volta nella cucina del ristorante, venivano sgozzate sul posto prima di essere cucinate e servite ai clienti. Per questo motivo i dipendenti di un ristorante cinese di Milano erano stati denunciati nel giugno del 2010 e il locale, che risultava pure in pessime condizioni igienico-sanitarie, era stato chiuso. Ora il Tribunale di Milano ha deciso di condannare i responsabili delle decapitazioni a due mesi di reclusione per il reato di maltrattamento di animali, ai sensi dell'art. 544 ter del codice penale.

Si tratta di una condanna significativa perché il giudice ha correttamente rilevato l'ipotesi delittuosa nei fatti descritti, anche se attinenti ad animali destinati al consumo alimentare. Le anatre, insomma, avrebbero anche potuto essere soppresse con la dignità che è prevista per qualunque tipo di macellazione, come dispone il decreto legislativo n. 333/98 in materia di attuazione della direttiva 93/119/CE relativa alla protezione degli animali durante la macellazione o l'abbattimento e che vieta la loro uccisione in modo sommario e primitivo.

Tutto ciò premesso, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. se è a conoscenza del maltrattamento degli animali destinati al consumo alimentare, e quali normative europee si applicano in materia;

2. se intende coordinare azioni di controllo a livello europeo delle competenti aziende sanitarie al fine di accertare che casi del genere non si ripetano.

Risposta data da John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(22 marzo 2012)

La prima legislazione adottata in merito al benessere degli animali nell'Unione riguardava la protezione degli animali durante la macellazione o l'abbattimento. Attualmente è di applicazione la direttiva 93/119/CE , che sarà sostituita, a decorrere dall'1.1.2013, dal regolamento (CE) n. 1099/2009.

Gli Stati membri sono anzitutto responsabili dell'applicazione della legislazione dell'UE, e la Commissione prevede una serie di azioni ([1]) al fine di garantire l'adeguata applicazione del nuovo regolamento.

Quanto al caso specifico menzionato nell'interrogazione, sembra che le autorità italiane abbiano reagito in modo adeguato e tempestivo per garantire l'applicazione della normativa. La Commissione concentra i suoi sforzi su aspetti in cui gli Stati membri sembrano non ottemperare all'applicazione delle norme dell'UE, il che non sembra qui il caso.

([1]) Cfr. in particolare la strategia dell'Unione europea per la protezione e il benessere degli animali 2012-2015 — COM(2012)6 definitivo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001697/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(13 February 2012)

Subject: Ducks maltreated in restaurant

In Milan in June 2010, the staff of a Chinese restaurant in Milan were reported to the authorities for their treatment of ducks. They were found to have bound them with adhesive tape, trapped them inside plastic bags and, inside the restaurant kitchen, cut their throats on the spot before cooking them and serving them to customers. The restaurant, whose hygiene standards were also found to be poor, was shut down. The Milan court concerned has now sentenced those responsible for these acts to two months' imprisonment for cruelty to animals, in accordance with Article 544b of the Penal Code.

This is an important conviction, as the judge correctly identified the criminal aspect of the acts described, even though this case involves animals for food consumption. In short, the ducks should have been killed with the dignity required for all types of slaughter, as set out in Italian Legislative Decree No 333/98, which transposes Directive 93/119/EC on the protection of animals at the time of slaughter or killing. This prevents them being killed in a crude or slipshod manner.

In the light of these facts, can the Commission state:

1. whether it is aware of the maltreatment of animals for food consumption, and what EU legislation applies in such cases;

2. whether it intends to coordinate monitoring activities by the relevant health and hygiene authorities at European level in order to avoid such cases being repeated?

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

The first legislation adopted on animal welfare in the Union was on the protection of animals at the time of slaughter or killing. Today Directive 93/119/EC is applicable, but will be replaced by Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009 from 1.1.2013.

Member States are primarily responsible for the implementation of the EU legislation and the Commission envisages a series of actions ([1]) in order to ensure that the new regulation will be properly enforced.

Regarding the specific case reported in the question, it seems that the Italian authorities have properly and swiftly reacted in order to ensure enforcement. The Commission focuses its efforts on issues where Member States appear to fail in implementing EU rules, which does not seem to be case here.

([1]) See in particular the EU strategy on the protection and welfare of animals 2012-2015 — COM(2012) 6 final.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001710/12
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin / Hohe Vertreterin)
Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE), Nicole Kiil-Nielsen (Verts/ALE), Tarja Cronberg (Verts/ALE), Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE), Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE), Barbara Lochbihler (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE) und Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE)
(13. Februar 2012)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Auswirkung restriktiver Maßnahmen, angenommen am 23. Januar 2012, auf die Menschen im Iran

Am 23. Januar 2012 nahm der Rat der Europäischen Union einen Beschluss 2010/35/GASP des Rates über restriktive Maßnahmen gegen den Iran an. Auf der Plenartagung des Parlaments am 1. Februar 2012 äußerte sich die Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin zu diesem Thema wie folgt: „Ich überwache unsere Maßnahmen, um sicherzustellen, dass die Auswirkungen auf die Menschen im Iran so gering wie möglich gehalten werden ([1])". Eine Woche nach Annahme der restriktiven Maßnahmen strandeten Berichten zufolge große Weizenlieferungen (etwa 400 000 Tonnen), die in den Iran transportiert werden sollten, auf mindestens 10 Schiffen, die vor den iranischen Häfen infolge dieser Maßnahmen aufgehalten wurden ([2]). Zwei Wochen nach Annahme der restriktiven Maßnahmen wurde bekannt, dass iranische Käufer etwa 200 000 Tonnen Reis nicht bezahlt hatten, dass die Maisausfuhren der Ukraine in den Iran im Januar um 40 % zurückgegangen waren, dass mehrere Länder die Ausfuhr von Weizen in den Iran unterbrochen hatten und dass diese Situation durch die Annahme der neuen restriktiven Maßnahmen der EU verursacht wurde ([3]).

1. Ist sich die VP/HR dessen bewusst, dass die restriktiven Maßnahmen der EU gegen den Iran unter anderem dazu geführt haben, dass die Einfuhr von Weizen durch den Iran zunehmend erschwert wurde, ja sogar praktisch unmöglich gemacht wurde?

2. Kann die VP/HR angeben, ob sie der Ansicht ist, dass die oben beschriebene Situation direkt und/oder indirekt die Menschen im Iran betrifft und/oder betreffen wird?

3. Sollte die VP/HR der Ansicht sein, dass diese Situation die Menschen im Iran betrifft und/oder betreffen wird, kann sie angeben, ob sie dieses Problem angehen wird? Falls nicht, warum nicht?

4. Sollte die VP/HR nicht der Ansicht sein, dass diese Situation die Menschen im Iran betrifft und/oder betreffen wird, kann sie erklären, warum sie nicht der Ansicht ist, dass diese Situation die Menschen im Iran betrifft und/oder betreffen wird?

5. Kann die VP/HR angeben, welche Situation, die direkt und/oder indirekt durch die restriktiven Maßnahmen der EU verursacht wird, sie als Situation definieren würde, die die Menschen im Iran betrifft und/oder betreffen würde?

6. Kann die VP/HR mit eigenen Worten erklären, wie sie „sicherstellen, dass die Auswirkungen (der restriktiven Maßnahmen) auf die Menschen im Iran so gering wie möglich gehalten werden" definieren würde?

Antwort von Frau Catherine Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(10. April 2012)

Am 23. Januar 2012 beschloss der Rat weitere restriktive Maßnahmen gegen Iran, darunter Maßnahmen im Finanzsektor und ein Importverbot für iranisches Öl. Diese Maßnahmen richten sich unmittelbar auf das iranische Nuklearprogramm, aber auch auf Einnahmen der iranischen Regierung, die zur Finanzierung des Nuklearprogramms verwendet werden können. Durch diese Ausrichtung der Maßnahmen werden jedwede negative Auswirkungen auf die iranische Bevölkerung so weit wie möglich verhindert.

Beschließt die iranische Regierung allerdings unter Missachtung der Bedürfnisse des iranischen Volkes, die Finanzierung des Nuklearprogramms fortzusetzen, kann dies durchaus negative Auswirkungen auf die Bevölkerung haben. Die Verantwortung hierfür läge jedoch bei der Regierung Irans und nicht bei der EU.

In Bezug auf die Schwierigkeiten hinsichtlich des Getreideimports in Iran ist darauf hinzuweisen, dass mit den EU-Sanktionen keinerlei Verbot oder Beschränkung eines derartigen Handels eingeführt wird.

([1]) http://www.europarl.ep.ec/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+CRE+20120201+ITEM-014+DOC+XML+V0//EN&language=EN.
([2]) http://af.reuters.com/article/commoditiesNews/idAFL5E8CU2YB20120130?sp=true.
([3]) http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/02/07/us-india-rice-idUSTRE8160CX20120207?irpc=932 und http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/02/08/us-iran-asia-trade-idUSTRE8170Q420120208.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001710/12
à la Commission (Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante)
Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE), Nicole Kiil-Nielsen (Verts/ALE), Tarja Cronberg (Verts/ALE), Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE), Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE), Barbara Lochbihler (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE) et Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE)
(13 février 2012)

Objet: VP/HR — Incidences des mesures restrictives, adoptées le 23 janvier 2012, sur la population iranienne

Le 23 janvier 2012, le Conseil de l'Union européenne a adopté la décision 2012/35/PESC du Conseil imposant des mesures restrictives à l'encontre de l'Iran. Au cours du débat entourant cette question en séance plénière du Parlement du 1er février 2012, la vice-présidente/haute représentante a déclaré garder un œil sur les mesures adoptées, afin de garantir que les incidences sur le peuple iranien sont mineures ([1]). Une semaine après l'adoption de ces mesures, des témoignages rapportent que d'importantes cargaisons de grain (400 000 tonnes) à destination de l'Iran ont été bloquées sur au moins 10 navires immobilisés hors des ports iraniens à la suite de ces mesures ([2]). Deux semaines après leur adoption, les nouvelles rapportaient que les acheteurs iraniens étaient en défaut de paiement pour environ 200 000 tonnes de riz, que les exportations de maïs ukrainien vers l'Iran avaient chuté de 40 % en janvier, que plusieurs pays avaient suspendu leurs exportations de grain à destination de l'Iran, et que cette situation avait été provoquée par l'adoption des nouvelles mesures restrictives de l'UE ([3]).

1. La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante est-elle consciente que les mesures restrictives à l'encontre de l'Iran ont abouti à une situation dans laquelle les importations de grain de l'Iran, entre autres, sont devenues très difficiles, pour ne pas dire pratiquement impossibles?

2. La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante peut-elle indiquer si elle pense que la situation décrite ci-dessus touche ou touchera, directement ou indirectement, le peuple iranien?

3. Si elle pense que la situation décrite ci-dessus touche ou touchera, directement ou indirectement, le peuple iranien, la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante peut-elle indiquer si elle s'attaquera au problème? Dans la négative, pourquoi?

4. Si elle ne pense pas que la situation décrite ci-dessus touche ou touchera, directement ou indirectement, le peuple iranien, peut-elle en expliquer les raisons?

5. La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante peut-elle indiquer quelle est la situation, directement ou indirectement provoquée par les mesures restrictives de l'UE, qu'elle qualifierait de situation ayant des répercussions ou susceptible d'en avoir sur le peuple iranien?

6. La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante peut-elle préciser, dans ses propres mots, ce qu'elle entend par «garantir que les incidences sur le peuple iranien sont mineures»?

Réponse donnée par la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante Ashton au nom de la Commission
(10 avril 2012)

Le 23 janvier 2012, le Conseil a décidé de prendre des mesures restrictives additionnelles à l'encontre de l'Iran qui comprennent des mesures dans le secteur financier ainsi qu'une interdiction d'importation de pétrole iranien. Ces mesures visent directement le programme nucléaire iranien, mais également les recettes dont pourrait se servir le gouvernement iranien pour financer son programme nucléaire. Les mesures ainsi ciblées éviteront, autant que possible, toute retombée négative sur la population iranienne.

Cependant, il convient de souligner que si le gouvernement iranien décide de poursuivre le financement du programme nucléaire au détriment des besoins de la population iranienne, une telle décision est susceptible d'avoir des répercussions négatives sur les Iraniens. Le cas échéant, la responsabilité en incomberait toutefois au gouvernement iranien, et non à l'Union européenne.

Pour ce qui est des difficultés alléguées concernant l'importation de céréales en Iran, il convient de souligner que les sanctions de l'Union européenne n'établissent aucune interdiction ni restriction applicable à ce type de commerce.

([1]) http://www.europarl.ep.ec/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+CRE+20120201+ITEM-014+DOC+XML+V0//EN&language=EN.
([2]) http://af.reuters.com/article/commoditiesNews/idAFL5E8CU2YB20120130?sp=true.
([3]) http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/02/07/us-india-rice-idUSTRE8160CX20120207?irpc=932 et http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/02/08/us-iran-asia-trade-idUSTRE8170Q420120208.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001710/12
aan de Commissie (Vicevoorzitter — Hoge Vertegenwoordiger)
Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE), Nicole Kiil-Nielsen (Verts/ALE), Tarja Cronberg (Verts/ALE), Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE), Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE), Barbara Lochbihler (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE) en Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE)
(13 februari 2012)

Betreft: VP/HR — Effecten van beperkende maatregelen voor het Iraanse volk, aangenomen op 23 januari 2012

Op 23 januari 2012 nam de Raad van de Europese Unie het Besluit van de Raad nr. 2012/35/CFSP aan dat verschillende beperkende maatregelen oplegde aan Iran. Tijdens het debat in de plenaire zitting van het Parlement op 1 februari 2012 verklaarde de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger: „Ik zal oog houden op wat wij doen en proberen ervoor te zorgen dat de effecten voor het Iraanse volk minimaal blijven ([1])". Een week nadat de beperkende maatregelen werden goedgekeurd, waren er rapporten dat grote graantransporten (ongeveer 400 000 ton) naar Iran als gevolg van deze maatregelen buiten Iraanse havens op minstens 10 schepen werden opgehouden ([2]). Twee weken na de goedkeuring van de beperkende maatregelen kwam het nieuws dat Iraanse kopers in gebreke waren gebleven met de betaling van ongeveer 200 000 ton rijst, dat de maïsexport van Oekraïne naar Iran in januari met 40 % was afgenomen, dat meerdere landen de export van graan naar Iran hadden stopgezet en dat deze gehele situatie het gevolg was van het goedkeuren van de nieuwe beperkende maatregelen door de EU ([3]).

1. Is de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger zich bewust van het nieuws dat de beperkende maatregelen van de EU tegen Iran hebben geleid tot een situatie waarin onder meer de import van graan door Iran in toenemende mate is bemoeilijkt, zo niet praktisch onmogelijk is gemaakt?

2. Kan de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger aangeven of zij van mening is dat genoemde situatie de belangen van het Iraanse volk direct en/of indirect schaadt of zal schaden?

3. Als de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger van mening is dat deze situatie de belangen van het Iraanse volk schaadt en/of zal schaden, kan zij dan aangeven of zij hieromtrent actie zal ondernemen? Zo niet, waarom niet?

4. Als de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger niet van mening is dat deze situatie de belangen van het Iraanse volk schaadt en/of zal schaden, kan zij dan uitleggen waarom zij deze mening is toegedaan?

5. Kan de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger aangeven welk soort situatie, die direct of indirect ontstaat als gevolg van beperkende maatregelen van de EU, door haar wordt gezien als schadelijk en/of mogelijk schadelijk voor het Iraanse volk?

6. Kan de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger, in haar eigen woorden, de zinsnede definiëren „ervoor te zorgen dat de effecten voor het Iraanse volk minimaal blijven"?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(10 april 2012)

Op 23 januari 2012 heeft de Raad besloten extra beperkende maatregelen vast te stellen ten aanzien van Iran, waaronder maatregelen in de financiële sector en een verbod op de invoer van Iraanse olie. Deze maatregelen zijn rechtstreeks gericht op het Iraanse nucleaire programma, maar ook op inkomsten die de Iraanse regering zou kunnen gebruiken voor dit programma. Op deze manier beperken deze maatregelen zoveel mogelijk eventuele negatieve gevolgen voor de Iraanse bevolking.

Indien de Iraanse regering besluit door te gaan met de financiering van haar nucleaire programma, zonder rekening te houden met de behoeften van het Iraanse volk, zal dit zal naar alle waarschijnlijkheid leiden tot negatieve effecten op de bevolking. Dit zou echter wel de verantwoordelijkheid zijn van de Iraanse regering, niet van de EU.

Wat de vermeende moeilijkheden met betrekking tot de invoer van graan door Iran betreft, moet worden opgemerkt dat de door de EU opgelegde sancties geen verbod of beperking op dit terrein inhouden.

([1]) http://www.europarl.ep.ec/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+CRE+20120201+ITEM-014+DOC+XML+V0//EN&language=EN.
([2]) http://af.reuters.com/article/commoditiesNews/idAFL5E8CU2YB20120130?sp=true.
([3]) http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/02/07/us-india-rice-idUSTRE8160CX20120207?irpc=932 en
http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/02/08/us-iran-asia-trade-idUSTRE8170Q420120208.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-001710/12
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente / Alta Representante)
Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE), Nicole Kiil-Nielsen (Verts/ALE), Tarja Cronberg (Verts/ALE), Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE), Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE), Barbara Lochbihler (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE) e Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE)
(13 de fevereiro de 2012)

Assunto: VP/HR — Efeitos no povo iraniano das medidas restritivas adotadas em 23 de janeiro de 2012

Em 23 de janeiro de 2012, o Conselho da União Europeia adotou a Decisão 2012/35/PESC, que impunha várias medidas restritivas contra o Irão. Na abordagem a esta questão, durante a sessão plenária do Parlamento, de 1 de fevereiro de 2012, a Vice-Presidente/Alta-Representante afirmou: «Acompanho o que estamos a fazer no sentido de tentar assegurar que os efeitos no povo iraniano sejam mínimos» ([1]). Uma semana depois de as medidas restritivas terem sido adotadas, soube-se que se encontravam bloqueadas grandes remessas de cereais (cerca de 400 000 toneladas) destinadas ao Irão em, pelo menos, 10 navios, impedidos de atracar a portos iranianos como resultado destas medidas ([2]). Duas semanas depois de as medidas restritivas terem sido adotadas, surgiram notícias de que compradores iranianos não tinham cumprido com os pagamentos de cerca de 200 000 toneladas de arroz, que as exportações de milho da Ucrânia para o Irão tinham baixado 40 por cento em janeiro, que vários países tinham interrompido a exportação de cereais para o Irão e que toda esta situação tinha sido causada pela adoção das novas medidas restritivas ([3]) da UE.

1. Estará a Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante a par das notícias segundo as quais as medidas restritivas da UE contra o Irão conduziram a uma situação na qual, nomeadamente, a importação de cereais pelo Irão se foi tornando cada vez mais difícil, para não dizer praticamente impossível?

2. Poderá a Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante indicar se considera que a situação acima mencionada afeta, direta e/ou indiretamente, e/ou irá afetar o povo iraniano?

3. No caso de considerar que esta situação está a afetar e/ou irá afetar o povo iraniano, poderá a Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante indicar se irá resolver a questão? Se não, por que motivo?

4. No caso de a Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante considerar que esta situação está a afetar e/ou irá afetar o povo iraniano, poderá explicar o motivo pelo qual não considera que a situação está a afetar e/ou irá afetar o povo iraniano?

5. Poderá a Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante indicar que tipo de situação, direta e/ou indiretamente causada pelas medidas restritivas da UE, definiria como uma situação que está a afetar e/ou irá afetar o povo iraniano?

6. Poderá a Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante elucidar, pelas suas próprias palavras, como explica a expressão «assegurar que os efeitos (das medidas restritivas) no povo iraniano sejam mínimos»?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(10 de abril de 2012)

Em 23 de janeiro de 2012 o Conselho decidiu adotar medidas restritivas adicionais contra o Irão, incluindo medidas no setor financeiro e uma proibição de importação de petróleo iraniano. Estas medidas visam não só o programa nuclear iraniano diretamente, como também as receitas do Governo iraniano que podem ser utilizadas para financiar o seu programa nuclear. Estas medidas estão orientadas de modo a evitar, tanto quanto possível, quaisquer efeitos negativos para o povo iraniano.

No entanto, é de salientar que caso o Governo iraniano decida continuar a financiar o programa nuclear, sem ter em consideração as necessidades do povo iraniano, é possível que se verifiquem efeitos negativos para a população. No entanto, tal será da responsabilidade do Governo iraniano e não da UE.

Relativamente às alegadas dificuldades na importação de cereais pelo Irão, é de salientar que as sanções da UE não estabelecem qualquer proibição ou restrição no que diz respeito a este tipo de comércio.

([1]) http://www.europarl.ep.ec/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+CRE+20120201+ITEM-014+DOC+XML+V0//EN&language=EN.
([2]) http://af.reuters.com/article/commoditiesNews/idAFL5E8CU2YB20120130?sp=true.
([3]) http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/02/07/us-india-rice-idUSTRE8160CX20120207?irpc=932 e http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/02/08/us-iran-asia-trade-idUSTRE8170Q420120208.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-001710/12
komissiolle (Varapuheenjohtajalle / Korkealle edustajalle)
Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE), Nicole Kiil-Nielsen (Verts/ALE), Tarja Cronberg (Verts/ALE), Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE), Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE), Barbara Lochbihler (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE) ja Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE)
(13. helmikuuta 2012)

Aihe: VP/HR – 23. tammikuuta 2012 hyväksyttyjen rajoittavien toimenpiteiden vaikutus Iranin kansaan

Euroopan unionin neuvosto hyväksyi 23. tammikuuta 2012 neuvoston päätöksen 2012/35/YUTP, jolla otettiin käyttöön erilaisia Iraniin kohdistuvia rajoittavia toimenpiteitä. Komission varapuheenjohtaja/korkea edustaja puhui asiasta parlamentin täysistunnossa 1. helmikuuta 2012 ja sanoi, että ”valvon toimiamme ja pyrin varmistamaan, että Iranin kansaan kohdistuvat vaikutukset ovat mahdollisimman vähäisiä” ([1]). Viikko rajoittavien toimenpiteiden hyväksymisen jälkeen saimme tietää, että suuret viljalähetykset odottivat ainakin kymmenellä aluksella, joiden pääsy Iranin satamiin oli estetty toimenpiteiden seurauksena ([2]). Kaksi viikkoa rajoittavien toimenpiteiden hyväksymisen jälkeen uutiset kertoivat, että iranilaiset ostajat ovat laiminlyöneet noin 200 000:ta tonnia riisiä koskevat maksut, että Ukrainan maissin vienti Iraniin laski tammikuussa 40 prosenttia, että useat maat ovat keskeyttäneet viljan viennin Iraniin ja että koko tilanne johtuu EU:n hyväksymistä uusista rajoittavista toimenpiteistä ([3]).

1. Onko varapuheenjohtaja/korkea edustaja tietoinen uutisista, joiden mukaan EU:n hyväksymät Iraniin kohdistuvat rajoittavat toimenpiteet ovat johtaneet tilanteeseen, joka on muun muassa vaikeuttanut viljan maahantuontia Iraniin ja tehnyt siitä käytännössä jopa mahdotonta?

2. Voiko varapuheenjohtaja/korkea edustaja kertoa, katsooko hän, että edellä mainittu tilanne vaikuttaa ja/tai tulee vaikuttamaan Iranin kansaan suoraan ja/tai epäsuorasti?

3. Jos varapuheenjohtaja/korkea edustaja katsoo, että tilanne vaikuttaa ja/tai tulee vaikuttamaan Iranin kansaan, voiko hän kertoa, miten aikoo puuttua asiaan? Jos ei, miksi ei?

4. Jos varapuheenjohtaja/korkea edustaja katsoo, ettei tilanne vaikuta ja/tai tule vaikuttamaan Iranin kansaan, voiko hän selittää, miksi katsoo, ettei tilanne vaikuta ja/tai tule vaikuttamaan Iranin kansaan?

5. Voiko varapuheenjohtaja/korkea edustaja kertoa, millaisen EU:n rajoittavien toimenpiteiden suoraan ja/tai epäsuorasti aiheuttaman tilanteen hän määrittelisi tilanteeksi, joka vaikuttaa ja/tai tulee vaikuttamaan Iranin kansaan?

6. Voiko varapuheenjohtaja/korkea edustaja selventää omin sanoin, miten hän määrittelee ilmauksen ”varmistaa, että Iranin kansaan (rajoittavien toimenpiteiden vuoksi) kohdistuvat vaikutukset ovat mahdollisimman vähäisiä”?

Catherine Ashtonin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(10. huhtikuuta 2012)

Neuvosto päätti 23. tammikuuta 2012 rajoittavista lisätoimenpiteistä Irania vastaan. Niihin kuului rahoitusalan toimenpiteitä sekä kielto tuoda Iranista öljyä. Nämä toimenpiteet kohdistuvat suoraan Iranin ydinohjelmaan, mutta myös Iranin valtion tuloihin, joita saatetaan käyttää ydinohjelman rahoittamiseen. Koska toimenpiteiden kohteina ovat juuri nämä toimenpiteet, vältetään mahdollisimman pitkälti kielteiset vaikutukset Iranin kansaan.

On kuitenkin huomattava, että jos Iranin hallitus päättää jatkaa ydinohjelman rahoittamista välittämättä iranilaisten tarpeista, kansalle todennäköisesti aiheutuu kielteisiä vaikutuksia. Vastuussa tästä on kuitenkin Iranin hallitus, ei EU.

Mahdollisista Iranin kokemista viljantuonnin vaikeuksista voidaan todeta, ettei EU:n pakotteilla kielletä tai rajoiteta viljakauppaa millään tavoin.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+CRE+20101110+ITEM-015+DOC+XML+V0//EN&language=EN.
([2]) http://af.reuters.com/article/commoditiesNews/idAFL5E8CU2YB20120130?sp=true.
([3]) http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/02/07/us-india-rice-idUSTRE8160CX20120207?irpc=932 ja http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/02/08/us-iran-asia-trade-idUSTRE8170Q420120208.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001710/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE), Nicole Kiil-Nielsen (Verts/ALE), Tarja Cronberg (Verts/ALE), Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE), Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE), Barbara Lochbihler (Verts/ALE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE) and Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE)
(13 February 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Effect of restrictive measures, adopted on 23 January 2012, on the Iranian people

On 23 January 2012 the Council of the European Union adopted Council Decision 2012/35/CFSP which imposed various restrictive measures against Iran. Speaking on this issue during Parliament's plenary sitting of 1 February 2012, the Vice-President/High Representative said, 'I keep watch over what we are doing, to try to ensure that the effects on the people of Iran are minimal ([1])'. A week after the restrictive measures were adopted there were reports that large grain shipments (some 400 000 tonnes) to Iran were stranded on at least 10 vessels which had been held up outside Iranian ports as a result of these measures ([2]). Two weeks after the restrictive measures were adopted news came out that Iranian buyers had defaulted on payments for about 200 000 tonnes of rice, that Ukraine's maize exports to Iran had dropped by 40% in January, that several countries had halted the export of grain to Iran, and that this entire situation was caused by the adoption of the new EU restrictive measures ([3]).

1. Is the VP/HR aware of the news that the EU restrictive measures against Iran have led to a situation in which *inter alia* the import of grain by Iran has been made increasingly difficult, not to say practically impossible?

2. Can the VP/HR indicate whether she considers that the aforementioned situation directly and/or indirectly affects and/or will affect the Iranian people?

3. If the VP/HR considers that this situation is affecting and/or will affect the Iranian people, can she indicate whether she will address this issue? If not, why not?

4. If the VP/HR does not consider that this situation is affecting and/or will affect the Iranian people, can she explain why she does not consider that this situation is affecting and/or will affect the Iranian people?

5. Can the VP/HR indicate what kind of situation, directly and/or indirectly caused by the EU restrictive measures, she would define as a situation which is affecting and/or would affect the Iranian people?

6. Can the VP/HR elucidate, in her own words, how she would define 'ensure that the effects (of the restrictive measures) on the people of Iran are minimal'?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2012)

On 23 January 2012 the Council decided to take additional restrictive measures against Iran, including measures in the financial sector and a prohibition on the import of Iranian oil. These measures target the Iranian nuclear programme directly, but also target revenues of the government of Iran which it may use to finance its nuclear programme. By thus targeting these measures, they avoid as much as possible any negative effect on the Iranian people.

It is to be noted however that where the Iranian government decides to continue financing the nuclear programme, in disregard for the needs of the Iranian people, this is likely to result in negative effects on the population. The responsibility for this would however lie with the Iranian government, not with the EU.

As for the alleged difficulties regarding the import of grain by Iran, it should be noted that the EU sanctions do not establish any prohibition or restriction regarding such trade.

([1]) http://www.europarl.ep.ec/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+CRE+20120201+ITEM-014+DOC+XML+V0//EN&language=EN
([2]) http://af.reuters.com/article/commoditiesNews/idAFL5E8CU2YB20120130?sp=true
([3]) http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/02/07/us-india-rice-idUSTRE8160CX20120207?irpc=932 and http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/02/08/us-iran-asia-trade-idUSTRE8170Q420120208

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001753/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(13 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Διαρθρωτικά ταμεία για τους αστέγους και νέες προβλέψεις για το 2013

Στην προγραμματική περίοδο 2007-2013 το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο χρησιμοποιείται σε πολλά κράτη μέλη για να χρηματοδοτήσει πρωτοβουλίες για την έλλειψη στέγης, ενώ ο κανονισμός για το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης (ΕΤΠΑ) 437/2010 προβλέπει έως 3 % της χρηματοδότησης του ΕΤΠΑ για κάθε κράτος μέλος να δίδεται για στεγαστικές παρεμβάσεις στο πλαίσιο μίας ολοκληρωμένης προσέγγισης για τις περιθωριοποιημένες κοινότητες συμπεριλαμβανομένων των αστέγων ([1]). Παράλληλα, σύμφωνα με τη γνωμοδότηση της Ευρωπαϊκής Οικονομικής και Κοινωνικής Επιτροπής με θέμα «Το πρόβλημα των αστέγων» που δημοσιεύτηκε στις 27 Οκτωβρίου του 2011, το φινλανδικό μοντέλο «Η στέγη πριν απ' όλα» («Housing first»), που αρχικά είχε σχεδιαστεί στις ΗΠΑ, δείχνει ότι είναι δυνατή η μείωση κατά 14 000 ευρώ των δαπανών ανά άτομο που δέχεται βοήθεια ([2]).

Η Επιτροπή ερωτάται:

1. Διαθέτει στοιχεία για την υλοποίηση των προγραμμάτων του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινωνικού Ταμείου και του Ευρωπαϊκού Ταμείου Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης που αφορούν τους άστεγους;

2. Εάν ναι, πώς αξιολογεί τη συνεισφορά και την αξιοποίηση των κοινοτικών αυτών πόρων για την αντιμετώπιση του προβλήματος των αστέγων;

3. Ποια τα νέα μέτρα και οι πρωτοβουλίες της Επιτροπής για την αντιμετώπιση της όξυνσης του προβλήματος των αστέγων, με δεδομένες της συνέπειες της οικονομικής κρίσης, στο πλαίσιο των προτάσεών της για τη νέα προγραμματική περίοδο μετά το 2013;

4. Τι συμπεράσματα αντλεί από το φινλανδικό μοντέλο «Housing first» και κατά πόσο θεωρεί ότι θα μπορούσε να εφαρμοστεί στα υπόλοιπα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(28 Μαρτίου 2012)

Τα Διαρθρωτικά Ταμεία αποτελούν μια σημαντική πηγή χρηματοδότησης για την αντιμετώπιση της αστεγίας. Το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο (ΕΚΤ) μπορεί να υποστηρίξει δραστηριότητες που αποσκοπούν στην προώθηση της ένταξης των αστέγων στην κοινωνία και στην αγορά εργασίας και το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης (ΕΤΠΑ) συγχρηματοδοτεί τις επενδύσεις για τη στέγαση των περιθωριοποιημένων κοινοτήτων. Κατά την προγραμματική περίοδο 2007-13, τα κράτη μέλη διέθεσαν 10 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ από τη χρηματοδότηση του ΕΚΤ σε ενέργειες για την προώθηση της κοινωνικής ένταξης των πλέον ευπαθών ομάδων στην κοινωνία. Ωστόσο, δεν υπάρχουν δεδομένα για τα ποσά που διατέθηκαν άμεσα στους άστεγους σε επίπεδο ΕΕ. Όσον αφορά το ΕΤΠΑ, ύστερα από την τροποποίηση του κανονισμού σχετικά με την επιλεξιμότητα της στέγασης, ορισμένα κράτη μέλη κατέθεσαν προτάσεις για πιλοτικά ολοκληρωμένα προγράμματα στέγασης σε τοπικό επίπεδο, ειδικότερα ως συνέχεια στην ανακοίνωση της Επιτροπής σχετικά με το ευρωπαϊκό πλαίσιο για τις εθνικές στρατηγικές ένταξης των Ρομά. Δεν διατίθενται ακόμα τα στοιχεία για τη χρηματοδότηση.

Για το Πολυετές Δημοσιονομικό Πλαίσιο 2014-20, η Επιτροπή υπέβαλε μια σημαντικά ενισχυμένη κοινωνική ατζέντα. Ειδικότερα, πρότεινε να διατίθεται, τουλάχιστον το 20 % της συνολικής χρηματοδότησης του ΕΚΤ σε κάθε κράτος μέλος για την κοινωνική ένταξη και την καταπολέμηση της φτώχειας, γεγονός που συνεπάγεται ότι τα περισσότερα κράτη μέλη θα χρειαστεί να εντείνουν τις προσπάθειές τους. Ο νέος κανονισμός για το ΕΚΤ δίνει επίσης μεγαλύτερη έμφαση στην ενίσχυση της πρόσβασης σε κοινωνικές υπηρεσίες και στην προώθηση της ενεργητικής ένταξης.

Η Επιτροπή συμμερίζεται το ενδιαφέρον του κ. βουλευτή για το «Housing first» και χρηματοδοτεί τη διερεύνηση αυτής της προσέγγισης για την αντιμετώπιση της αστεγίας σύμφωνα με μια πρωτοβουλία για την κοινωνική καινοτομία. Αυτή η διερεύνηση αναμένεται να μας ενημερώσει για την αποτελεσματικότητα αυτής της προσέγγισης και για τη δυνατότητα μεταφοράς της σε άλλα κράτη μέλη.

([1]) ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=6890&langId=en.
([2]) http://www.eesc.europa.eu/?i=portal.en.soc-opinions.14931.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001753/12
to the Commission
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(13 February 2012)

Subject: Structural Funds for the homeless and the new outlook for 2013

In the 2007-2013 programming period, the European Social Fund is being used in many Member States to fund initiatives for the homeless, while the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) Regulation 437/2010 allows up to 3% of ERDF funding for each EU Member State to be used for housing measures as part of an integrated approach for marginalised communities, including homeless people ([1]). At the same time, according to the European Economic and Social Committee opinion entitled '*The problem of homelessness*', published on 27 October 2011, the Finnish '*Housing first*' model, which originated in the USA, shows that it is possible to make savings of EUR 14 000 for each recipient of assistance ([2]).

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Does it have any data on the implementation of European Social Fund and European Regional Development Fund programmes relating to homelessness?

2. If so, how does it evaluate the contribution and utilisation of these social resources to combat the homelessness problem?

3. What new measures and initiatives is it taking to combat the worsening problem of homelessness, given the consequences of the economic crisis, as part of its proposals for the new programming period after 2013?

4. What conclusions does it draw from the Finnish '*Housing first*' model and to what extent does it believe it could be implemented in other EU Member States?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(28 March 2012)

The Structural Funds represent an important source of funding for tackling homelessness. The European Social Fund (ESF) may provide support for activities aimed at promoting the social and labour market integration of homeless people, and the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) co-finances investment in housing for marginalised communities. During the 2007-2013 programming period, the Member States have allocated EUR 10 billion of ESF funding to actions to promote the social inclusion of the most vulnerable groups in society. However, no data on the amounts that have benefited homeless people directly are available at EU level. As for ERDF, following the modification of the regulation concerning eligibility of housing a number of Member States have introduced proposals for pilot integrated housing programmes at the local level, particularly in response to the Commission Communication on an EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies. Figures concerning funding are not yet available.

For the 2014-2020 Multiannual Financial Framework, the Commission put forward a considerably reinforced social agenda. Notably, it proposed that at least 20% of total ESF financing in each Member State should be allocated to social inclusion and combating poverty, which implies that most Member States will need to step up their efforts. The new ESF Regulation also places a greater emphasis on enhancing access to social services and promoting active inclusion.

The Commission shares the Honourable Member's interest in 'Housing first', and is funding exploration of this approach to tackling homelessness under an initiative on social innovation. This should inform us about the effectiveness of the approach and its transferability to other Member States.

([1]) ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=6890&langId=en.
([2]) http://www.eesc.europa.eu/?i=portal.en.soc-opinions.14931.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001758/12
aan de Commissie
Judith A. Merkies (S&D)
(13 februari 2012)

Betreft: Vermarkting en gebruik van gerecyclede fosfaten

Fosfaat kan worden teruggewonnen bij de eindverwerking van zuiveringsslib (na verbranding resteert fosfaatvrije as) en op de rioolwaterzuiveringsinstallatie zelf (in de vorm van struviet). Beide methoden worden toegepast. De kunstmestindustrie toont zich in toenemende mate geïnteresseerd in dit biofosfaat.

De nationale en Europese wet- en regelgeving loopt achter bij deze ontwikkeling. Belangrijke belemmering voor de terugwinning van fosfaat is dat struviet afkomstig uit rioolafvalwater op dit moment in Nederland niet kan worden afgezet in de landbouw (in tegenstelling tot bijvoorbeeld Duitsland). Het is namelijk niet als toegestane meststof aangemerkt (Meststoffenwetgeving).

Vanwege aankomende schaarste van fosfaaterts is het van belang dat terugwinning van fosfaat, het sluiten van kringlopen en het gebruik van gerecyclede fosfaat mogelijk wordt gemaakt en wordt gestimuleerd in de hele Europese Unie.

1. Voldoet de Nederlandse of de Duitse regeling aan de Europese richtlijn met betrekking tot vermarkting van gerecyclede fosfaat?

2. Als beide landen voldoen, waarom laat de regeling zo'n brede eigen interpretatie toe? Zo ontstaat er geen interne markt voor hergebruikte grondstoffen, in dit geval fosfaat.

3. Hoe gaat de Commissie de verschillende interpretaties aanpakken en op welke termijn?

4. Welke acties onderneemt de Commissie om de vermarkting en het gebruik van gerecyclede fosfaat in de hele Europese Unie te stimuleren, bijvoorbeeld door nieuwe regelgeving of door herziening van bestaande regelgeving?

5. Op welke termijn komt de Commissie met voorstellen?

Antwoord van de heer Potočnik namens de Commissie
(2 april 2012)

De Commissie werkt momenteel aan een Groenboek over het duurzaam gebruik van fosfor dat was aangekondigd in het stappenplan voor een hulpbronnenefficiënt Europa ([1]). In dit Groenboek zullen de mogelijkheden worden onderzocht om de recycling van fosfor in de gehele EU te stimuleren, waarmee een debat op gang wordt gebracht over verdere maatregelen. et Groenboek is gepland voor 2012.

De recycling van fosfor of de afzet van gerecycled fosfor worden momenteel niet in specifieke EU-wetgeving behandeld. Het is ons niet duidelijk welke wetgeving door het geachte Parlementslid wordt bedoeld wanneer zij het heeft over de „Europese richtlijn met betrekking tot de vermarkting van gerecyclede fosfaat". Wij kunnen dan ook niet beoordelen of Nederland en Duitsland deze wetgeving al dan niet naleven.

De Commissie werkt momenteel ook aan de herziening van de meststoffenverordening ([2]) (Verordening (EG) nr. 2003/2003) waarin ook kwesties met betrekking tot de afzet van meststoffen in de EU aan bod kunnen komen. Verwacht wordt dat dit wetsvoorstel in 2013 klaar zal zijn.

([1]) Mededeling van de Commissie aan het Europees Parlement, de Raad, het Europees Economisch en Sociaal Comité en het Comité van de Regio's betreffende een „Efficiënt gebruik van hulpbronnen" (COM(2011) 571).

([2]) Verordening (EG) nr. 2003/2003 van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 13 oktober 2003 inzake meststoffen (PB L 304 van 21.11.2003, blz. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001758/12
to the Commission
Judith A. Merkies (S&D)
(13 February 2012)

Subject: Marketing and use of recycled phosphates

Phosphate can be recovered when sewage sludge undergoes final treatment (phosphate-free ash remains after incineration) and at the sewage treatment plant itself (in the form of struvite). Both methods are in use. The fertiliser industry is showing an increasing interest in this biophosphate.

National and European legislation lags behind this development. A major obstacle to the recovery of phosphate is that, in the Netherlands, struvite recovered from sewage is not allowed to be used in agriculture (unlike in Germany, for example). It is not considered a permissible fertiliser (rertiliser legislation).

In the light of an expected shortage of phosphate ores, it is important that the recovery of phosphate, the closing of the phosphate cycle and the use of recycled phosphate should be made possible and should be stimulated across the whole of the European Union.

1. Does the Dutch or the German legislation comply with the European directive on the marketing of recycled phosphate?

2. If both countries comply with the directive, why does it allow such divergent individual interpretations? This stands in the way of the creation of an internal market for recycled materials, in this case phosphate.

3. What is the Commission going to do about the differing interpretations and within what period?

4. What steps is the Commission going to take to stimulate the marketing and use of recycled phosphate in the whole of the European Union, for example by introducing new laws or amending the existing ones?

5. Within what period is the Commission going to put forward proposals?

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

The Commission is currently working on a Green Paper on the Sustainable Use of Phosphorus which was announced in the Roadmap to a Resource Efficient Europe ([1]). The Green Paper will analyse possible ways to stimulate phosphorus recycling in the whole of EU and will launch a debate on the way forward. The Green Paper is planned for 2012.

However, at present there is no specific EU legislation concerning recycling of phosphorous or marketing of recycled phosphorous. We are not able to identify which legal act the Honourable Member means by 'European directive on the marketing of recycled phosphate'. For that reason we cannot assess the compliance of the Netherlands and Germany with this legislation.

The Commission is also preparing a revision of the Fertiliser Regulation ([2]) (Regulation (EC) No 2003/2003) which may also address matters concerning marketing of fertilisers in the EU. The legislative proposal could be ready in 2013.

([1]) Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: 'Roadmap to a Resource Efficient Europe', COM(2011) 0571 final.
([2]) Regulation (EC) No 2003/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 October 2003 relating to fertilisers, OJ L 304, 21.11.2003.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001769/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(14. Februar 2012)

Betrifft: Flächendeckende Infrastruktur für Wasserstofftankstellen

Die in den letzten Jahren erzielten Fortschritte in den Bereichen umweltfreundliche Wasserstofferzeugung und Brennstoffzellentechnik lassen nunmehr für den Bürger finanzierbare Wasserstoff-Automobile in greifbare Nähe rücken. Mehrere Automobilhersteller haben bereits für 2014/15 den Verkaufsstart erster eigener Modelle angekündigt. Europa scheint bei dieser Technologie führend zu sein. Wichtig für eine schnelle Markteinführung und Kundenakzeptanz wird ein flächendeckendes Netz von Wasserstofftankstellen sein.

Die Europäische Union hat sich selbst zu ehrgeizigen Umwelt- und Klimaschutzzielen verpflichtet. Demgegenüber steht beispielsweise die Tatsache, dass der CO_2-Ausstoß in Europa nach wie vor ansteigt.

1. Wie beurteilt die Kommission den Einsatz der Wasserstofftechnologie im Fahrzeugbereich im Vergleich zum herkömmlichen Verbrennungsmotor?

2. Kann der Einsatz der Wasserstofftechnologie nach Meinung der Kommission dazu beitragen, die Umwelt- und Klimaschutzziele der Union schneller und effizienter zu erreichen?

3. Beabsichtigt die Kommission, einen EU-weiten Aufbau der notwendigen Infrastruktur zu unterstützen, um damit die eigenen Klimaschutzziele schneller zu erreichen und den Technologievorsprung der europäischen Unternehmen abzusichern?

Antwort von Herrn Tajani im Namen der Kommission
(26. März 2012)

1. In der im April 2010 angenommenen Mitteilung der Kommission „Eine europäische Strategie für saubere und energieeffiziente Fahrzeuge“ ([1]) wird die Bedeutung sauberer Antriebssysteme und effizienterer herkömmlicher Motoren für die Verwirklichung der Prioritäten der Strategie Europa 2020 anerkannt, in denen Wissen und Innovation als besonders wichtig hervorgehoben werden. Das Potenzial von Wasserstoff (und anderen Kraftstoffen) zur Verringerung von Schadstoff- und Treibhausgasemissionen (THG-Emissionen) wird allgemein anerkannt. Da Wasserstoff aus verschiedenen Quellen hergestellt werden kann, wird es von Bedeutung sein, Produktions- und Vertriebswege für Wasserstoff zu entwickeln, die langfristige Vorteile im Hinblick auf THG und Energieversorgungssicherheit bieten. Die Kommission hat außerdem Sicherheits- und Umweltschutzanforderungen für die Typgenehmigung von wasserstoffbetriebenen Kraftfahrzeugen ([2]) festgelegt.

2. Die Kommission strebt bis 2050 einen CO_2-ärmeren Verkehr an ([3]). Im Rahmen ihrer Initiative für saubere Verkehrssysteme untersucht sie Optionen für den Einsatz alternativer, an verschiedene Verwendungen angepasster Kraftstoffe. Wie schnell diese Optionen umgesetzt werden, hängt vom technischen Fortschritt, von den Möglichkeiten zur Investition in Infrastrukturen und von der Entwicklung geeigneter politischer Maßnahmen ab. Die Kommission verfolgt eine technologieneutrale Strategie zur Entwicklung und zum Einsatz von Fahrzeugen mit geringeren CO_2-Emissionen — dies umfasst z. B. die Verordnungen zur Verringerung der CO_2-Emissionen von Pkw ([4]) und leichten Nutzfahrzeugen ([5]), die Richtlinie über die Kraftstoffqualität ([6]) oder die Richtlinie zur Förderung sauberer Fahrzeuge ([7]).

3. Die Kommission stellt 470 Mio. EUR an FTE-Mitteln für ein gemeinsames Unternehmen „Brennstoffzellen und Wasserstoff“ (2007-2013) bereit. Diese öffentlich-private Partnerschaft soll den Einsatz der erwähnten Technologien beschleunigen. Darüber hinaus werden innovative Infrastrukturen im Rahmen des transeuropäischen Verkehrsnetzes (TEN-T) unterstützt. Für die volle Markteinführung sind eine flächendeckende Infrastruktur und erhebliche private Investitionen erforderlich. Die Kommission lotet derzeit neue Wege zur Förderung alternativer Kraftstoffe aus, darunter auch politische Maßnahmen und Finanzierungstechniken.

([1]) KOM(2010)186 endg.
([2]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 79/2009 und Verordnung (EG) Nr. 406/2010.
([3]) KOM(2011)112 endg.
([4]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 443/2009.
([5]) Verordnung (EU) Nr. 510/2011.
([6]) Richtlinie 2009/30/EG.
([7]) Richtlinie 2009/33/EG.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001769/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(14 February 2012)

Subject: A comprehensive infrastructure for hydrogen filling stations

The advances achieved in the areas of environmentally-friendly hydrogen production and fuel cell technology in recent years bring affordable hydrogen fuelled cars within reach for the ordinary public. Several car manufacturers have already announced plans to start selling their own models in 2014/15. Europe seems to be leading the way with this technology. A comprehensive network of hydrogen filling stations will be important for a speedy market introduction and for acceptance among customers.

The European Union has set itself ambitious environmental and climate protection goals. This contrasts with the fact that CO_2 emission levels are continuing to rise in Europe.

1. How does the Commission assess the use of hydrogen technology in the automotive sector in comparison with conventional combustion engines?

2. In the opinion of the Commission, can the use of hydrogen technology contribute to faster and more efficient achievement of the environmental and climate protection targets of the Union?

3. Does the Commission intend to support the EU-wide establishment of the necessary infrastructure, so that its own climate protection targets can be achieved more quickly, and in order to ensure a technological head start for European businesses?

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

1. The communication on a European Strategy on Clean and Energy Efficient Vehicles ([1]), adopted in April 2010, recognises the importance of clean powertrains and more efficient conventional engines for realising Europe 2020 priorities which emphasise knowledge and innovation. The potential of hydrogen (and other fuels) to reduce pollutant and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions is well recognised. As hydrogen can be produced from different sources, it will be important to develop hydrogen production and distribution routes that deliver long term GHG benefits and energy security. The Commission has also set out safety and environmental requirements for hydrogen vehicle type-approval ([2]).

2. The Commission aims at transport decarbonisation by 2050 ([3]). Through its Clean Transport Systems initiative, it is exploring options for deployment of a portfolio of alternative fuels, adapted to different applications. The pace of deployment is linked to technical progress, the capacity for investment in infrastructure, and the development of appropriate policies. The Commission follows a technology neutral strategy for development and deployment of vehicles with reduced CO_2 emissions — such as the CO_2 Regulation for cars ([4]) and vans ([5]), the Fuel Quality Directive ([6]), or the Clean Vehicles Directive ([7]).

3. The Commission provides EUR 470 million RTD support to a Fuel Cells and Hydrogen Joint Undertaking (2007-2013). This public-private-partnership aims to accelerate deployment of these technologies. There is also support for innovative infrastructure under the TEN-T. Full market deployment will require area wide infrastructure coverage and substantial private investment. The Commission is exploring new ways to incentivise alternative fuels, including policy and financial engineering options.

([1]) COM(2010) 186 final.
([2]) Regulation (EC) No 79/2009 and Regulation (EU) No 406/2010.
([3]) COM(2011) 112 final.
([4]) Regulation (EC) No 443/2009.
([5]) Regulation (EU) No 510/2011.
([6]) Directive 2009/30/EC.
([7]) Directive 2009/33/EC.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita P-001798/12
à Comissão
Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE)
(14 de fevereiro de 2012)

Assunto: Proposta da Comissão para utilização de fosfatos no peixe salgado

Tive conhecimento de que o Grupo de Peritos de Aditivos Alimentares da Comissão Europeia/DG Sanco está a trabalhar numa proposta legislativa de alteração ao Regulamento (CE) n.° 1331/2008 do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 16 de dezembro de 2008, no sentido de alargar o uso de fosfatos (E338— E341; E343i, E450-E452) ao processo de salga do pescado. Em concreto, a proposta pretende garantir a utilização de polifosfatos apenas em peixe salgado por salga húmida com um conteúdo em sal entre 18-21 % numa concentração máxima de 5 000 mg/kg. O objetivo principal, segundo pude apurar, é o de minimizar as reações de oxidação decorrentes dos iões metálicos presentes no peixe e também evitar as perdas de água durante o processo de armazenagem. Pese embora, o método de salga e secagem que é praticado em Portugal confere elevada segurança ao produto, decorrendo de forma 100 % natural, sendo o processo de desidratação do pescado efetuado sem recurso a aditivos químicos, o que confere ao bacalhau salgado português características únicas e diferenciadoras ao nível da textura, cheiro e sabor. Produto tradicional e único no mercado mundial.

A introdução de obrigatoriedade no uso de fosfatos para conservação do bacalhau implicará um conjunto de fatores negativos que importa realçar, a saber: alterações nas características do produto que desvirtuarão o bacalhau salgado português; custos acrescidos (poderão ser incomportáveis) na produção de bacalhau salgado seco; redução do interesse do consumidor face a um produto onde passarão a ser utilizados produtos químicos.

Os industriais de bacalhau em Portugal estão, portanto, preocupados com a proposta que a Comissão Europeia está a preparar e consideram que a mesma colocará em causa o futuro de uma indústria que emprega no meu país cerca de 2 000 trabalhadores.

Face ao exposto, pergunto:

1. Está a Comissão ciente de que, a verificar-se a introdução desta medida, a indústria transformadora de bacalhau portuguesa poderá ser reduzida substancialmente, gerando desemprego?

2. Está a Comissão ciente de que a introdução desta medida provocará o desaparecimento do bacalhau salgado português, produto tradicional mundialmente conhecido?

3. Qual a vantagem de introduzir químicos num produto 100 % natural, desconhecendo-se, inclusive, os seus verdadeiros efeitos na saúde humana?

Resposta dada por John Dalli em nome da Comissão
(20 de março de 2012)

A Comissão recebeu vários pedidos para a utilização de difosfatos (E 450), trifosfatos (E 451) e polifosfatos (E 452) no peixe salgado por salga húmida. Esses pedidos têm fundamento técnico, uma vez que o longo processo de conservação deste peixe resulta numa deterioração por oxidação que substitui a cor branca original por uma cor amarela e que pode também influenciar o seu sabor. Dada a sua função de agentes sequestrantes, os fosfatos demonstraram ser muito eficazes na proteção do peixe salgado contra essa oxidação. Esta questão foi debatida nas reuniões com os peritos dos Estados-Membros em matéria de aditivos alimentares, em 2010, 2011 e 2012.

Dado que a maioria dos fosfatos são removidos em água durante a imersão, a exposição dos consumidores aos fosfatos será mínima. Por conseguinte, a Comissão está a debater a questão com os Estados-Membros, com vista à autorização da utilização de difosfatos (E 450), trifosfatos (E 451) e polifosfatos (E 452) para a conservação do peixe salgado por salga húmida.

Convém sublinhar que a eventual autorização de fosfatos no peixe salgado por salga húmida não significa que a utilização seja obrigatória e, por conseguinte, não obriga os produtores à sua utilização. No caso de os fosfatos terem sido utilizados nesse processo, a sua presença deve ser mencionada no rótulo, em conformidade com a Diretiva 2000/13/CE ([1]).

A fim de clarificar esta questão, a Comissão irá organizar uma reunião entre os requerentes interessados na utilização dos fosfatos e as partes portuguesas em causa, antes de avançar com a autorização.

([1]) Diretiva 2000/13/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 20 de março de 2000, relativa à aproximação das legislações dos Estados-Membros, respeitantes à rotulagem, apresentação e publicidade dos géneros alimentícios, JO L 109 de 6.5.2000.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001798/12
to the Commission
Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE)
(14 February 2012)

Subject: Commission proposal for the use of phosphates in salted fish

It has been brought to my attention that Commission/DG SANCO food additive experts are working on a legislative proposal to amend Regulation (EC) No 1331/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council, of 16 December 2008, in order to extend the use of phosphates (E338-E341; E343i, E450-E452) to the process of salting fish. The proposal specifically aims to ensure the use of polyphosphates only in wet salted fish with a salt content between 18-21% in a maximum concentration of 5 000 mg/kg. The main objective, according to my understanding, is to minimise oxidation resulting from the metal ions present in the fish and to prevent water loss during storage. However, the method of salting and drying that is practised in Portugal guarantees a high level of product safety, as it is 100% natural: the fish-drying process is free from chemical additives, and this gives Portuguese salted cod its unique and distinctive characteristics in terms of texture, smell and taste. It is a traditional and unique product on the world market.

The introduction of the mandatory use of phosphates for the preservation of cod will involve a set of negative factors that need to be noted, namely: changes in product characteristics that will affect the quality of Portuguese salted cod; increased costs (which may be unsustainable) for the production of salted cod; and reduced consumer interest in a product for which chemical products are used.

The Portuguese cod industry is therefore concerned over the proposal being prepared by the Commission, and believes it could jeopardise the future of an industry that employs about 2 000 workers in my country.

In view of the above:

1. Is the Commission aware that, if this measure is introduced, the Portuguese cod processing industry may be greatly reduced, generating unemployment?

2. Is the Commission aware that the introduction of this measure will cause the disappearance of Portuguese salted cod, a traditional product that is known worldwide?

3. What is the advantage of adding chemicals to a 100% natural product, without even knowing their real effects on human health?

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

The Commission received several requests for the use of diphosphates (E450), triphosphates (E451) and polyphosphates (E452) in wet salted fish. These requests were technologically justified as during the long preservation of this fish oxidative spoilage occurs which changes the original white colour to yellow and which may also influence its flavour. Because of their function as sequestrants, these phosphates have been proven to be most effective to protect the salted fish against such oxidation. This was discussed with the Member States' experts on food additives in 2010, 2011 and 2012.

As most of the phosphates are removed during the soaking with water the exposure of the consumer to the phosphates will be minimal. Therefore the Commission is discussing the issue with the Member States with a view to the authorisation of the use of Diphosphates (E450), Triphosphates (E451) and Polyphosphates (E452) for the preservation of wet salted fish.

It has to be underlined that the possible authorisation of phosphates in wet salted fish does not mean that the use is compulsory and therefore does not oblige the producers to use it. In case phosphates have been used there presence shall be labelled in accordance with Directive 2000/13/EC ([1]).

In order to clarify this issue, the Commission will organise a meeting between the applicants for the use of the phosphates and the Portuguese parties concerned, before progressing with the authorisation.

([1]) Directive 2000/13/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 March 2000 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the labelling, presentation and advertising of foodstuffs, OJ L 109, 6.5.2000.

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-001799/12
Komisi
Jiří Havel (S&D)
(14. února 2012)

Předmět: Přerušení plateb u jednoho z operačních programů ČR (Vzdělávání pro konkurenceschopnost)

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 chybovostí u předkládaných projektů (spolu se Španělskem a Itálií). Tuto situaci odráží i skutečnost, že Komise (GŘ EMPL) v lednu přerušila platby u jednoho z operačních programů ČR (Vzdělávání pro konkurenceschopnost).

— Jak Komise hodnotí kroky, které ČR dělá k obnovení plateb v rámci uvedeného OP?

— Jaký je reálný stav čerpání ČR ze strukturálních fondů EU?

— Jaké největší problémy má ČR podle Komise při čerpání ze strukturálních fondů?

— Jaké kroky musí ČR podle Komise udělat, aby zprůchodnila čerpání v rámci přerušeného OP VK?

— Do jaké míry je podle Komise reálné riziko, že ČR peníze z OP VK nevyčerpá, resp. že o ně přijde?

— Jsou ohrožené ještě další OP?

Odpověď komisaře Andora jménem Komise
(10. dubna 2012)

1., 4. Za fungování řídících a kontrolních systémů operačního programu „Vzdělávání pro konkurenceschopnost" jsou odpovědné české úřady. Nedávný audit Komise zjistil významné nedostatky ve fungování těchto systémů. K nápravě zjištěných nedostatků musí být proto co nejdříve provedena opatření, která pravděpodobně zahrnou finanční opravy. Jedině poté může dojít k obnovení plateb.

Komise dne 1. března 2012 obdržela oficiální odpověď českých úřadů na svá zjištění. Kroky provedené českými úřady s cílem zajistit obnovení plateb se v současné době analyzují.

2. Co se týká čerpání prostředků ze strukturálních fondů EU, zveřejňuje Ministerstvo pro místní rozvoj měsíční monitorovací zprávu ([1]), která je k dispozici na internetové stránce ([2]):

3. Hlavní nedostatky se týkají fungování řídících a kontrolních systémů, uplatňování pravidel pro zadávání veřejných zakázek a celkové administrativní kapacity pro realizaci činností ve vztahu ke strukturálnímu fondu. Další problémy se týkají výběru projektů a politického zasahování do procesu technické realizace projektů.

5., 6. Nepředpokládají se významné problémy ve včasném provádění dvou ze tří českých operačních programů (OP) čerpajících z Evropského sociálního fondu. Více je však ohroženo čerpání z OP „Vzdělávání pro konkurenceschopnost", zejména pro rok 2013, kdy je nutné certifikovat vysoké částky k dosažení souladu s pravidlem N+3/N+2. Požadavkem k zajištění plného čerpání je hladká realizace projektů přímo na místě.

([1]) Zahrnuta je analýza stavu pravidla N+3/N+2.
([2]) www.strukturalni-fondy.cz/getdoc/9d9a23d0-4d1e-42b3-8414-291de7e247ae/MMZ.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001799/12
to the Commission
Jiří Havel (S&D)
(14 February 2012)

Subject: Suspension of payments for one of the Operational Programmes in the Czech Republic (Education for Competitiveness — ECOP)

The sixth and penultimate year of the current budgetary period (2007-2013) 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 January 2012, the Commission (DG EMPL) stopped payment for one of the Operational Programmes (Education for Competitiveness).

— How does the Commission evaluate the steps taken by the Czech Republic to restore payments under the aforementioned Operational Programme?

— What is the real status of the Czech Republic's absorption of EU Structural Funds?

— In the Commission's view, what are the biggest problems that the Czech Republic has when absorbing Structural Funds?

— What steps should the Czech Republic take, in the Commission's view, in order to make the absorption of funds possible as part of the suspended ECOP?

— To what extent does the Commission believe there is a real risk that the Czech Republic will not absorb funds from the ECOP, or will lose them?

— Are any other Operational Programmes at risk?

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

1, 4. The Czech authorities are responsible for the management and control systems of the Education for Competitiveness Operational Programme. A recent audit by the Commission found significant shortcomings in the functioning of these systems. Measures therefore need to be taken as soon as possible to remedy the shortcomings identified, and these will probably include financial corrections. Only then can payments be resumed.

The Commission received the Czech authorities' official response to its findings on 1 March 2012. The steps taken by the Czech authorities with a view to restoring payments are being analysed.

2. Regarding the absorption of EU Structural Funds, the Ministry of Regional Development publishes a monthly monitoring report ([1]) available online ([2]).

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. There should be no significant problems in the timely implementation of two of the three Czech European Social Fund operational programmes (OP). However, there is higher risk of decommitment for the Education for Competitiveness OP, especially in the case of 2013, where large sums need certifying to meet the n+3/2 rule. Smooth implementation on the ground will be required to ensure full absorption.

([1]) Including an analysis of the N+2/3 rule state of play.
([2]) www.strukturalni-fondy.cz/getdoc/9d9a23d0-4d1e-42b3-8414-291de7e247ae/MMZ.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-001857/12
do Komisji
Sławomir Witold Nitras (PPE)
(15 lutego 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Walka z polskimi taksówkarzami na niemieckich terenach przygranicznych

Niemieckie miejscowości wypoczynkowe znajdujące się w Maklemburgii – Pomorzu Przednim takie jak Ahlbeck, Heringsdorf czy Bansin leżące na wyspie Uznam bezpośrednio sąsiadują między innymi z polskim Świnoujściem. W ostatnim czasie na terenie niemieckiej części wyspy, przedstawiciele niemieckiej firmy komunikacyjnej EDV Ostseebus zaczęli wywieszać plakaty przestrzegające przed korzystaniem z usług zarejestrowanych w Polsce taksówek oraz nagradzać pieniężnie donosy o prowadzeniu tego typu procederu.

Niemieckie przedsiębiorstwo podejmując te działania, powołuje się na przepisy polsko-niemieckiego porozumienia o międzynarodowym transporcie osób, w myśl których dozwolone jest tylko przewożenie przez polskich taksówkarzy klientów z Polski do Niemiec. Porozumienie równocześnie wyraźnie zabrania świadczenia usług przez polskie podmioty na rzecz klientów w Niemczech. Umowa zawiera klauzulę wzajemności.

Zdając sobie sprawę z faktu, że usługi transportowe objęte są mniejszym stopniem liberalizacji, ponieważ zostały wyłączone z zakresu przedmiotowego dyrektywy usługowej (2006/123/WE), należy jednak zauważyć, że opisana wyżej sytuacja realizuje hipotezę art. 50 ust. 2 lit. b) TFUE, który stanowi co następuje: „(…) Parlament Europejski, Rada i Komisja wykonują funkcje powierzone im na podstawie powyższych postanowień, zwłaszcza: b) zapewniając ścisłą współpracę między właściwymi organami administracyjnymi Państw Członkowskich w celu poznania szczególnych sytuacji w różnych dziedzinach działalności wewnątrz Unii; c) znosząc takie procedury i praktyki administracyjne wynikające z prawa krajowego bądź z wcześniej zawartych umów między Państwami Członkowskimi, których utrzymanie w mocy stanowiłoby przeszkodę dla swobody przedsiębiorczości;”.

W mojej ocenie zarówno obowiązujące prawo krajowe (ustawa z dnia 6 września 2001 r. o transporcie drogowym; Dz.U.07.125.874), jak i porozumienie o międzynarodowym transporcie osób, są szkodliwe. Pozbawiają one bowiem potencjalnych klientów możliwości wyboru korzystniejszej oferty, a przez to ograniczają konkurencję oraz swobodny przepływ usług między państwami członkowskimi, które są fundamentalnymi zasadami definiującymi wspólny rynek.

— Powołując się na przytoczony wyżej art. 50 ust. 2 lit. b) TFUE, chciałbym poznać opinię Komisji na temat przedstawionej sprawy oraz jej ocenę zgodności polsko-niemieckiego porozumienia o międzynarodowym transporcie osób z europejskim prawem pierwotnym w obszarze swobody przedsiębiorczości i usług.

— W związku z przedstawionym stanem faktycznym chciałbym także zapytać, jakie rozwiązania prawne w zakresie transgranicznego przewozu osób są stosowane w umowach pomiędzy innymi państwami członkowskimi oraz czy Komisja zamierza w najbliższym czasie podjąć działania zmierzające w kierunku liberalizacji usług przewozu osobowego w Unii Europejskiej.

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Michela Barniera w imieniu Komisji
(14 czerwca 2012 r.)

Zgodnie z tym, co pisze Szanowny Pan Poseł, usługi taksówkowe są wyłączone z zakresu stosowania dyrektywy 123/2006/WE. Wynika to faktu, iż art. 2 ust. 2 lit d). dyrektywy usługowej wyklucza z jej zakresu stosowania usługi transportowe objęte postanowieniami tytułu VI Traktatu. Usługi taksówkowe są nawet wyraźnie wymienione w motywie 21 dyrektywy usługowej jako usługi wyłączone z zakresu stosowania tej dyrektywy.

Komisja nie posiada informacji na temat umów dwustronnych między państwami członkowskimi w zakresie transgranicznego transportu pasażerskiego. Przepisy UE mają zastosowanie wyłącznie do przewozu pasażerów pojazdami przewożącymi więcej niż 9 osób, łącznie z kierowcą ([1]). Przewóz mniejszymi pojazdami należy do kompetencji państw członkowskich. Wprowadzając regulacje dotyczące tych usług państwa członkowskie muszą przestrzegać ogólnych zasad prawa UE, takich jak zasada niedyskryminacji ze względu na narodowość, jak również swoboda przedsiębiorczości.

W chwili obecnej Komisja nie zamierza proponować żadnych nowych przepisów UE w tej dziedzinie.

---

[1] Rozporządzenie (WE) nr 1073/2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001857/12
to the Commission
Sławomir Witold Nitras (PPE)
(15 February 2012)

Subject: Conflict with Polish taxi drivers in German border areas

The German holiday resorts of Mecklemburg-Western Pomerania, such as Ahlbeck, Heringsdorf and Bansin on the island of Uznam, are directly adjacent to the Polish town of Świnoujście. Recently, in the German part of the island, representatives of German transport company, EDV Ostseebus, have begun hanging posters warning against using taxis registered in Poland and offering cash rewards for reporting such practices.

In taking these steps, the German company refers to the provisions of the Polish-German agreement on international passenger transport, according to which Polish taxi drivers are only authorised to transport customers from Poland to Germany. The agreement also specifically prohibits Polish entities from providing services to customers in Germany. The contract contains a reciprocity clause.

Although transport services are covered by a lesser degree of liberalisation on account of their exclusion from the scope of the Services Directive (2006/123/EC), it should be noted, nonetheless, that the situation described above falls within the hypothesis set out in Article 50, (2)(b) of the TFEU, which states as follows: '2. The European Parliament, the Council and the Commission shall carry out the duties devolving upon them under the preceding provisions, in particular: … (b) by ensuring close cooperation between the competent authorities in the Member States in order to ascertain the particular situation within the Union of the various activities concerned; (c) by abolishing those administrative procedures and practices, whether resulting from national legislation or from agreements previously concluded between Member States, the maintenance of which would form an obstacle to freedom of establishment'.

In my view, both the applicable national law (Law of 6 September 2001 on road transport; Journal of Laws 07.125.874) and the agreement on international passenger transport are harmful. This is because they prevent potential customers from choosing the best available offer, thereby limiting competition and free movement of services between Member States, which are fundamental principles that define the single market.

— With reference to Article 50(2)(b) of the TFEU, what is the Commission's opinion on the matter presented, and what is its assessment of the conformity of the Polish-German agreement on international passenger transport with European primary legislation in the area of freedom of enterprise and services?

— In view of the state of affairs presented, what legal solutions are applied in agreements between other Member States in the area of cross-border passenger transport? Does the Commission intend to take steps in the near future towards liberalising passenger transport services in the European Union?

Answer given by M Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(14 June 2012)

As indicated by the Honourable Member, taxi services are excluded from the scope of application of Directive 123/2006/EC. This is because Article 2(2)(d) Services Directive excludes from its scope of application the transport services falling within the scope of Title VI of the Treaty. Indeed, taxi services, are explicitly mentioned in Recital 21 of the Services Directive as being transport services excluded from the scope of application of the Services Directive.

The Commission is not aware of bilateral agreements between Member States in the field of cross-border passenger transport. EU legislation applies only to carriage of passengers by vehicles which are carrying more than nine persons including the driver ([1]). The operation of smaller vehicles falls under the competence of the Member States. When regulating these services Member States have to respect the general principles of EC law such as the principle of non-discrimination on the basis of nationality as well as the freedom of establishment.

At this stage, the Commission does not intend to propose any further EU legislation in this area.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1073/2009.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-001862/12
до Комисията
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Антония Първанова (ALDE), Françoise Castex (S&D), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE) и Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE)
(15 февруари 2012 г.)

Относно: Проследяване на инициативата за Целите на хилядолетието за развитие на стойност 1 милиард евро

На срещата на високо равнище на ООН за целите на хилядолетието за развитие през септември 2010 г. председателят на Комисията обяви, че ЕС ще стартира инициатива на стойност 1 милиард евро за подпомагане на напредъка най-бедните страни в света за постигане на техните цели на хилядолетието за развитие (ЦХР).

Правителствата на групата държави от Африка, Карибите и Тихоокеанския басейн бяха поканени да представят предложения за одобрение от комитета на Европейския фонд за развитие. На 21 декември 2011 г. Комисията публикува документа MEMO/11/930, който съдържа списък на страни заедно с техните проекти и фокус по отношение на ЦХР, както и паричните суми, които следва да получат съгласно инициативата.

Със заинтересованите страни от гражданското общество бяха проведени консултации в процеса на подготовка на предложението, като те работиха съвместно и с правителствата на Кения, Сенегал и Етиопия, в които равнищата на майчина смъртност са едни от най-високите, за да гарантират, че цели на хилядолетието 4 и 5 ще бъдат ясно изразени в предложенията на тези страни във връзка с ЦХР. Въпреки високото качество на предложенията, за трите посочени по-горе страни не бяха избрани проекти по петата цел на хилядолетието.

Би ли могла Комисията да изясни следното:

1. Как са били оценявани предложенията на правителствата във връзка с ЦХР на страните от АКТБ и какви насоки са били използвани при оценката на качеството на тези предложения? Какви критерии са били използвани при вземането на това решение?

2. Коя институция или агенция е отговаряла за процеса на оценяване и може ли тя да излезе с мотивирано обяснение защо няма да бъдат подкрепени трите посочени по-горе страни?

3. Ще предостави ли Комисията допълнителна обратна информация на правителствата на страните от АКТБ, за да обясни решението си?

4. Би ли могъл също така компетентният орган да обясни по-подробно как ще се използват финансовите средства в отделните държави?

Отговор, даден от г-н Пиебалгс от името на Комисията
(10 май 2012 г.)

Както е посочено в Насоките относно инициативата за Целите на хилядолетието за развитие (ЦХР), организирана съвместно с държавите от АКТБ, службите на Комисията и Европейската служба за външна дейност (ЕСВД) оцениха заедно всички 69 предложения, получени по линия на инициативата. Оценяването бе извършено съгласно критериите, които са подробно изложени в Насоките, а именно: а) релевантност и яснота на предложението, б) постигане на максимално въздействие и приложимост, и в) ефикасност. Всеки критерий бе разбит на подкритерии и бе дадена оценка на всяко предложение. За да се считат за приемливи, предложенията трябваше да получат определена минимална оценка по всеки критерий.

Насоките бяха изготвени от Генерална дирекция „Развитие и сътрудничество — EuropeAid“ (DEVCO) и ЕСВД, след което те бяха обсъдени с държавите членки и утвърдени от компетентния член на Комисията. Разглежданата инициатива несъмнено е насочена към постигането на резултати и бе постигнато съгласие с държавите членки, че във всяко от предложенията трябва ясно да бъде обоснована добавената стойност на интервенцията и трябва да бъдат посочени индикаторите, използвани за измерване на нейното въздействие.

Предложенията, подадени от Кения, Сенегал и Етиопия, не получиха необходимата минимална оценка по третия критерий. По-специално, техните предложения не успяха убедително да покажат ефикасността на предложения механизъм за постигане на резултати в сравнение с други инструменти, нито силните страни на капацитета на страната за извършване на наблюдение. Правителствата на тези страни бяха уведомени чрез писмо за отхвърлянето на техните предложения.

Понастоящем, държавите от АКТБ, подкрепяни от делегациите, се занимават с определянето на най-ефикасните механизми за изпълнение на всяко от избраните предложения и изготвят съответните проекти. Тъй като инициативата цели бързо постигане на резултати, ще се използват вече съществуващи механизми и способи за изпълнение: управление, осъществявано от националните органи, бюджетна подкрепа и сключване на споразумения за финансово участие с агенции на държавите членки, с международни органи или неправителствени организации.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001862/12
an die Kommission
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Antonyia Parvanova (ALDE), Françoise Castex (S&D), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE) und Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE)
(15. Februar 2012)

Betrifft: Folgeanfrage zur 1-Mrd.-EUR-Initiative der EU zur Verwirklichung der Millennium-Entwicklungsziele

Auf dem UN-Millenniumsgipfel im September 2010 kündigte der Kommissionspräsident an, dass die EU eine 1-Mrd.-EUR-Initiative starten würde, um den ärmsten Ländern der Welt zu helfen, Fortschritte bei der Erreichung ihrer Millennium-Entwicklungsziele (MDG) zu machen.

Die Regierungen der Gruppe der afrikanischen, karibischen und pazifischen Staaten wurden aufgefordert, dem EEF-Ausschuss Vorschläge zur Genehmigung zu unterbreiten. Am 21. Dezember 2011 veröffentlichte die Kommission MEMO/11/930 mit einer Liste von Ländern und ihren Projekten sowie dem jeweiligen Fokus der Millennium-Entwicklungsziele und mit Angaben zu den Geldsummen, die diese Länder im Rahmen der Initiative erhalten sollen.

Beim Entwurf des Vorschlags wurden bürgerliche Interessengruppen konsultiert. Sie arbeiteten außerdem mit den Regierungen von Kenia, Senegal und Äthiopien zusammen — die zu den Ländern mit den weltweit höchsten Müttersterblichkeitsraten gehören —, um sicherzustellen, dass die Millennium-Entwicklungsziele Nr. 4 und 5 in ihren Vorschlägen für die MDG-Initiative besonders herausgestellt wurden. Trotz der hervorragenden Qualität der Vorschläge wurden keine MDG-Nr.-5-Projekte in den drei oben genannten Ländern ausgewählt.

Kann die Kommission folgende Punkte klären:

1. Wie wurden die MDG-Vorschläge der AKP-Regierungen bewertet und anhand welcher Richtlinien wurde die Qualität der Vorschläge bewertet? Nach welchen Kriterien wurde diese Entscheidung getroffen?

2. Welche Einrichtung oder Agentur war für diesen Bewertungsprozess zuständig, und kann sie eine Begründung dafür liefern, warum die drei oben genannten Länder nicht unterstützt werden?

3. Wird die Kommission den AKP-Regierungen zusätzliches Feedback geben, um ihre Entscheidung zu erläutern?

4. Kann die zuständige Stelle außerdem Auskunft darüber geben, wie die Geldmittel in den verschiedenen Ländern eingesetzt werden?

Antwort von Herrn Piebalgs im Namen der Kommission
(10. Mai 2012)

Entsprechend den Leitlinien für die Initiative der Millennium-Entwicklungsziele (MDG) zur Unterstützung der AKP-Staaten haben die Kommissionsdienststellen und der Europäische Auswärtige Dienst (EAD) alle 69 für die Initiative eingereichten Vorschläge gemeinsam bewertet. Dies erfolgte nach den in den Leitlinien genannten Kriterien: (a) Relevanz und Klarheit, (b) Optimierung der Wirkung und Durchführbarkeit und (c) Effizienz. Jedes Kriterium wurde weiter unterteilt und jeder Vorschlag erhielt eine Punktzahl. Damit ein Vorschlag als annehmbar erachtet wurde, musste für jedes Kriterium eine Mindestpunktzahl erreicht werden.

Die Leitlinien wurden von der Generaldirektion Entwicklung (DEVCO) und dem EAD ausgearbeitet, mit den Mitgliedstaaten erörtert und erhielten die Zustimmung des Kommissars. Diese Initiative ist eindeutig ergebnisorientiert, und es wurde mit den Mitgliedstaaten vereinbart, dass in jedem Vorschlag der Mehrwert der Maßnahme klar nachgewiesen werden muss und die Indikatoren, die zur Beurteilung ihrer Auswirkungen verwendet wurden, angeführt werden müssen.

Die Vorschläge von Kenia, Senegal und Äthiopien haben die Mindestpunktzahl für das dritte Kriterium nicht erreicht. Insbesondere konnten sie mit ihren Vorschlägen weder die Effizienz des Durchführungsmechanismus im Vergleich zu anderen Instrumenten noch die Stärken der Überwachungskapazitäten des Landes nachweisen. Diese Regierungen wurden über die Ablehnung ihrer Vorschläge schriftlich informiert.

Für jeden ausgewählten Vorschlag versuchen nun die AKP-Staaten, mit Unterstützung der Delegationen, die effizienteste Art der Umsetzung zu finden, und arbeiten an der Projektbeschreibung. Da die Initiative auf rasche Ergebnisse ausgerichtet ist, werden bestehende Mechanismen und Modalitäten für die Umsetzung verwendet: Management durch nationale Behörden, Budgethilfe und Beitragsvereinbarung mit Einrichtungen der Mitgliedstaaten, internationalen Organisationen oder Nichtregierungsorganisationen.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001862/12
à la Commission
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Antonyia Parvanova (ALDE), Françoise Castex (S&D), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE) et Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE)
(15 février 2012)

Objet: Suivi de l'initiative 1 milliard d'euros pour les objectifs du Millénaire pour le développement

Lors du Sommet des Nations unies sur les objectifs du millénaire pour le développement, en septembre 2010, le président de la Commission a annoncé que l'Union européenne lancerait une initiative d'un milliard d'euros afin d'aider les pays les plus pauvres de la planète à engranger des progrès dans la réalisation des objectifs du Millénaire pour le développement (OMD).

Les gouvernements des États d'Afrique, des Caraïbes et du Pacifique (ACP) ont été invités à présenter des propositions pour approbation par le comité du FED. Le 21 décembre 2011, la Commission a publié le MEMO/11/930, qui comprend une liste des pays, de leurs projets et de leurs priorités en matière d'OMD, ainsi que les montants que ces pays recevront dans le cadre de l'initiative.

Les acteurs de la société civile ont été consultés lors de la rédaction de la proposition et ont collaboré avec les gouvernements du Kenya, du Sénégal et de l'Éthiopie — qui enregistrent des taux de mortalité maternelle parmi les plus élevés du monde — afin de garantir que les objectifs du Millénaire pour le développement n^{os} 4 et 5 soient clairement mentionnés dans leurs propositions d'initiatives. Malgré la haute qualité des propositions, aucun projet relatif à l'OMD n^{o} 5 n'a été sélectionné dans les trois pays susmentionnés.

La Commission pourrait-elle répondre aux questions suivantes:

1. Comment les propositions des gouvernements ACP pour les OMD ont-elles été évaluées et quelles lignes directrices ont-elles été utilisées pour évaluer la qualité de ces propositions? Quels critères ont-ils été utilisés dans la prise de cette décision?

2. Quelle institution ou agence était-elle responsable du processus d'évaluation et cette institution ou cette agence peut-elle raisonnablement expliquer pourquoi les trois pays susmentionnés ne seront pas soutenus?

3. La Commission fournira-t-elle d'autres informations aux gouvernements ACP sur les raisons de cette décision?

4. L'organisme compétent pourrait-il également fournir des détails sur la manière dont les fonds seront mis en œuvre dans les différents pays?

Réponse donnée par M. Piebalgs au nom de la Commission
(10 mai 2012)

Conformément aux lignes directrices concernant l'initiative à l'appui des objectifs du millénaire pour le développement (OMD) mise en place avec les pays ACP, les services de la Commission et le service européen pour l'action extérieure (SEAE) ont évalué conjointement chacune des 69 propositions reçues dans le cadre de ladite initiative. Cet examen a été réalisé sur la base des critères définis dans les lignes directrices, à savoir a) la pertinence et la clarté de la proposition, b) la maximisation de son impact et sa faisabilité et c) son efficacité. Une note a été attribuée à chaque proposition. Pout être jugée admissible, une proposition devait obtenir une note minimale pour chaque critère.

Les lignes directrices ont été élaborées par la direction générale Développement et coopération — EuropeAid (DEVCO) et le SEAE, discutées avec les États membres et approuvées par le membre de la Commission compétent. L'initiative en question est clairement axée sur les résultats, et il a été convenu avec les États membres que toute proposition devait clairement justifier la valeur ajoutée de l'intervention et mentionner les indicateurs utilisés pour mesurer son impact.

Les propositions du Kenya, du Sénégal et de l'Éthiopie n'ont pas obtenu la note minimale requise pour le troisième critère. Plus particulièrement, leurs propositions ne démontraient pas l'efficacité du mécanisme d'exécution par rapport à d'autres instruments, ni les points forts de la capacité de suivi du pays. Les gouvernements concernés ont été informés par courrier du rejet de leurs propositions.

Les pays ACP procèdent à présent, avec le soutien des délégations, à la détermination du mécanisme d'exécution le plus efficace et à la formulation des projets pour chaque proposition retenue. L'initiative devant produire rapidement des résultats, il sera recouru aux mécanismes et modalités d'exécution existants: gestion par les autorités nationales, appui budgétaire et accord de contribution avec les agences des États membres, les organismes internationaux ou les ONG.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001862/12
aan de Commissie
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Antonyia Parvanova (ALDE), Françoise Castex (S&D), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE) en Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE)
(15 februari 2012)

Betreft: Follow-up van het initiatief voor 1 miljard euro voor millenniumontwikkelingsdoelen

Op de topbijeenkomst van de Verenigde Naties over de millenniumontwikkelingsdoelen in september 2010 kondigde de voorzitter van de Commissie aan dat de EU een initiatief voor 1 miljard euro zou nemen om de armste landen in de wereld te helpen vooruitgang te boeken bij de verwezenlijking van hun millenniumdoelstellingen voor ontwikkeling (MDG's).

De regeringen van de groep van staten in Afrika, het Caribisch gebied en de Stille Oceaan werden uitgenodigd om voorstellen ter goedkeuring aan het EOF-comité voor te leggen. Op 21 december 2011 heeft de Commissie MEMO/11/930 gepubliceerd met een lijst van landen en dier projecten en MDG-focus, en de bedragen die deze landen in het kader van het initiatief zullen ontvangen.

Bij het opstellen van het voorstel zijn belanghebbende partijen van het maatschappelijk middenveld geraadpleegd, die hebben samengewerkt met de regeringen van Kenia, Senegal en Ethiopië — waar enkele van de hoogste moedersterftecijfers ter wereld voorkomen — om ervoor te zorgen dat millenniumontwikkelingsdoelen nummer 4 en 5 een prominente plaats zouden krijgen in hun voorstellen met betrekking tot het MDF-initiatief. Ondanks de hoge kwaliteit van de voorstellen zijn er in voornoemde drie landen geen projecten in het kader van MDG nummer 5 geselecteerd.

Kan de Commissie het volgende verduidelijken:

1. Op welke wijze zijn de MDG-voorstellen van de ACS-regeringen beoordeeld en welke richtsnoeren zijn er gehanteerd om de kwaliteit van die voorstellen te beoordelen? Welke criteria zijn er gebruikt bij de besluitvorming?

2. Welk orgaan of agentschap was verantwoordelijk voor deze beoordelingsprocedure, en kan het een met redenen omklede uitleg geven waarom voornoemde drie landen geen steun zullen ontvangen?

3. Is de Commissie voornemens te zorgen voor een verdere feedback aan de ACS-regeringen om haar beschikking te motiveren?

4. Zou de bevoegde instantie ook kunnen uiteenzetten hoe de middelen in de verschillende landen zullen worden ingezet?

Antwoord van de heer Piebalgs namens de Commissie
(10 mei 2012)

Overeenkomstig de richtsnoeren voor het initiatief inzake de millenniumdoelstellingen voor ontwikkeling (MDG's), dat samen met de ACS-landen is opgesteld, hebben de diensten van de Commissie en de Europese Dienst voor extern optreden alle 69 voorstellen in het kader van dit initiatief gezamenlijk beoordeeld. Deze beoordeling is uitgevoerd volgens de criteria van voornoemde richtsnoeren, namelijk (a) relevantie en transparantie, (b) optimalisering van de resultaten en uitvoerbaarheid en (c) doelmatigheid. Elk voorstel kreeg een score toebedeeld. Om als ontvankelijk te worden beschouwd, moest elk voorstel een minimumscore voor alle criteria behalen.

De richtsnoeren zijn opgesteld door het directoraat-generaal EuropeAid Ontwikkeling en Samenwerking (DEVCO) en de Europese Dienst voor extern optreden, besproken met de lidstaten en goedgekeurd door de commissaris. Dit initiatief is uitgesproken resultaatgericht en met de lidstaten werd afgesproken dat voor elk voorstel de meerwaarde van de steunverlening moest worden aangetoond en de indicatoren voor het meten van de resultaten moesten worden aangegeven.

De voorstellen van Kenia, Senegal en Ethiopië haalden de minimumscore voor het derde criterium niet. Deze landen hebben met name niet de doelmatigheid van het steunverleningsmechisme in vergelijking met andere instrumenten aangetoond, noch de sterke punten van hun controlecapaciteit. Hun regeringen werden bij brief op de hoogte gebracht van de afwijzing van hun voorstellen.

Met de ondersteuning van de EU-delegaties werken de ACS-landen nu voor elk geselecteerd voorstel aan het meest doelmatige steunverleningsmechisme en aan de projectvoorbereiding. Aangezien het initiatief is gericht op snelle resultaten, worden bestaande mechanismen en werkwijzen gebruikt: beheer door de nationale autoriteiten, begrotingssteun en bijdrageovereenkomsten met agentschappen van de lidstaten, internationale organisaties en ngo's.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-001862/12
komissiolle
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Antonyia Parvanova (ALDE), Françoise Castex (S&D), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE) ja Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE)
(15. helmikuuta 2012)

Aihe: Vuosituhannen kehitystavoitteita koskevan yhden miljardin euron aloitteen seuranta

Komission puheenjohtaja ilmoitti syyskuussa 2010 järjestetyssä Yhdistyneiden Kansakuntien vuosituhannen kehitystavoitteita koskevassa huippukokouksessa, että EU käynnistäisi yhden miljardin euron aloitteen auttaakseen maailman köyhimpiä maita vuosituhannen kehitystavoitteiden saavuttamisessa.

Afrikan, Karibian ja Tyynenmeren valtioiden ryhmän hallituksia kehotettiin esittämään ehdotuksia Euroopan kehitysrahaston komitean hyväksyttäväksi. Komissio julkaisi 21. joulukuuta 2011 asiakirjan MEMO/11/930, joka sisälsi luettelon maista, niiden hankkeista ja vuosituhattavoitteiden painopisteistä sekä summista, jotka näiden maiden oli määrä saada aloitteen puitteissa.

Ehdotusta laadittaessa kuultiin kansalaisyhteiskunnan sidosryhmiä. Lisäksi yhteistyössä Kenian, Senegalin ja Etiopian (joissa äitiyskuolleisuus on maailman suurimpia) hallitusten kanssa pyrittiin varmistamaan, että vuosituhattavoitteet 4 ja 5 mainittaisiin näkyvästi näiden maiden esittämissä, vuosituhattavoitteita koskevaan aloitteeseen liittyvissä ehdotuksissa. Ehdotusten tasokkuudesta huolimatta yhtään vuosituhattavoitteeseen 5 liittyvää ehdotusta ei valittu näissä kolmessa maassa.

Voiko komissio selventää seuraavia seikkoja:

1. Kuinka AKT-maiden hallitusten vuosituhattavoitteita koskevia ehdotuksia arvioitiin, ja mitä ohjeita ehdotusten laadun arvioinnissa käytettiin? Mitä perusteita käytettiin päätöksenteossa?

2. Mikä toimielin tai virasto oli vastuussa arviointiprosessista, ja voiko se esittää perustellun selvityksen siitä, miksi edellä mainittuja kolmea maata ei aiota tukea?

3. Aikooko komissio selittää päätöstään AKT-maiden hallituksille tarkemmin?

4. Voiko toimivaltainen taho myös selvittää tarkemmin, miten varoja aiotaan käyttää eri maissa?

Andris Piebalgsin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(10. toukokuuta 2012)

Komission yksiköt ja Euroopan ulkosuhdehallinto (EUH) arvioivat yhdessä kaikki vuosituhattavoitteita koskevan aloitteen perusteella toimitetut 69 ehdotusta, kuten AKT-maiden kanssa yhteisissä aloitteen suuntaviivoissa määrätään. Arvioinnissa sovellettiin suuntaviivoissa vahvistettuja kriteereitä, jotka ovat a) relevanssi ja selkeys, b) vaikutusten maksimointi ja toteutettavuus ja c) tehokkuus. Kaikki ehdotukset pisteytettiin. Hyväksyttyjen ehdotusten oli saatava kustakin kriteeristä tietty vähimmäispistemäärä.

Suuntaviivojen laatimisesta vastasivat kehitys- ja yhteistyöpääosasto (DEVCO) ja EUH, minkä jälkeen niistä keskusteltiin jäsenvaltioiden kanssa ennen kuin komissaari vahvisti ne. Aloitteessa painotetaan vahvasti tuloksia, ja jäsenvaltioiden kanssa sovittiin, että ehdotuksissa on selkeästi perusteltava toimenpiteistä saatava lisäarvo ja osoitettava indikaattorit, joilla ehdotuksen vaikutusta mitataan.

Kenian, Senegalin ja Etiopian ehdotukset eivät saaneet kolmannen kriteerin osalta vaadittua vähimmäispistemäärää. Ehdotusten puutteena oli erityisesti se, että niissä ei osoitettu täytäntöönpanomekanismin tehokkuutta verrattuna muihin välineisiin eikä maan seurantakapasiteetin vahvuuksia. Maiden hallituksille on ilmoitettu ehdotusten hylkäämisestä kirjeitse.

AKT-maat tutkivat nyt edustustojen avulla kunkin hyväksytyn ehdotuksen osalta, miten ne voitaisiin panna täytäntöön mahdollisimman tehokkaasti, ja valmistelevat hankkeiden muotoilua. Koska aloitteen avulla pyritään saamaan tuloksia nopeasti, on tarkoitus käyttää olemassa olevia täytäntöönpanomekanismeja ja -sääntöjä: hallinnoinnista vastaavat kansalliset viranomaiset, hankkeille myönnetään budjettitukea, ja rahoitussopimukset tehdään jäsenvaltioiden virastojen, kansainvälisten organisaatioiden tai valtiosta riippumattomien järjestöjen kanssa.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001862/12
to the Commission
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Antonyia Parvanova (ALDE), Françoise Castex (S&D), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE) and Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE)
(15 February 2012)

Subject: Follow-up to the EUR 1 billion Millennium Development Goals initiative

At the UN Millennium Development Goals Summit in September 2010, the President of the Commission announced that the EU would launch a EUR 1 billion initiative to help the world's poorest countries make progress in achieving their Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

The governments of the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States were invited to submit proposals for the EDF committee's approval. On 21 December 2011, the Commission published MEMO/11/930, which included a list of countries alongside their projects and MDG focus, as well as the sums of money these countries are to receive under the initiative.

Civil society stakeholders were consulted during the drafting of the proposal, and they also worked together with the governments of Kenya, Senegal and Ethiopia — which have some of the world's highest maternal mortality rates — to ensure that Millennium Development Goals Nos 4 and 5 were prominently mentioned in their MDG initiative proposals. Despite the high quality of the proposals, no MDG No 5 projects were selected in the three aforementioned countries.

Can the Commission clarify:

1. How were the ACP governments' MDG proposals evaluated, and what guidelines were used to evaluate the quality of those proposals? What criteria were used in making this decision?

2. Which institution or agency was responsible for this evaluation process, and can it come forward with a reasoned explanation why the three aforementioned countries will not be supported?

3. Will the Commission give further feedback to the ACP governments to explain its decision?

4. Could the competent body also elaborate on how the funds will be implemented in the different countries?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(10 May 2012)

As laid down in the Guidelines for the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) initiative, shared with ACP countries, the Commission services and the European External Action Service (EEAS) jointly assessed all the 69 proposals received for the initiative. It has been made in accordance with the criteria detailed in the guidelines, namely (a) relevance and clarity, (b) impact maximisation and feasibility, and (c) efficiency. Each criterion was sub-divided as below and a score has been attributed to each proposal. To be deemed acceptable, a proposal had to obtain a minimum mark for each criterion.

The guidelines has been prepared by the Directorate-General Development (DEVCO) and EEAS, discussed with Member States and endorsed by the Commissioner. This initiative is clearly results oriented and it was agreed with Member States that any proposal have to justify clearly the added value of the intervention and indicate indicators used to measure its impact.

Proposals from Kenya, Senegal and Ethiopia have not obtained the minimum mark for the third criteria. Their proposals failed in particular to demonstrate the efficiency of the delivery mechanism compared to other instruments and the strengths of the monitoring capacity of the country. These governments have been notified of the rejection of their proposal by letter.

For each selected proposal, ACP States, with the support of Delegations, are now looking at the most efficient way to deliver and are preparing the project formulation. As the Initiative is geared for rapid results, existing delivery mechanisms and modalities will be used: management by national authorities, budget support, and contribution agreement with Member States agencies, international bodies or NGOs.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001870/12
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(16 de febrero de 2012)

Asunto: Nuevo fallo de la central nuclear de Garoña

La empresa norteamericana fabricante de reactores nucleares, General Electric, ha elaborado un informe en el que afirma que el reactor nuclear BWE/2-5, de agua en ebullición, instalado, entre otras, en la central burgalesa de Garoña, presenta un problema de fricción en las barras de control que afectaría a la seguridad humana y medioambiental en caso de terremoto. El fallo consiste en una interferencia o fricción de las barras de control con los canales de combustible cuando éstos van a hacer sus funciones de absorber los neutrones y parar la reacción nuclear, por lo que de producirse una terremoto y fallaran las barras de control este problema podría ocasionar la imposibilidad de parar la central en caso de emergencia. El informe de General Electric se ha remitido a NRC (Consejo de Seguridad Nuclear Americano) y a las empresas que operan las centrales de este tipo de diseño, como Nuclenor en el caso de Garoña.

— ¿Comparte la Comisión la preocupación expresada por General Electric en torno al fallo detectado en el reactor instalado en la planta nuclear de Garoña?

— ¿Por qué motivos el fallo comunicado por General Electric no aparece mencionado en el informe de las pruebas de resistencia realizadas en Garoña en motivo del accidente de Fukushima?

— ¿Va a recomendar la Comisión que la central de Garoña cambie todo el sistema de accionamiento de las barras de control?

Respuesta del Sr. Oettinger en nombre de la Comisión
(30 de marzo de 2012)

1. y 3. La Comisión no está en condiciones de evaluar las declaraciones de General Electric en el informe mencionado por Su Señoría.

Con arreglo a la Directiva 2009/71/Euratom ([1]), es obligatorio para los Estados miembros establecer y mantener un marco legislativo, reglamentario y organizativo nacional que determine las responsabilidades relativas a la adopción de los requisitos de seguridad nuclear y que exija a los titulares de licencias evaluar y verificar periódicamente y mejorar la seguridad de sus instalaciones nucleares, bajo la supervisión de la autoridad nacional competente.

2. Los informes finales de los Estados miembros sobre las pruebas de resistencia, incluido el informe de España, han sido elaborados por las autoridades reguladoras nacionales, que revisaron las autoevaluaciones realizadas por los operadores nucleares. Los resultados de estos informes también están siendo objeto de una revisión por expertos de los Estados miembros y la Comisión a fin de validar su coherencia y objetividad. La Comisión presentará los resultados finales al Consejo Europeo en junio de 2012.

La Comisión también remite a Su Señoría a su respuesta a la pregunta escrita E-010554/2011 del Sr. Martin ([2]).

([1]) Directiva 2009/71/Euratom del Consejo, de 25 de junio de 2009, por la que se establece un marco comunitario para la seguridad nuclear de las instalaciones nucleares (DO L 172 de 2.7.2009).
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001870/12
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(16 February 2012)

Subject: New fault in the Garoña nuclear plant

The US company General Electric, which makes nuclear reactors, has produced a report stating that the BWE/2-5 boiling water nuclear reactor, found in the Garoña power plant in Burgos and elsewhere, has a problem with friction in the control rods which would pose a threat to human and environmental safety in the event of an earthquake. The fault consists of interference or friction between the control rods and the fuel channels when the latter are operating to absorb the neutrons and stop the nuclear reaction. Hence if there were an earthquake and the control rods failed, the problem might make it impossible to shut down the plant in an emergency. General Electric sent the report to the NRC (the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission) and to the companies which operate power plants of this type, such as Nuclenor in the case of Garoña.

— Does the Commission share General Electric's concern about the fault detected in the Garoña nuclear power plant?

— Why was the fault referred to by General Electric not mentioned in the report on the stress tests carried out at Garoña following the accident at Fukushima?

— Will the Commission recommend replacement of the entire control rod system at the Garoña power plant?

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

1 and 3. The Commission is not in a position to assess the statements of General Electric in the report mentioned by the Honourable Member.

According to Council Directive 2009/71/Euratom ([1]), it is an obligation of the Member States to establish and maintain a national legislative, regulatory and organisational framework, which lays down responsibilities for the adoption of nuclear safety requirements and which requires licence holders to regularly assess, verify and improve the safety of their nuclear installations, under the supervision of the national competent authority.

2. The final reports from Member States on stress tests, thus also the report from Spain, have been prepared by the national regulators, who reviewed the self-assessments carried out by nuclear operators. The results of these reports are also currently being peer-reviewed by experts from Member States and the Commission, in order to validate their consistency and objectivity. The Commission will present the final results to the European Council in June 2012.

The Commission would also like to refer the Honourable Member to its reply to Written Question E-010554/2011 by Mr Martin ([2]).

([1]) Council Directive 2009/71/Euratom of 25 June 2009 establishing a Community framework for the nuclear safety of nuclear installations, OJ L 172, 2.7.2009.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-001871/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Takis Hadjigeorgiou (GUE/NGL)
(16 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Καταστροφή μέγαλου τμήματος του μεγάλου ανακτόρου του Βυζαντίου

Σύμφωνα με δημοσίευμα της εφημερίδας RADICAL (5.2.2012) οι τουρκικές αρχές έχουν επιτρέψει την καταστροφή ενός μεγάλου τμήματος του μεγάλου ανακτόρου του Βυζαντίου για την ανέγερση πενταόροφου ξενοδοχείου. Ο χώρος της καταστροφής βρίσκεται στην προστατευόμενη αρχαιολογική περιοχή κοντά στην Αγία Σοφία (οδός Kücükayasofya caddesi). Σύμφωνα με την εφημερίδα ισοπεδώθηκε ένας τοίχος πλάτους τεσσάρων μέτρων και ύψους δέκα μέτρων ενώ καταστράφηκαν ολοσχερώς όλα τα αρχαιολογικά ευρήματα μέχρι και τα θεμέλια.

Η καταστροφή έγινε παρά τις σφοδρές διαμαρτυρίες και αντιδράσεις του Αρχαιολογικού Μουσείου της Κωνσταντινούπολης που ζητούσε τη διακοπή των εργασιών.

Γνωρίζει η Επιτροπή τα γεγονότα αυτά και σε ποιες ενέργειες προτίθεται να προχωρήσει έτσι ώστε η Τουρκία, υποψήφια προς ένταξη χώρα, να σεβαστεί τις ιστορικές περιοχές και τα σημαντικά μνημεία της πόλης, που από το 1985 περιλαμβάνονται στον κατάλογο Μνημεία Παγκόσμιας Πολιτιστικής Κληρονομιάς της ΟΥΝΕΣΚΟ.

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(10 Απριλίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή αποδίδει μεγάλη σημασία στη διαφύλαξη όλων των μνημείων και κτιρίων της ευρωπαϊκής πολιτιστικής κληρονομιάς.

Ωστόσο, η συντήρηση, η προστασία, η διατήρηση και η ανακαίνιση της πολιτιστικής κληρονομιάς είναι πρωτίστως εθνική ευθύνη του κράτους μέλους. Σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 167 της Συνθήκης ΕΕ, η ΕΕ «συμβάλλει στην ανάπτυξη των πολιτισμών των κρατών μελών και σέβεται την εθνική και περιφερειακή πολυμορφία τους, ενώ ταυτόχρονα προβάλλει την κοινή πολιτιστική κληρονομιά. Η δράση της Ένωσης αποσκοπεί στην ενθάρρυνση της συνεργασίας μεταξύ κρατών μελών και, αν αυτό είναι αναγκαίο, υποστηρίζει και συμπληρώνει τη δράση τους […].».

Εντούτοις, η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί τις συζητήσεις σχετικά με την κατασκευή ξενοδοχείου στα ερείπια του μεγάλου ανακτόρου του Βυζαντίου στην Κωνσταντινούπολη που ανέφερε το Αξιότιμο Μέλος, και μπορεί να τον πληροφορήσει ότι ο τούρκος υπουργός τουρισμού και πολιτισμού, Ertuğul Günay, ανακοίνωσε ότι τα έργα κατασκευής ήταν παράνομα και ότι το νέο κτίριο θα κατεδαφιστεί.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001871/12
to the Commission
Takis Hadjigeorgiou (GUE/NGL)
(16 February 2012)

Subject: Destruction of a large section of the Great Palace of Byzantium

According to a report in the newspaper *Radical* (5.2.2012), the Turkish authorities have authorised the destruction of a large section of the Great Palace of Byzantium to enable the construction of a five-storey hotel. The scene of the destruction is inside the protected archaeological precinct near Hagia Sophia (in Kücükayasofya Caddesi street). The newspaper reports that a wall four metres wide by ten metres high has been raised and all the archaeological finds have been destroyed, including the foundations.

The destruction took place despite the vehement protests and reactions of the Istanbul Archaeology Museum, which demanded suspension of the works.

Is the Commission aware of these developments and what steps does it propose to take to ensure that Turkey, a candidate for EU membership, respects historic areas and important monuments in the city which, since 1985, has been included on Unesco's list of World Cultural Heritage sites?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2012)

The Commission regards the safeguarding of all monuments and buildings of European cultural heritage with the highest importance.

However, the upkeep, protection, conservation and renovation of cultural heritage are primarily a national responsibility of Member States. In accordance with Article 167 of the EU Treaty, the European Union 'shall contribute to the flowering of the cultures of the Member States, while respecting their national and regional diversity and at the same time bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore. Action by the Union shall be aimed at encouraging cooperation between Member States and, if necessary, supporting and supplementing their action […]'.

This being said, the Commission has been following the discussion around a hotel construction on the ruins of the Grand Byzantine Palace in Istanbul mentioned by the Honourable Member and can inform him that the Turkish Minister of Tourism and Culture, Ertuğul Günay, has announced that the construction works were illegal and the new building will be demolished.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001879/12
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(16 februari 2012)

Betreft: Corruptie neemt toe

Uit de vandaag, door de Europese Commissie gepubliceerde, Eurobarometerenquête blijkt dat de corruptie in de EU de laatste drie jaar is toegenomen. Daarmee blijft corruptie een van de grootste problemen waarmee Europa te maken heeft. Nadelige gevolgen van corruptie voor de EU zijn onder andere: teruglopende investeringen, belemmeringen van de (eerlijke) werking van de interne markt en een weerslag op de overheidsfinanciën.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met de resultaten uit haar Eurobarometerenquête en het bericht „Eurobarometer: Neemt corruptie toe?" ([1])?

2. Eurocommissaris Malmström heeft gesteld dat „de praktische resultaten van de EU-brede aanpak van corruptie onbevredigend blijven". Daarmee impliceert de Commissie dat haar corruptie-bestrijdingspakket ([2]) heeft gefaald. Welke nieuwe acties is de Commissie van plan te nemen tegen corruptie binnen de EU?

3. Eurocommissaris Malmström stelt namens de Commissie dat „de Europeanen […] van de nationale regeringen doortastend optreden [verwachten]". Op welke wijze stimuleert de Commissie dat nationale regeringen een effectief anti-corruptiebeleid voeren?

4. Op welke wijze zal de Commissie de (eerlijke) werking van de interne markt herstellen, opdat een van de hoofddoelstellingen van de EU overeind blijft?

5. Wat vindt de Commissie ervan dat 67 % van de Europeanen meent dat corruptie onderdeel van de eigen (bedrijfs)cultuur van hun land is? Is de Commissie de mening toegedaan dat in het geval van dergelijke hardnekkige corruptie, strafmaatregelen tegen de lidstaten die het betreft moeten worden genomen? Zo ja, welke strafmaatregelen worden overwogen? Zo neen, welke andere mogelijkheden ziet de Commissie nog om dergelijke hardnekkige corruptie tegen te gaan?

Antwoord van mevrouw Malmström namens de Commissie
(16 maart 2012)

De Commissie heeft het hoofddoel van het corruptiebestrijdingspakket dat in juni 2011 werd goedgekeurd, bevestigd met haar verklaring dat de praktische resultaten van de EU-brede aanpak van corruptie onbevredigend blijven. Er moet met andere woorden gefocust worden op de daadwerkelijke impact en de tenuitvoerlegging van de anticorruptiewetgeving en -beleidsmaatregelen.

De Eurobarometer over corruptie is een bijzondere enquête die om de twee jaar wordt uitgevoerd namens de Commissie. De evolutie die uit de enquête blijkt, zal in het EU-corruptiebestrijdingsverslag worden beoordeeld. Dit verslaggevingsmechanisme voor corruptiebestrijding is in het leven geroepen om de prestaties van de lidstaten in de strijd tegen corruptie te kunnen evalueren. Het doel van het EU-corruptiebestrijdingsverslag is niet om sancties op te leggen, maar zwakke punten en tekortkomingen bloot te leggen, goede praktijken te identificeren en peer learning te stimuleren.

Het is nog te vroeg om de daadwerkelijke impact van het EU-corruptiebestrijdingsverslag te evalueren, aangezien het eerste verslag pas in 2013 wordt gepubliceerd. De Commissie heeft de doelstellingen en werkmethodes voor dit verslag niettemin reeds gepresenteerd in de openbare hoorzitting van het Europees Parlement in september 2011.

Het feit dat 67 % van de Europeanen menen dat corruptie onderdeel van de cultuur van hun land is, geeft aan dat deze vorm van criminaliteit bestrijden een moeilijke en complexe onderneming is.

De Commissie heeft in haar mededeling over corruptiebestrijding in de EU van juni 2011 erkend dat de initiatieven die zij heeft aangekondigd, waaronder het EU-corruptiebestrijdingsverslag, corruptie niet zullen uitbannen, maar alles bijeengenomen wel zullen helpen het probleem terug te dringen.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/12/135&format=HTML&aged=0&language=NL&guiLanguage=en.
([2]) IP/11/678 en MEMO/11/376.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001879/12
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(16 February 2012)

Subject: Corruption on the rise

According to the Eurobarometer survey published today by the European Commission, corruption in the EU has risen in the last three years. Thus, corruption remains one of the biggest problems facing Europe. Detrimental consequences of corruption for the EU are, among other things: decreasing investments, obstruction of the (fair) operation of the internal market and a negative impact on government finances.

1. Is the Commission familiar with the results of its Eurobarometer survey and the report, 'Eurobarometer: Corruption on the rise?'? ([1])

2. European Commissioner Malmström said that 'the practical results of the EU-wide approach in tackling corruption remain unsatisfactory'. The Commission thus implies that its anti-corruption package has failed ([2]). Which new actions does the Commission plan on taking against corruption inside the EU?

3. European Commissioner Malmström says, on behalf of the Commission, that 'Europeans expect national governments to take decisive steps'. How is the Commission encouraging national governments to implement effective anti-corruption policies?

4. How will the Commission restore the (fair) operation of the internal market in order to uphold one of the EU's main objectives?

5. What view does the Commission take of the fact that 67% of Europeans believe that corruption is part of their own country's (business) culture? Does the Commission agree that, in the case of such persistent corruption, punitive measures must be taken against the Member States concerned? If so, which punitive measures are being considered? If not, which other solutions does the Commission see in order to oppose such persistent corruption?

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

The Commission's statement concerning the insufficient practical results in tackling corruption across the EU reaffirmed the main rationale of the anti-corruption package adopted in June 2011, i.e. the need to focus on actual impact and implementation of anti-corruption legislation and policies.

The Eurobarometer on corruption is a special survey carried out every two years on behalf of the Commission. The trends shown by this survey over time will be assessed in the EU Anti-Corruption Report. This anti-corruption reporting mechanism was set up to be able to evaluate Member States' performance against corruption. The aim of the EU Anti-Corruption Report is not to set sanctions, but to expose vulnerabilities and shortcomings, identify good practices and encourage peer learning.

It is premature to evaluate the actual impact of the EU Anti-Corruption Report, since the first report will be published in 2013. However, the Commission presented the objectives and working methodology for this Report in the public hearing of the European Parliament held in September 2011.

The fact that 67% of the European citizens see corruption as part of their business culture shows that fighting this crime is a difficult and complex endeavour.

In its communication on Fighting Corruption in the EU of June 2011, the Commission recognised that the initiatives it announced, including the EU Anti-Corruption Report, will not eradicate corruption, but taken together should help reduce the problem.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/12/135&format=HTML&aged=0&language=NL&guiLanguage=en.
([2]) IP/11/678 and MEMO/11/376.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-001880/12
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI) en Lucas Hartong (NI)
(16 februari 2012)

Betreft: Radiotelescopie

De organisatie SKA is een onafhankelijke organisatie voor de ontwikkeling van een stelsel superradiotelescopen. Deelnemers aan de SKA zijn ministeries en wetenschapsorganisaties uit Australië, China, Italië, Nederland, Nieuw Zeeland, Groot Brittannië, en Zuid-Afrika. Ook de EU heeft uitgesproken deel te willen nemen aan de SKA.

1. Voor welk bedrag draagt de Commissie bij aan het SKA project?

2. Uit welke budgetregel(s) wordt de financiering van het SKA project bekostigd?

3. Over welke jaren strekt de financiering zich uit?

4. Kan de Commissie aangeven waar de SKA project office zal worden gevestigd? 1. Waar binnen de EU; 2. Bij de radiotelescopen zelf (Australië — Zuid-Afrika); 3. Elders?

5. Kan de Commissie aangeven wat de verwachte opbrengsten van het SKA project voor de EU zijn? Zo niet, waarom niet?

6. Kan de Commissie aangeven welke doelstellingen van de Commissie worden bereikt met het SKA project?

7. Kan de Commissie aangeven wat de rol van de EU is binnen de SKA?

8. Zijn er afspraken gemaakt over de verdeling van de tijd die onderzoekers van de EU kunnen besteden aan het doen van waarnemingen met de radiotelescopen? Zo neen, waarom niet? Zo ja, hoeveel uur per jaar zijn gereserveerd voor waarnemingen door onderzoekers uit de EU?

Antwoord van mevrouw Geoghegan-Quinn namens de Commissie
(22 maart 2012)

1. De Commissie heeft in totaal 16 839 949,40 euro bijgedragen aan de ontwikkeling van het SKA-project via subsidies op basis van oproepen tot het indienen van voorstellen in het kader van het zesde en zevende kaderprogramma voor onderzoek en technologische ontwikkeling (KP6, 2002-2006 en KP7, 2007-2013). Zij draagt niet bij aan de financiering van de in 2012 opgerichte SKA-organisatie.

2 & 3. De middelen komen uit het budget voor de activiteit onderzoeksinfrastructuur, die loopt van 2005 tot 2014.

4. Het projectbureau van de SKA-organisatie is op dit moment in het Verenigd Koninkrijk gevestigd. De definitieve locatie van het projectbureau is nog niet bepaald. De Commissie neemt geen standpunt in over de keuze van de vestigingsplaats.

5. De Commissie kan deze cijfers niet verstrekken omdat het project nog niet lang genoeg loopt. Voor het projectbureau wordt een aankoopbeleid overeenkomstig de EU-regelgeving uitgestippeld.

6. Het project draagt bij tot de totstandbrenging van het Europa 2020-vlaggenschipinitiatief inzake de Innovatie-Unie ([1]), en met name agendapunt 4 (open toegang tot onderzoeksinfrastructuur), 5 (ESFRI-onderzoeksinfrastructuur) en 32 (mondiale onderzoeksinfrastructuur en internationale samenwerking).

7. De Commissie treedt in de eerste plaats op als neutraal bemiddelaar en adviseur wanneer zij daartoe wordt verzocht. Daarnaast verleent zij via het GO-SKA project op dit moment subsidies voor de ontwikkeling van een global-governancebeleid (EU-bijstand van 888 988,93 euro).

8. Het project is nog niet ver genoeg gevorderd om reeds afspraken te maken over de toegang tot de telescoop. De afspraken daarover worden wellicht samen met de global governance van het project vastgesteld.

([1]) COM(2010)546 SEC(2010) 1161 van 6.10.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001880/12
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI) and Lucas Hartong (NI)
(16 February 2012)

Subject: Radiotelescopy

The SKA Organisation is an independent organisation working on the development of a system of super radio telescopes. Ministries and scientific organisations from Australia, China, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Great Britain and South Africa are participating in the SKA. The EU has also expressed interest in participating in the SKA project.

1. How much is the Commission contributing to the SKA project?

2. From which budget item(s) is the SKA project financing being funded?

3. Over which years does the funding run?

4. Can the Commission specify where the 'SKA project office' will be situated? 1. Where inside the EU; 2. At the radio telescopes themselves (Australia/South Africa); 3. Somewhere else?

5. Can the Commission specify the amount of the expected revenue for the EU from the SKA project? If not, why not?

6. Can the Commission specify which of the Commission's aims are being achieved with the SKA project?

7. Can the Commisson specify the EU's role within the SKA project?

8. Have any agreements been made regarding the allocation of time that researchers from the EU can spend using the radio telescopes for their observations? If not, why not? If so, how many hours per year have been reserved for observations by researchers from the EU?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(22 March 2012)

1. The Commission contributed to the development of the SKA project with a total of EUR 16 839 949 40 through the Sixth and Seventh Framework Programmes for Research and Technological Development (FP6, 2002-2006 and FP7, 2007-2013) projects awarded through calls for proposals. The Commission does not contribute to the funding of the SKA Organisation established in 2012.

2 and 3. The funding comes from the research infrastructures action that runs for the period 2005-2014.

4. The Project Office for the SKA Organisation is currently located in the United Kingdom. The final location of the Project Office cannot yet be specified. The Commission remains neutral with respect to the choice of site.

5. The Commission cannot specify these figures because it is too early for the project. A procurement policy following EU legislation is currently being developed by the Project Office.

6. The project will contribute to achieving the Europe 2020 Flagship Initiative Innovation Union ([1]), in particular commitments four (open access to research infrastructures), five (ESFRI research infrastructures) and 32 (global research infrastructures and international cooperation).

7. The Commission's role is primarily of neutral facilitator and advisor if and when required. Additionally, the Commission currently provides support to development of policy and global governance via the GO-SKA project ([2]) (EC funding EUR 899 988.93).

8. Access policy to the telescope has not been defined yet because it is too early in the timeline of the project. It is expected to be agreed together with the global governance ofthe project.

([1]) COM(2010) 546, SEC(2010) 1161, 6.10.2010.
([2]) http://cordis.europa.eu/search/index.cfm?fuseaction=proj.document&PJ_RCN=12275437.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-001889/12
komissiolle
Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE)
(16. helmikuuta 2012)

Aihe: IPPC- ja vesipuitedirektiivien rikkominen Suomen turvetuotannon lupamenettelyssä

Saarijärven kaupunki on tehnyt kantelun, jossa se pyytää komissiota tutkimaan, rikkooko Suomi IPPC-direktiivin (2008/1/EY) artikloja 3, 6, 9 ja 10 ja vesipuitedirektiivin (2000/60/EY) artikloja 4 ja 10 turvetuotannon lupamenettelyssä.

Suomi ei ole täyttänyt IPPC-direktiivin mukaisia velvoitteitaan ryhtyä toimiin, jotta turvetuotanto ei merkittävästi pilaa ympäristöä ja jotta laitosten lupahakemukset sisältävät mm. arviot eri päästöjen laadusta ja määrästä kuhunkin ympäristöelementtiin.

Suomessa turvetuotannon ympäristölupakäsittelyssä humuksen vaikutukset vesistöihin on jätetty kokonaan lupahakemuksessa vaadittavien tietojen ulkopuolelle, vaikka se on turvetuotannon keskeisin vesistöpäästö.

Kantelun mukaan turvetuotannon lupamenettely ei täytä vesipuitedirektiivin vaatimuksia. Vesistöjen humuskuormitusta ei ole käsitelty eikä nykyisellä muutaman kerran vuodessa tapahtuvalla vedenlaadun seurannalla saada riittävää tietoa. Humus rehevöittää vesistöjä ja aiheuttaa happikatoa sekä sedimentoituu pohjaan, missä se muuttaa pohjaeliöstön elinympäristöä. Kokemusten mukaan suodatuskentät, joilla humusta pyritään poistamaan valumavesistä, saattavat tosiasiassa jopa lisätä vesistöihin valuvan humuksen määrää.

Esitin marraskuussa 2010 komissiolle kysymyksen turvetuotannon vesistövaikutusten arvioinnista Suomen ympäristölupakäytännössä (E-009730/2010). Komissaari Janez Potočnikin vastauksessa kerrottiin komission parhaillaan arvioivan vesipiirin hoitosuunnitelmia perusteellisesti, minkä jälkeen se päättää jatkotoimenpiteistä.

Onko komissio vesipiirin hoitosuunnitelmia arvioidessaan todennut turvetuotantoon liittyviä EU:n ympäristödirektiivien rikkomuksia Suomessa? Aikooko se ryhtyä toimiin Saarijärven kaupungin, Suomen Birdlife ry:n ja Suomen luonnonsuojeluliiton vuonna 2011 jättämien kantelujen perusteella varmistaakseen, että turvetuotannon lupamenettelyt Suomessa ovat EU-lainsäädännön mukaisia ja johtavat vesistöille aiheutettujen haittojen vähenemiseen?

Janez Potočnikin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(17. huhtikuuta 2012)

Komissio viimeistelee paraikaa vesipiirien hoitosuunnitelmien arviointia.

Komissio vahvistaa vastaanottaneensa ja rekisteröineensä turvetuotantoa koskevat kantelut Saarijärjen kaupungilta, Suomen BirdLife ry:ltä ja Suomen luonnonsuojeluliitolta.

Kanteluissa esille tuotujen monimutkaisten kysymysten tekninen ja oikeudellinen arviointi ei ole vielä valmistunut.

Jos komissio toteaa arvioinnissaan, että EU:n lainsäädäntöä on rikottu, se aikoo toteuttaa tarvittavat toimenpiteet.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001889/12
to the Commission
Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE)
(16 February 2012)

Subject: Breaches of the IPPC Directive and the Water Framework Directive in the application process for peat production permits in Finland

The town of Saarijärvi has lodged a complaint requesting the Commission to investigate whether Finland is in breach of IPPC Directive (2008/1/EC) Articles 3, 6, 9 and 10 and Water Framework Directive (2000/60/CE) Articles 4 and 10 in the application process for peat production permits.

Finland has not fulfilled its obligations, as stipulated in the IPPC Directive, of ensuring that peat production does not cause significant environmental damage and of ensuring that permit applications for installations include such details as estimates of the nature and quantity of emissions into each environmental medium.

There is no requirement at all for applicants to provide information on the effect of humus leakage into bodies of water in the environmental permit application process for peat production in Finland, despite humus leakage being the most significant type of water pollution arising from peat production.

According to the complaint, the authorisation process for peat production does not fulfil the requirements of the Water Framework Directive. The process makes no mention of the amount of humus pollution in bodies of water nor is there enough information produced by the current water quality monitoring process, which is carried out several times per year. Humus causes eutrophication in bodies of water and leads to a loss of oxygen, whilst also leaving a sediment on the beds of bodies of water, where it alters the habitats of organisms. It has been demonstrated that waste water filtration fields, which are intended to remove humus from runoff water, may actually increase the amount of humus leakage into bodies of water.

I put a question to the Commission in November 2010 regarding the assessment of the impact of peat production on waters in the context of the issuing of environmental permits in Finland (E-009730/2010). Commissioner Janez Potočnik's response stated that the Commission was currently carrying out an in-depth assessment of river basin management, after which the Commission would decide on further measures.

In the course of its assessment of river basin management, has the Commission discovered breaches of the EU's environmental directives related to peat production in Finland? Does it intend to take action on the basis of the complaints lodged in 2011 by the town of Saarijärvi, BirdLife Finland and the Finnish Association for Nature Conservation to ensure that the environmental permit application processes for peat production in Finland comply with EU legislation and lead to a reduction in damage to bodies of water?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(17 April 2012)

The Commission is currently finalising the assessment of the river basin management plans.

The Commission can confirm that it has received and registered complaints from the town of Saarijärvi, BirdLife Finland and the Finnish Association for Nature Conservation concerning peat extraction in Finland.

The technical and legal assessments of the complex issues that have been raised in the complaints have not yet been finalised.

Necessary measures will be taken should the Commission in its assessments find indications of breaches of EU legislation.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-001915/12
lill-Kummissjoni
David Casa (PPE)
(16 ta' Frar 2012)

Suġġett: Il-midja soċjali għaż-żgħażagħ

Għalkemm jeżistu ċerti żvantaġġi għaż-żieda fl-użu tal-midja soċjali fost iż-żgħażagħ, huwa meħtieġ li jkun żgurat li ż-żgħażagħ Ewropej ikollhom għarfien ġust ta' din il-midja, peress li hija parti importanti mid-dinja tal-lum.

Mir-rapport tal-Kummissjoni bl-isem "'Approċċ Ewropew għal-litteriżmu medjatiku fid-dinja diġitali" "l hawn, il-Kummissjoni ħadet xi inizjattivi sabiex tiżgura li persuni żgħażagħ jiġu mgħallma l-importanza tal-użu tal-midja soċjali b'moderazzjoni?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Vassiliou f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(25 ta' April 2012)

Fl-20 ta' Awwissu 2009, il-Kummissjoni adottat Rakkomandazzjoni dwar il-litteriżmu medjatiku fl-ambjent diġitali għal industrija awdjoviżiva u tal-kontenut aktar kompetittiva u soċjetà tal-għarfien inklussiva [C(2009) 6464 finali]. F'dan id-dokument il-Kummissjoni rrakkomandat, fost l-oħrajn, li l-Istati Membri "jifthu dibattitu f'konferenzi u avvenimenti pubbliċi oħra dwar l-inklużjoni tal-litteriżmu medjatiku fil-kurikulu edukattiv obbligatorju, u bħala parti mill-għoti ta' kompetenzi ewlenin għat-tagħlim tul il-ħajja, stipulati fir-Rakkomandazzjoni tal-Parlament Ewropew u tal-Kunsill tat-18 ta' Diċembru 2006 dwar kompetenzi ewlenin għat-tagħlim tul il-ħajja".

Sabiex jikkontribwixxu għal dan il-proċess, fl-2011 il-Kummissjoni ħolqot grupp ta' esperti dwar il-litteriżmu medjatiku fl-iskejjel, magħmul minn rappreżentanti tal-Ministeri tal-Edukazzjoni tal-Istati Membri kollha u tal-pajjiżi tal-EFTA. Dan il-grupp se janalizza sa fejn il-litteriżmu medjatiku huwa inkluż fil-politiki edukattivi ta' kull pajjiż. Se jiġu eżaminati approċċi differenti u se jkunu identifikati u deskritti prattiki tajbin. Il-grupp huwa mistenni wkoll jevalwa l-fattibbiltà ta' — u possibbilment jipproponi — pjan biex jivvaluta l-livelli tal-litteriżmu medjatiku fl-Ewropa, permezz ta' koperazzjoni bejn il-Kummissjoni Ewropea u l-awtoritajiet nazzjonali u reġjonali.

Barra minn hekk, il-Kummissjoni Ewropea tissokta tappoġġa r-riċerka sistematika permezz ta' studji fuq l-aspetti u d-dimensjonijiet differenti tal-għarfien ċinematografiku u medjatiku fl-ambjent diġitali, u li jimmonitorjaw u jkejlu l-progress tal-livelli tal-litteriżmu medjatiku (eż. l-studju "L-ittestjar u l-irfinar tal-kriterji għall-valutazzjoni tal-livelli tal-litteriżmu medjatiku fl-Ewropa" li sar fl-2010 u l-istudji "Studju dwar l-Edukazzjoni tal-Litteriżmu Medjatiku Ewropew" u "Il-litteriżmu ċinematografiku fl-Ewropa" li tnedew fl-2012).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001915/12
to the Commission
David Casa (PPE)
(16 February 2012)

Subject: Social media for youth

Despite certain drawbacks to the increasing use of social media among young people, it has become necessary to ensure that Europe's youth has a sound understanding of these media, given that they are such an important part of today's world.

Since the Commission's report entitled 'A European approach to media literacy in the digital environment', has the Commission taken any initiatives to ensure that young people are taught the importance of using social media in moderation?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(25 April 2012)

On 20 August 2009 the Commission adopted a recommendation on media literacy in the digital environment for a more competitive audiovisual and content industry and an inclusive knowledge society [C(2009) 6464 final]. In this document, the Commission recommended, *inter alia*, that Member States 'open a debate in conferences and other public events on the inclusion of media literacy in the compulsory education curriculum, and as part of the provision of key competences for lifelong learning, set out in the recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 on key competences for lifelong learning'.

In order to contribute to this process, the Commission established in 2011 an expert group on media literacy in schools, composed of representatives of Ministries of Education of all Member States and EFTA countries. This group will analyse to what extent media literacy is included in educational policies of each country. Different approaches will be examined and good practices identified and outlined. The group is also expected to evaluate the feasibility of — and possibly propose — a plan for assessing media literacy levels in Europe, through cooperation between the European Commission and national and regional authorities.

Furthermore, the European Commission continues to support systematic research through studies on different aspects and dimensions of media and film literacy in the digital environment and monitoring and measuring the progress of media literacy levels (e.g. the study 'Testing and refining criteria to assess media literacy levels in Europe' carried out in 2010 and the studies 'European Media Literacy Education Study' and 'Film literacy in Europe' launched in 2012).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001929/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(17 febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Maldive, fondamentalisti islamici distruggono statue buddiste

Fondamentalisti islamici hanno fatto irruzione nel Museo nazionale delle Maldive e distrutto almeno 30 statue buddiste. La polizia non ha ancora identificato gli aggressori, nonostante l'attacco sia avvenuto il 7 febbraio scorso. Tra i reperti devastati, una stele tantrica di corallo a sei facce del nono secolo e la cosiddetta testa di Thoddoo, un blocco di corallo di 50 cm raffigurante il volto di Buddha, ritrovato sull'isola omonima negli anni '50 e risalente al sesto secolo.

Nell'ultimo mese, l'arcipelago sta attraversando una fase di grave tensione politica e sociale, alimentata da gruppi e partiti islamici radicali.

Si chiede:

1. il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante è al corrente di questa vicenda?

2. quali azioni ha intenzione di intraprendere il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante per risolvere le violenze che si stanno verificando nel paese?

Risposta data dall'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(25 aprile 2012)

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente è a conoscenza di questo deplorevole incidente avvenuto nel museo nazionale delle Maldive e del ruolo che la religione e la radicalizzazione religiosa stanno assumendo nel corso degli eventi nel paese.

A seguito della visita dei capi missione dell'UE di Colombo e New Delhi a Male dal 12 al 15 febbraio, l'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ha rilasciato una dichiarazione a nome dell'UE, esortando tutte le parti ad astenersi da atti di violenza, dalla retorica dell'odio e da qualunque azione provocatoria che possa minacciare il futuro della democrazia nelle Maldive (rif. A 68/12 in data 21 febbraio 2012; http://eeas.europa.eu/statements/index_it.htm).

Sulla base di quanto emerso durante la visita nelle Maldive dei capi missione dell'UE, l'Unione ritiene che tutti i gruppi politici vadano incoraggiati a cooperare per il ripristino della stabilità e dello Stato di diritto. L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ha ribadito la necessità di raggiungere un accordo per convocare le elezioni anticipate. La legittimità del passaggio di poteri avvenuto il 7 febbraio andrebbe determinata da un'indagine imparziale e indipendente, come convenuto in linea di principio da tutte le parti.

L'UE è pronta ad offrire ulteriore assistenza nel quadro delle azioni esistenti finanziate dagli Stati membri.

L'UE continua a seguire attentamente gli eventi nelle Maldive, in stretta collaborazione con l'ONU, il Commonwealth e l'India, per contribuire al ripristino di una situazione politica stabile.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001929/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(17 February 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — The Maldives: Islamic fundamentalists destroy Buddhist statues

Islamic fundamentalists have carried out a raid on the National Museum of the Maldives and destroyed at least 30 Buddhist statues. The police have not yet identified the perpetrators, despite the fact that the attack took place on 7 February 2012. Among the exhibits destroyed was a ninth-century six-sided tantric stele made of coral and the so-called head of Thoddoo, a 50 cm block of coral depicting the face of Buddha, found on the island of the same name in the 1950s and dating from the sixth century.

In the last month, the archipelago has been experiencing a period of serious political and social tensions, fuelled by radical Islamic groups and parties.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of this incident?

2. What action does the Vice-President/High Representative intend to take to address the violence that is taking place in the country?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(25 April 2012)

The HR/VP is aware of the regrettable incident at the National Museum and that religion and religious radicalization is an issue in current events unfolding in the Maldives.

EU Heads of Mission based in Colombo and New Delhi visited Male on 12-15 February. Subsequently, the HR/VP released a declaration on behalf of the EU calling on all parties to refrain from violence, inflammatory rhetoric and any provocative actions which could threaten the future of democracy in the Maldives (ref. A 68/12 dated 21 February 2012, http://eeas.europa.eu/statements/index_en.htm).

The EU is of the view, following the outcome of the EU Heads of Missions' visit to the country, that all political groupings should be encouraged to cooperate in re-establishing stability and the rule of law. The HR/VP has stated that a consensus should be achieved so that early elections can take place. The legality of the transfer of power on 7 February should be determined by an impartial, independent investigation, as in principle agreed by all parties in the Maldives.

The EU is ready to offer further assistance in conjunction with existing actions financed by Member States.

The EU continues to follow the events in the Maldives closely, in coordination with the UN, the Commonwealth and India, in order to contribute to a return to a stable political situation.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-001966/12
an die Kommission
Hannu Takkula (ALDE), Malika Benarab-Attou (Verts/ALE), Marie-Christine Vergiat (GUE/NGL), Doris Pack (PPE), Helga Trüpel (Verts/ALE), Lothar Bisky (GUE/NGL) und Petra Kammerevert (S&D)
(20. Februar 2012)

Betrifft: Konzentration im Musikmarkt

Die Europäische Union hat die kulturelle Vielfalt zu respektieren — dies ist ein in der Charta der Grundrechte und im EG-Vertrag festgelegter Grundsatz.

In seiner Entschließung vom 12. Mai 2011 zu der Erschließung des Potenzials der Kultur- und Kreativindustrien betont das Parlament, „wie wichtig Überlegungen dazu sind, wie der Regelungsrahmen — insbesondere die Wettbewerbsregeln — am besten an die Besonderheiten des Kultursektors angepasst werden könnte, um die kulturelle Vielfalt zu schützen und den Zugang der Verbraucher zu vielfältigen und hochwertigen kulturellen Inhalten und Dienstleistungen zu gewährleisten".

In ihrem Grünbuch 2010 zur Erschließung des Potenzials der Kultur- und Kreativindustrien betonte die Kommission die Tatsache, dass „dauerhaft gleiche Wettbewerbsbedingungen zu schaffen … gemeinsame Anstrengungen in verschiedenen politischen Bereichen [erfordert], vor allem im Bereich der Wettbewerbspolitik".

Im November 2011 verkündeten Universal und Sony, dass sie den Zuschlag für einen ihrer größten Konkurrenten, EMI, gewonnen hatten.

Zahlen einer jüngsten Studie zeigen, dass in Europa auf Universal, Sony und EMI zusammen 76,5 % der 200 wichtigsten Downloads und 76 % der 200 meistgespielten Titel entfallen. Das amerikanische Repertoire macht 50 % der in Europa im Radio gespielten und heruntergeladenen Musikstücke aus. Unter den wichtigsten 1 000 Titeln befinden sich weniger als 10 % von Künstlern, die bei unabhängigen Labels unter Vertrag stehen, obgleich auf sie 80 % der Neuerscheinungen entfallen.

— Wird die Europäische Kommission bei der Beurteilung des Angebots von Universal und Sony für EMI diese Zahlen und branchenspezifischen Faktoren berücksichtigen?

— Wird die Kommission prüfen, ob bei den oben genannten Zahlen das erforderliche Niveau an Wettbewerb, kultureller Vielfalt und Wahlfreiheit der Verbraucher gegeben ist?

Antwort von Herrn Almunia im Namen der Kommission
(11. April 2012)

Der geplante Erwerb des Tonträgergeschäfts von EMI durch Universal wurde am 17. Februar 2012 bei der Kommission angemeldet, und der geplante Erwerb von EMI Music Publishing durch eine Investorengruppe, der u. a. die Sony Corporation of America („Sony") und die Mubadala Development Company PJSC („Mubadala") angehören, wurde am 27. Februar 2012 bei der Kommission angemeldet.

Der Kommission ist bekannt, dass es sich bei Universal und Sony um große Unternehmen handelt, die sowohl im Tonträger- als auch im Musikverlagsgeschäft tätig sind. Daher führt die Kommission gemäß der Fusionskontrollverordnung ([1]) eine eingehende Prüfung der Marktverhältnisse durch, bei der unter anderem die Marktstellung der verschiedenen Unternehmen, die Nachfragemacht der Kunden und die Wettbewerbsprobleme aufgrund von Produktpiraterie berücksichtigt werden. Die Prüfung soll zeigen, ob eines der Vorhaben oder beide den wirksamen Wettbewerb auf einem der relevanten Musikmärkte wesentlich einschränken würden.

Die Wahrung des wirksamen Wettbewerbs gehört nach Auffassung der Kommission zu den wichtigen Instrumenten zum Schutz der kulturellen Vielfalt nach Artikel 167 Absatz 4 AEUV. Auf allen Stufen der Musikindustrie, also sowohl bei der Entdeckung neuer Künstler und Komponisten und ihrer Untervertragnahme als auch beim Verkauf und Vertrieb von Musikstücken in Form von Tonträgern oder Dateien, ist ein funktionierender Wettbewerb für die Wahrung der kulturellen Vielfalt und eines breitgefächerten Angebots für Verbraucher von entscheidender Bedeutung.

([1]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 139/2004 des Rates vom 20. Januar 2004 über die Kontrolle von Unternehmenszusammenschlüssen („Fusionskontrollverordnung") (ABl. L 24 vom 29.1.2004).

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-001966/12
à la Commission
Hannu Takkula (ALDE), Malika Benarab-Attou (Verts/ALE), Marie-Christine Vergiat (GUE/NGL), Doris Pack (PPE), Helga Trüpel (Verts/ALE), Lothar Bisky (GUE/NGL) et Petra Kammerevert (S&D)
(20 février 2012)

Objet: Concentration sur le marché de la musique

L'Union européenne doit respecter la diversité culturelle, ce principe est inscrit dans la Charte des droits fondamentaux de l'Union européenne et dans le traité CE.

Dans sa résolution du 12 mai 2011 intitulée «Libérer le potentiel des industries culturelles et créatives», le Parlement a rappelé «l'importance de s'interroger sur la façon dont il convient d'adapter les cadres réglementaires, en particulier les règles en vigueur en matière de concurrence, aux spécificités du secteur culturel, afin de garantir la diversité culturelle ainsi que l'accès des consommateurs à des contenus et des services culturels diversifiés et de qualité».

Dans son livre vert de 2010 intitulé «Libérer le potentiel des industries culturelles et créatives», la Commission a souligné le fait que «créer et maintenir des conditions de concurrence égales […] nécessitera de conjuguer les efforts dans différents domaines stratégiques, en particulier la politique de la concurrence».

En novembre 2011, Universal et Sony ont annoncé avoir remporté l'appel d'offres de l'un de leurs plus grands concurrents, EMI.

Selon les chiffres d'une récente étude, Universal, Sony et EMI représentent à eux trois 76,5 % des 200 titres les plus téléchargés et 76 % des 200 titres ayant le plus de temps d'antenne en Europe. Le répertoire musical américain représente 50 % des morceaux diffusés à la radio et téléchargés en Europe. Dans le top 1000, moins de 10 % des artistes sont engagés auprès de labels indépendants, en dépit du fait qu'ils représentent 80 % des nouveautés.

— La Commission tiendra-t-elle compte de ces chiffres et de facteurs spécifiques à ce secteur au moment d'évaluer l'offre d'Universal et de Sony faite à EMI?

— La Commission considère-t-elle que ces chiffres décrivent le degré de concurrence, de diversité culturelle et de choix pour les consommateurs exigé?

Réponse donnée par M. Almunia au nom de la Commission
(11 avril 2012)

La proposition de rachat des activités «musique enregistrée» d'EMI par Universal a été notifiée à la Commission le 17 février 2012, tandis que la proposition de rachat de EMI Music Publishing par un groupe d'investisseurs comprenant Sony Corporation of America (ci-après, «Sony»), la société Mubadala Development Company PJSC (ci-après, «Mubadala») ainsi que d'autres investisseurs, a été notifiée à la Commission le 27 février 2012.

La Commission est consciente du fait qu'Universal et Sony sont de grosses sociétés présentes à la fois dans les domaines de l'édition musicale et de la musique enregistrée. C'est pourquoi, conformément au règlement sur les concentrations ([1]), la Commission examine de manière détaillée toutes les conditions du marché, qui incluent, entre autres, le pouvoir des différents acteurs du marché, le pouvoir des consommateurs et la contrainte que représente le piratage pour évaluer si l'une ou l'autre des transactions entraverait significativement une concurrence effective sur l'un des marchés en cause de l'industrie de la musique.

La Commission estime que la préservation d'une concurrence effective est un outil important pour la protection de la diversité culturelle visée à l'article 167, paragraphe 4, du TFUE. De fait, un environnement compétitif à tous les niveaux de l'industrie de la musique, à la fois pour découvrir, engager de nouveaux artistes et compositeurs et vendre et distribuer les œuvres musicales, tant au format physique que numérique, constitue un élément fondamental pour préserver la diversité culturelle et le choix du consommateur.

([1]) Règlement (CE) n° 139/2004 du Conseil du 20 janvier 2004 relatif au contrôle des concentrations entre entreprises (le «règlement sur les concentrations»), JO L 24 du 29.1.2004.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-001966/12
komissiolle
Hannu Takkula (ALDE), Malika Benarab-Attou (Verts/ALE), Marie-Christine Vergiat (GUE/NGL), Doris Pack (PPE), Helga Trüpel (Verts/ALE), Lothar Bisky (GUE/NGL) ja Petra Kammerevert (S&D)
(20. helmikuuta 2012)

Aihe: Musiikkimarkkinoiden keskittyminen

EU:n on kunnioitettava kulttuurista monimuotoisuutta – periaatetta, joka on kirjattu perusoikeuskirjaan ja EY:n perustamissopimukseen.

Kulttuuriteollisuuden ja luovan alan teollisuuden mahdollisuuksien käyttöönotosta 12. toukokuuta 2011 antamassaan päätöslauselmassa parlamentti korosti, ”että on pohdittava parasta tapaa, jolla sääntelykehys, erityisesti kilpailusäännöt, olisi sovitettava kulttuurialan erityispiirteisiin, jotta taataan kulttuurinen moninaisuus ja monipuolisten ja laadukkaiden kulttuurisisältöjen ja -palvelujen saatavuus kuluttajille”.

Vuonna 2010 julkaisemassaan vihreässä kirjassa ”Kulttuuriteollisuuden ja luovan alan teollisuuden mahdollisuudet käyttöön” komissio korosti, että ”tasavertaisten toimintaolosuhteiden luominen ja säilyttäminen […] edellyttää yhteisiä toimenpiteitä politiikan eri osa-alueilla, erityisesti kilpailupolitiikan alalla”.

Marraskuussa 2011 Universal ja Sony ilmoittivat voittaneensa tarjouskilpailun, joka koski EMIä, yhtä niiden suurimmista kilpailijoista.

Hiljattain laaditussa tutkimuksessa esitetyt luvut osoittavat, että 200 eniten ladatusta kappaleesta Universalin, Sonyn ja EMIn osuus oli yhteensä 76,5 prosenttia ja 200 suosituimmasta Airplay-tekniikalla toistetusta kappaleesta niiden osuus oli 76 prosenttia Euroopassa. Euroopassa radiossa soitetuista ja ladatuista kappaleista yhdysvaltalaisen ohjelmiston osuus on 50 prosenttia. Tuhannen suosituimman kappaleen esittäjistä alle kymmenen prosenttia on tehnyt sopimuksen riippumattomien levy-yhtiöiden kanssa, vaikka niiden osuus uusista kappaleista on 80 prosenttia.

— Ottaako komissio huomioon edellä mainitut luvut ja alakohtaiset tekijät arvioidessaan Universal- ja Sony-yhtiöiden tekemää tarjousta EMIstä?

— Katsooko komissio edellä olevien lukujen osoittavan, että kilpailun, kulttuurisen monimuotoisuuden ja kuluttajien valinnanvapauden taso on vaatimustenmukainen?

Joaquìn Almunian komission puolesta antama vastaus
(11. huhtikuuta 2012)

Ehdotettu yrityskauppa, jolla Universal hankkii omistukseensa EMIn musiikkiäänitteiden alan liiketoiminnan, ilmoitettiin komissiolle 17. helmikuuta 2012, ja ehdotettu yrityskauppa, jolla yrityksistä Sony Corporation of America (Sony), the Mubadala Development Company PJSC (Mubadala) ja muista sijoittajista muodostuva sijoittajaryhmä hankkii omistukseensa EMI Music Publishing -yrityksen, ilmoitettiin komissiolle 27. helmikuuta 2012.

Komissio on tietoinen siitä, että Universal ja Sony ovat suuria yrityksiä, jotka toimivat sekä musiikkiäänitteiden alalla että musiikin kustantamisessa. Sen vuoksi komissio toteuttaa sulautuma-asetuksen ([1]) mukaisesti yksityiskohtaisen tutkimuksen kaikista markkinaolosuhteista kuten eri markkinatoimijoiden vahvuudet, asiakkaiden kysyntävoima ja piratismin aiheuttama kilpailupaine. Tarkoituksena on arvioida johtaisivatko kyseiset liiketoimet merkittävään tehokkaan kilpailun esteeseen merkityksellisillä musiikkimarkkinoilla.

Komissio katsoo, että tehokkaan kilpailun säilyttäminen on tärkeää kulttuurien monimuotoisuuden suojelemiseksi SEUT-sopimuksen 167 artiklan 4 kohdan mukaisesti. Kulttuurien monimuotoisuuden ja kuluttajien valinnanvaran säilyttämiseksi on tärkeää edistää kilpailua kaikilla musiikkiteollisuuden tasoilla, on kyse sitten uusien artistien löytämisestä ja levytyssopimusten tekemisestä tai musiikkiteosten myynnistä ja jakelusta fyysisessä ja digitaalisessa muodossa.

([1]) Neuvoston asetus (EY) N:o 139/2004, annettu 20 päivänä tammikuuta 2004, yrityskeskittymien valvonnasta (sulautuma-asetus), EUVL L 24, 29.1.2004.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001966/12
to the Commission
Hannu Takkula (ALDE), Malika Benarab-Attou (Verts/ALE), Marie-Christine Vergiat (GUE/NGL), Doris Pack (PPE), Helga Trüpel (Verts/ALE), Lothar Bisky (GUE/NGL) and Petra Kammerevert (S&D)
(20 February 2012)

Subject: Concentration in the music market

The EU must respect cultural diversity — a principle enshrined in the Charter of Fundamental Rights and the EC Treaty.

In its resolution of 12 May 2011 on unlocking the potential of cultural and creative industries, Parliament stressed 'the importance of considering the best way to adapt the regulatory framework — and in particular the rules on competition policy — to the specific situation of the cultural sector to ensure cultural diversity and consumer access to a range of high-quality cultural content and services'.

In its 2010 Green Paper on unlocking the potential of cultural and creative industries, the Commission underlined the fact that 'creating and maintaining the level playing field … will require combined efforts in different policy fields, especially competition policy'.

In November 2011, Universal and Sony announced that they had won the bidding for one of their nearest rivals, EMI.

Figures from a recent study show that Universal, Sony and EMI together account for 76.5% of top 200 downloads and 76% of top 200 airplay in Europe. US repertoire accounts for 50% of the tracks played on radio and downloaded in Europe. In the top 1000, fewer than 10% of artists are signed to independent labels, though they account for 80% of new releases.

— Will the Commission take these figures and sector-specific factors into account when assessing the Universal and Sony bid for EMI?

— Does the Commission consider that the above figures demonstrate the required level of competition, cultural diversity and consumer choice?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(11 April 2012)

The proposed acquisition of EMI's recorded music business by Universal was notified to the Commission on 17 February 2012, while the proposed acquisition of EMI Music Publishing by an investor group comprising Sony Corporation of America ('Sony'), the Mubadala Development Company PJSC ('Mubadala') and other investors was notified to the Commission on 27 February 2012.

The Commission is aware of the fact that Universal and Sony are large companies active in both recorded music and music publishing. In accordance with the Merger Regulation ([1]), the Commission is therefore carrying out a detailed investigation of all market circumstances, including, but not limited to, the strength of the various market players, the power of customers and the constraint exercised by piracy with a view to assessing whether either transaction would lead to a significant impediment to effective competition on any relevant music market.

It is the Commission's view that preserving effective competition is an important tool to protect cultural diversity pursuant to Article 167(4) TFEU. Indeed, a competitive environment at all levels of the music industry in both the discovery and signing of new artists and composers and in the sale and distribution of musical works in both physical and digital form is key to preserving cultural diversity and consumer choice.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 139/2004 of 20 January 2004 on the control of concentrations between undertakings (the Merger Regulation), OJ L 24, 29.1.2004.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-001971/12
alla Commissione
Elisabetta Gardini (PPE)
(20 febbraio 2012)

Oggetto: Assistenza psicologica ai minori malati di tumore

L'apprendere di avere un tumore rappresenta un dramma per le persone di ogni sesso, provenienza ed età, ma indubbiamente risulta particolarmente delicato quando la malattia colpisce un minore, specialmente un bambino.

In occasione della 10ª Giornata mondiale contro il cancro infantile sono state pubblicate alcune ricerche che contengono dati preoccupanti. Secondo questi dati infatti un'alta percentuale di bambini colpiti da tumore cade poi in depressione. In questi bambini la depressione rischia di compromettere il successo delle cure, indebolendo il sistema immunitario e la salute psichica. In molti casi questi danni persistono anche in età adulta.

L'intervento di psicologi specialisti aiuta ad accettare la malattia e le cure, migliorando la risposta del sistema immunitario e la qualità della vita dei bambini malati e delle loro famiglie. Purtroppo emerge come anche nei Paesi occidentali spesso le strutture che si dedicano alla cura dei bambini malati di tumore non prevedano di avvalersi del contributo di uno psicologo.

In riferimento a quanto sopra esposto, può la Commissione comunicare:

1. se è a conoscenza di queste carenze in merito al mancato uso di psicologi nella cura dei bambini malati di tumore;

2. di quali dati dispone al riguardo;

3. cosa intende fare affinché il sostegno psicologico per i bambini malati di tumore diventi un diritto garantito?

Risposta data da John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(29 marzo 2012)

La Commissione non dispone di dati sul ricorso a psicologi per assistere i minori malati di tumore. La Commissione ritiene tuttavia che una cura del cancro integrata, che tenga in debita considerazione il benessere e il sostegno psicosociale, sia un elemento cruciale della terapia che deve essere incoraggiato ([1]).

Nel contesto dell'iniziativa comune Partnership europea per l'azione contro il cancro, sostenuta dal programma «Sanità» dell'UE si è svolta a Varsavia il 20-21 ottobre 2011 una conferenza sugli standard europei per l'assistenza ai bambini malati di cancro. Questa conferenza ha divulgato gli «Standard europei per l'assistenza ai bambini malati di cancro» che comprendono gli standard raccomandati in tema di assistenza psicologica e psicosociale. Prodotto da un gruppo di esperti multisettoriale e interdisciplinare di tutta Europa questo documento è disponibile on line in diverse lingue ([2]). Spetta agli Stati membri applicare tali standard poiché l'organizzazione e la fornitura di assistenza sanitaria rientrano per l'essenziale nelle loro responsabilità.

([1]) Comunicazione della Commissione al Parlamento europeo, al Consiglio, al Comitato economico e sociale europeo e al Comitato delle regioni. Lotta contro il cancro: un partenariato europeo, COM(2009)291 definitivo.

([2]) http://www.siope.eu/SIOPE-EU/English/Home-Page/Conferences-Events/Past-Events/European-Standards-of-Care-Warsaw-2011/page.aspx/249.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-001971/12
to the Commission
Elisabetta Gardini (PPE)
(20 February 2012)

Subject: Psychological support for young cancer sufferers

Learning that you have cancer is a tragedy for anyone, regardless of sex, origin or age, but there is no doubt that it is particularly difficult when the illness affects young people, particularly young children.

On the occasion of the tenth International Childhood Cancer Day, research containing worrying data has been published. According to these data, a high percentage of children suffering from cancer subsequently fall into depression. This depression is likely to jeopardise the success of treatment given to such children, weakening their immune system and their mental health. In many cases, the damage continues into adulthood.

Intervention by specialist psychologists helps children accept the disease and its treatment, thus improving the immune system's response and quality of life of sick children and their families. Unfortunately it appears that, even in Western countries, facilities devoted to caring for child cancer sufferers often fail to provide for the help of a psychologist.

With regard to the above, can the Commission state:

1. whether it is aware of these shortcomings in relation to the failure to use psychologists when caring for child cancer sufferers;

2. what figures it has available in this respect;

3. what it intends to do to ensure that psychological support for child cancer sufferers becomes a guaranteed right?

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

The Commission does not have data on the use of psychologists in child cancer care. However, the Commission considers that integrated cancer care, giving due consideration to psycho-social wellbeing and support, is a crucial part of care that should be encouraged ([1]).

As part of the joint action European Partnership for Action Against Cancer, supported by the EU Health Programme, a Conference on European Standards of Care for Children with Cancer took place in Warsaw on 20-21 October 2011. This conference disseminated the 'European Standards of Care for Children with Cancer' which include recommended standards on Psychological and Psychosocial Care. Produced by a multi-disciplinary, multi-professional team of experts across Europe, this document is available online in several languages ([2]). It is up to Member States to implement those standards as the organisation and the delivery of healthcare falls under their primary responsibility.

([1]) Communication from the Commission to the EP, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on Action Against Cancer: European Partnership, COM(2009) 291 final.

([2]) http://www.siope.eu/SIOPE-EU/English/Home-Page/Conferences-Events/Past-Events/European-Standards-of-Care-Warsaw-2011/page.aspx/249.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-001983/12
an den Rat
Werner Schulz (Verts/ALE)
(20. Februar 2012)

Betrifft: Sanktionen gegen Beamte aus Belarus, die an Menschenrechtsverletzungen und der Verletzung internationaler Wahlstandards bei den Präsidentschaftswahlen beteiligt sind

In seiner Entschließung vom 16. Februar 2012 zur Todesstrafe in Belarus, insbesondere zu den Fällen Dzmitry Kanavalau und Uladzislau Kavalyouthe, begrüßt das Europäische Parlament den Beschluss des EU-Rates „Auswärtige Angelegenheiten" vom 23. Januar 2012 über die Ausweitung der Sanktionskriterien, mit dem die Möglichkeit eröffnet wird, künftig diejenigen zu benennen, die für gravierende Menschenrechtsverletzungen oder die Unterdrückung der Zivilgesellschaft und der demokratischen Opposition in Belarus verantwortlich zeichnen, und bekräftigt, dass es keine Fortschritte im Dialog EU-Belarus geben kann, solange Belarus keine Fortschritte in den Bereichen Demokratie, Menschenrechte und Rechtsstaatlichkeit macht.

Die anhaltenden restriktiven Maßnahmen umfassen Visa-Sperren und das Einfrieren von Guthaben bei über 200 Personen. Es handelt sich dabei um Personen, die für die Verletzung internationaler Wahlstandards bei den Präsidentschaftswahlen in den Jahren 2006 und 2010 und für das harte Vorgehen gegen die Zivilgesellschaft und die demokratische Opposition verantwortlich zeichnen. Darüber hinaus sollten die Vermögenswerte von Unternehmen, die mit dem Regime in Verbindung stehen, eingefroren werden und Ausfuhren von Waffen und Ausrüstung nach Belarus, welche zur Repression im Land verwendet werden können, verboten werden.

In diesem Zusammenhang möchte ich die folgenden Fragen stellen:

— Wie viele Beamte aus Belarus unterliegen momentan der Visa-Sperre? Bitte legen Sie eine detaillierte Liste aller Personen vor.

— Wie hoch ist die genaue Summe des Regimevermögens, das derzeit auf Auslandskonten eingefroren ist? Welche Mitgliedstaaten kooperieren mit dem EAS in diesem Zusammenhang?

— Wie viele Unternehmen oder Personen aus Belarus sind von den wirtschaftlichen Sanktionen betroffen? Bitte legen Sie eine detaillierte Liste vor.

Antwort
(30. April 2012)

Für 227 belarussische Beamte gelten Visabeschränkungen ([1]) (Anlage 1 — die Anlage 1 wurde an den Fragesteller und ans Sekretariat des Europäischen Parlaments übermittelt).

Über die Höhe des Vermögens des belarussischen Regimes, das im Ausland eingefroren ist, hat der Rat keine Informationen.

Von 243 Personen und 32 Unternehmen sind, gemäß den gegen Belarus verhängten Sanktionen, die Vermögenswerte eingefroren (Anlage 2 — die Anlage 2 wurde an den Fragesteller und ans Sekretariat des Europäischen Parlaments übermittelt).

([1]) Die letzten Aktualisierungen erfolgten durch den Durchführungsbeschluss 2012/171/GASP des Rates vom 23. März 2012 zur Durch-führung des Beschlusses 2010/639/GASP über restriktive Maßnahmen gegen Belarus (ABl. L 87 vom 24.3.2012, S. 95); die Durchführungsverordnung (EU) Nr. 265/2012 des Rates vom 23. März 2012 zur Durchführung des Artikels 8a Absatz 1 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 765/2006 über restriktive Maßnahmen gegen Belarus (ABl. L 87 vom 24.3.2012, S. 37).

(English version)

Question for written answer P-001983/12
to the Council
Werner Schulz (Verts/ALE)
(20 February 2012)

Subject: Sanctions against Belarusian officials involved in human rights violations and violations of international electoral standards in the presidential elections

In its Resolution of 16 February 2012 'on the death penalty in Belarus, in particular the case of Dzmitry Kanavalau and Uladzislau Kavalyou', the European Parliament welcomes the EU Foreign Affairs Council decision of 23 January 2012 to broaden sanction criteria that pave the way for future designations of those responsible for serious human rights violations or the repression of civil society and the democratic opposition in Belarus, and reiterates that there cannot be any progress on EU-Belarus dialogue without progress in Belarus towards democracy, human rights and the rule of law.

The prolonged restrictive measures subject more than 200 individuals to a visa ban and an assets freeze. The people targeted are those responsible for the violations of international electoral standards in the presidential elections in 2006 and 2010 as well as for the crackdown on civil society and democratic opposition. In addition, the assets of companies linked to the regime should be frozen, while exports to Belarus of arms and materials that might be used for internal repression are prohibited.

In this regard, I would like to ask the following questions:

— How many Belarusian officials are currently subject to the visa ban? Please provide a detailed list of all individuals.

— What exact amount of money belonging to the regime is currently frozen in accounts abroad? Which Member States are cooperating with the EAS in this regard?

— How many Belarusian companies or individuals are targeted by economic sanctions? Please provide a detailed list.

Reply
(30 April 2012)

227 Belarusian officials are subject to visa restrictions ([1]). (Annex 1 sent directly to the Honourable Member and to Parliament's Secretariat).

The Council does not have any information on the amount of money belonging to the Belarusian regime frozen abroad.

243 individuals and 32 companies are subject to the asset freeze provided for in the Belarus sanctions regime (Annex 2 sent directly to the Honourable Member and to Parliament's Secretariat).

([1]) For the last update of the lists, see: Council implementing Decision 2012/171/CFSP of 23 March 2012 implementing Decision 2010/639/2010 concerning restrictive measures against Belarus, in OJ L 87, 24.3.2012, p. 95; Council implementing Regulation (EU) No 265/2012 of 23 March 2012 implementing Article 8a(1) of Regulation (EC) No 765/2066 concerning restrictives measure in respect of Belarus, in OJ L 87, 24.3.2012, p. 37.

Publications Office of the European Union
2985 Luxembourg
LUXEMBOURG

EN