Az Európai Unió
Hivatalos Lapja

C 426

57. évfolyam

Magyar nyelvű kiadás

Tájékoztatások és közlemények

2014. november 27.

Tartalom

HU

Megjegyzés az olvasónak

Ez a kiadvány az Európai Parlament tagjai által feltett, írásbeli választ igénylő kérdéseket és az európai uniós intézmények által rájuk adott válaszokat tartalmazza.

Minden kérdés és válasz esetében az eredeti nyelvi változat szerepel először az esetleges fordítások előtt.

Egyes esetekben előfordulhat, hogy a válasz más nyelven születik, mint a kérdés. Ez a válaszadásra felkért bizottság munkanyelvétől függ.

E kérdések és válaszok az Európai Parlament eljárási szabályzatának 117. és 118. cikkével összhangban kerülnek közzétételre.

Minden kérdés és válasz megtalálható az Európai Parlament weboldalán (Europarl) a „Parlamenti kérdések" cím alatt:

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

KÉPVISELŐCSOPORTOK RÖVIDÍTÉSEI

PPE	Európai Néppárt (Kereszténydemokraták) képviselőcsoport
S&D	Európai Szocialisták és Demokraták Progresszív Szövetsége képviselőcsoport
ALDE	Liberálisok és Demokraták Szövetsége Európáért képviselőcsoport
ECR	Európai Konzervatívok és Reformerek képviselőcsoport
Verts/ALE	Zöldek/Európai Szabad Szövetség képviselőcsoport
GUE/NGL	Egységes Európai Baloldal/Északi Zöld Baloldal képviselőcsoport
EFD	Szabadság és Demokrácia Európája képviselőcsoport
NI	független képviselők

IV

(Tájékoztatások)

AZ EURÓPAI UNIÓ INTÉZMÉNYEITŐL, SZERVEITŐL, HIVATALAITÓL ÉS ÜGYNÖKSÉGEITŐL SZÁRMAZÓ TÁJÉKOZTATÁSOK

EURÓPAI PARLAMENT

ÍRÁSBELI VÁLASZT IGÉNYLŐ KÉRDÉSEK A VÁLASZOKKAL

Az Európai Parlament tagjai által feltett, írásbeli választ igénylő kérdések és az európai uniós intézmények által rájuk adott válaszok

(2014/C 426/01)

Tartalom Oldal

(English version)

Question for written answer P-005100/14
to the Commission
Malcolm Harbour (ECR)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Travel concessions for old-age pensioners in the internal market

It is common across the Member States for old-age pensioners (OAPs) to receive concessions for travel. In the UK, for example, when people reach a pensionable age they are entitled to a free bus pass and reduced fares for rail travel. Considering that most OAPs are on limited incomes, mutual recognition or harmonisation of travel discounts for OAPs could help pensioners better exercise their right to free movement.

1. Has the Commission ever considered proposing the mutual recognition of OAP concessions for travel across the European Union?

2. Does the Commission consider that this measure would support the free movement of persons in the European Union?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(22 May 2014)

1. Commission Recommendation 89/350/EEC ([1]) calls for a European over-sixties' card to facilitate access to travel and other age-related concessions across the European Union. For about a decade the Commission has looked at ways of making the idea a fact. As the obstacles were many and interest in the idea among the Member States was negligible, the Commission abandoned the idea in 2000. No new initiatives have been taken since.

The Commission would also refer the Honourable Member to its answers to Oral Questions H-1148/98, H-1023/98 and H-0302/03 and Written Questions E-2406/99, E-1054/99, E-2326/01, E-0781/02, E-3411/04, E-0363/05, E-3662/07, E-0727/07, E-3741/08, E-3904/09, E-009889/11, E-007354/11 and E-013479/13.

2. The Commission is not aware of any recent estimates of the extent to which travel concessions for old-age pensioners within the internal market could influence the free movement of persons across the European Union.

([1]) Commission Recommendation 89/350/EEC of 10 May 1989 concerning a European over-sixties' card, OJ L 144, 27.5.1989, p. 59.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande P-005101/14
till kommissionen
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(17 april 2014)

Angående: Lagring av uppgifter, Berec och Post- och telestyrelsen

Post- och telestyrelsen (PTS) anger i ett pressmeddelande att den, till följd av Europeiska unionens domstols beslut om direktivet om lagring av uppgifter, inte kommer att vidta åtgärder för att upprätthålla regler om lagring som grundas på detta direktiv ([1]).

1. Har Berec informerats om detta? Om så är fallet, när kan den svenska tillsynsmyndigheten förvänta sig ett svar eller en kommentar från Berec?

2. På vilken rättslig grund ska Berec beakta och/eller agera på denna information?

Svar från Cecilia Malmström på kommissionens vägnar
(11 juni 2014)

PTS har ingen juridisk skyldighet att underrätta organet för europeiska regleringsmyndigheter för elektronisk kommunikation (Berec) om sin tolkning av nationell lagstiftning. PTS-ordföranden har dock informellt informerat Berec om pressmeddelandet från PTS. Berec känner till den svenska justitieminsterns brev till riksdagen, där det klargörs att svensk lagstiftning fortfarande gäller och kommer att analyseras ([2]). Det finns dock ingen specifik rättslig grund som föreskriver att Berec ska notera och/eller agera utifrån denna information.

([1]) https://www.pts.se/sv/Nyheter/Telefoni/2014/PTS-kommer-inte-i-nulaget-att-vidta-atgarder-utifran-datalagringsreglerna/
([2]) http://www.riksdagen.se/sv/Dokument-Lagar/Fragor-och-anmalningar/Svar-pa-skriftliga-fragor/EU-domstolens-ogiltigforklaran_H112561/

(English version)

Question for written answer P-005101/14
to the Commission
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Data retention, BEREC and the Swedish Post and Telecom Authority

The Swedish Post and Telecom Authority (PTS) states in a press release that, following the ruling by the Court of Justice of the European Union on the Data Retention Directive, it will not take measures to uphold retention rules based on the directive ([1]).

1. Has BEREC been informed thereof? If so, when can the Swedish regulatory authority expect a reply or comment from BEREC?

2. On what legal basis would BEREC take note of and/or act on this information?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2014)

There is no legal obligation for PTS to inform the Body of European Regulators for Electronic Communications (BEREC) of its interpretation of national law. The PTS Chair has however informally informed BEREC of the press release by PTS. BERES is aware of the letter of the Swedish Minister of Justice to Parliament clarifying that Swedish law still applies and will be assessed ([2]). However, there is no specific legal basis for BERED to take note of and/or act on this information.

([1]) https://www.pts.se/sv/Nyheter/Telefoni/2014/PTS-kommer-inte-i-nulaget-att-vidta-atgarder-utifran-datalagringsreglerna/
([2]) http://www.riksdagen.se/sv/Dokument-Lagar/Fragor-och-anmalningar/Svar-pa-skriftliga-fragor/EU-domstolens-ogiltigforklaran_H112561/

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005102/14
an die Kommission
Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE)
(17. April 2014)

Betrifft: Lärmbedingte Betriebsbeschränkungen an Flughäfen im Rahmen von TTIP

In der Plenarwoche April 2014 hat das Europäische Parlament den mit den EU-Verkehrsministern ausgehandelten Kompromiss zum Lärmschutz an Flughäfen bestätigt. Dieser sieht bei der Erlassung von Schutzmaßnahmen gegen Lärm einen sogenannten „ausgewogenen Ansatz“ vor. Darin wird eine Abstufung der Maßnahmen nach deren Wirtschaftlichkeit verlangt. Flugbeschränkungen — auch während der Nachtzeiten — dürfen dabei immer nur das letzte Mittel sein. Diese neue Regelung geht nicht zuletzt auf das massive Lobbying der Fluggesellschaften zurück — auch von der US-Regierung, denn amerikanische Airlines wären von strengeren Lärmschutzvorgaben besonders betroffen.

Die bisherigen Beobachtungen und Erfahrungen schüren deshalb die Sorge, dass im Rahmen der Verhandlungen zum Transatlantischen Freihandelsabkommen („Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership“ — „TTIP“) ein erneuter Versuch zur Aushebelung des Lärmschutzes droht.

1. Ist die Frage von lärmbedingten Betriebsbeschränkungen an Flughäfen Gegenstand der laufenden Verhandlungen zum Transatlantischen Freihandelsabkommen (TTIP)?

2. Kann die Kommission ausschließen, dass die Festlegung von Nachtflugverboten und anderen Betriebsbeschränkungen durch den Abschluss des TTIP beeinflusst wird?

Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(4. Juni 2014)

Die Frage lärmbedingter Betriebsbeschränkungen an Flughäfen war bislang nicht Gegenstand der Verhandlungen über die Transatlantische Handels- und Investitionspartnerschaft. Der Gemeinsame Ausschuss EU-USA, der durch das Luftverkehrsabkommen zwischen der EU und den USA ins Leben gerufen wurde, scheint das am besten geeignete Forum zu sein, um dieses Thema zusammen mit verbesserten Investitionsmöglichkeiten für europäische Luftfahrzeugbetreiber auf dem US-amerikanischen Markt für Luftverkehrsdienste zu erörtern.

In jedem Fall wird mit den vor kurzem angenommenen neuen Regeln für lärmbedingte Betriebsbeschränkungen die Zuständigkeit nationaler und lokaler Behörden für Entscheidungen über die Einführung lärmbedingter Betriebsbeschränkungen gewahrt. Die Verhandlungen über die Transatlantische Handels- und Investitionspartnerschaft werden diese Zuständigkeit nicht berühren.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005102/14
to the Commission
Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Noise-related operating restrictions at airports in the context of the TTIP

In the April 2014 plenary part-session, the European Parliament confirmed the compromise relating to noise protection at airports that had been negotiated with the EU transport ministers. This compromise provides for a so-called 'Balanced Approach' when adopting noise-protection measures, and requires the measures to be categorised in accordance with their economic efficiency. For those purposes, restrictions on flights — including night flights — may only ever be imposed as a last resort. This new rule is attributable in no small part to the massive lobbying operation carried out by the airlines and by the US government, given that American airlines would be particularly affected by stricter rules on noise protection.

In light of previous observations and experience, there is therefore a concern that the negotiations relating to the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership ('TTIP') harbour a new risk that noise protection will be undermined.

1. Is the question of noise-related operating restrictions at airports a subject of the on-going negotiations relating to the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP)?

2. Can the Commission exclude the possibility that the ability to impose bans on night flights and other operating restrictions will be affected by the TTIP?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(4 June 2014)

The question of noise-related operating restrictions at airports has, at this stage, not been a subject of the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership negotiations. The EU-US Joint Committee, created by the EU-US Air Services Agreement, appears to be the most appropriate forum to discuss this topic,together with improved investment opportunities for European aircraft operators in the US air services market.

In any case, the recently adopted new rules on noise-related operating restrictions preserve the competence of national and local authorities to decide on the introduction of noise-related operating restrictions. The Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership negotiations will not affect this competence.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005103/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(17 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Παραβίαση της Οδηγίας 2008/98 από τις δημοπρατήσεις των έργων διαχείρισης απορριμμάτων

Στην Ελλάδα δημοπρατούνται, μέσω ΣΔΙΤ, μεγάλα έργα διαχείρισης απορριμμάτων, σε επίπεδο περιφερειών (Δυτ. Μακεδονίας, Πελοποννήσου, Αττικής) ή νομών (Σερρών, Αχαΐας, Ηλείας, Αιτωλοακαρνανίας). Από τα στοιχεία που δίνονται στη δημοσιότητα προκύπτουν:

— σχεδιαζόμενες μονάδες σκόπιμα υπεραυξημένης δυναμικότητας σε σχέση με τον παραγόμενο όγκο απορριμμάτων,

— δημιουργία φαραωνικών κεντρικών εγκαταστάσεων με στόχο την επεξεργασία σύμμεικτων απορριμμάτων σε ποσοστό που ξεκινά από το 80% και σε κάποιες περιπτώσεις αγγίζει έως και το 98% του όγκου των απορριμμάτων,

— δέσμευση για εγγυημένες ποσότητες, προς επεξεργασία, σύμμεικτων απορριμμάτων, με συμβάσεις 25-30 ετών,

— υπερβολική αύξηση του κόστους επεξεργασίας προς όφελος ιδιωτικών εταιρειών, η οποία ουσιαστικά θα επιβαρύνει τους πολίτες,

— διευρυμένη περιβαλλοντική υποβάθμιση,

— εξάντληση της φέρουσας ικανότητας ήδη επιβαρυμένων περιοχών (ΧΥΤΑ ΦΥΛΗΣ).

Αποτελεί παραβίαση της Οδηγίας 2008/98/ΕΚ:

1. Η σχεδιαζόμενη διαχείριση, αποκλειστικά, σύμμεικτων απορριμμάτων που ακυρώνει το στόχο της χωριστής συλλογής-επαναχρησιμοποίησης και ανακύκλωσης χαρτιού, γυαλιού, μετάλλων και πλαστικών κατά 50% έως το 2020;

2. Η δέσμευση για 25-30 έτη, εγγυημένων ποσοτήτων σύμμεικτων απορριμμάτων για τις μονάδες επεξεργασίας, που έχει σαν αποτέλεσμα την αποτροπή της πρόληψης και της προοπτικής μείωσης του όγκου σύμμεικτων απορριμμάτων, καθώς και την υπονόμευση της διαλογής στην πηγή, της κομποστοποίησης και της επαναχρησιμοποίησης υλικών;

3. Η υπερδιαστασιολόγηση των μονάδων επεξεργασίας σύμμεικτων απορριμμάτων και, κατά συνέπεια, η κατασπατάληση δημόσιων και κοινοτικών πόρων;

Απάντηση του κ. Potočnik εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(5 Ιουνίου 2014)

Με βάση τα στοιχεία που προσκόμισε ο κ. βουλευτής, η Επιτροπή δεν διαπιστώνει παραβίαση της οδηγίας 2008/98/ΕΚ για τα απόβλητα ([1]).

Η επιλογή των υποδομών διαχείρισης αποβλήτων και του χρηματοδοτικού καθεστώτος στήριξης βαρύνει το οικείο κράτος μέλος, υπό την προϋπόθεση ότι πληρούνται οι απαιτήσεις του δικαίου της ΕΕ. Η εν λόγω επιλογή περιλαμβάνει τη χωριστή συλλογή αποβλήτων και την ανάκτηση και ανακύκλωση οικιακών απορριμμάτων με την επίτευξη του στόχου ανακύκλωσης του 50%, έως το 2020. Η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί εκ του σύνεγγυς την κατάσταση στην Ελλάδα, καθώς και την κατάρτιση του μελλοντικού εθνικού σχεδίου διαχείρισης αποβλήτων για την περίοδο 2014-2020, ούτως ώστε να διασφαλίσει ότι οι εν λόγω απαιτήσεις τηρούνται δεόντως. Η Επιτροπή πρότεινε στις αρμόδιες αρχές το 2013 ένα χάρτη πορείας που περιελάμβανε έναν κατάλογο με συστάσεις ([2]).

([1]) ΕΕ L 312 της 22.11.2008.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/framework/support_implementation.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005103/14
to the Commission
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Infringement of Directive 2008/98/EC by tenders for waste management works

In Greece, major waste management works are put out to tender through PPP either by region (West Macedonia, Peloponnese, Attica) or by prefecture (Serres, Achaia, Ileia, Aitoloakarnania). According to reports in the media, it would appear that:

— planned units are deliberately oversized compared to the volume of waste produced;

— colossal central installations are created for the purpose of processing mixed waste in proportions that range from 80% to close to 98% in some cases of the volume of waste;

— 25-30 year contracts are granted, with guaranteed volumes of mixed waste for processing;

— processing costs are massively inflated for the benefit of private companies and to the detriment of citizens;

— there is extensive environmental degradation;

— the load-bearing capacity of already highly polluted areas is being exhausted (Fili landfill).

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

Do the following infringe Directive 2008/98/EC?

1. The planned management of exclusively mixed waste, which compromises the objective of separate collection, recovery and recycling of 50% of paper, glass, metal and plastic by the year 2020?

2. The 25-30 year contracts with guaranteed volumes of mixed waste for processing units, which act as a disincentive to prevention and the prospect of reducing the volume of mixed waste produced and undermine sorting at source, composting and recovery of materials?

3. The oversizing of processing units for mixed waste and, by extension, the waste of public and community resources?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2014)

On the basis of the elements provided by the Honourable Member, the Commission cannot detect any infringement of Directive 2008/98/EC on waste ([1]).

The choice of the waste management infrastructure and the supporting financial scheme lies with the Member State concerned provided that the requirements of EC law are met. This includes separate collection of waste and the recovery and recycling of household waste, with a 50% recycling target to be met by 2020. The Commission is closely following the situation in Greece as well as the preparation of the future national waste management plan 2014-2020 in order to ensure that such requirements are duly observed. A roadmap including a list of recommendations was proposed by the Commission to the competent authorities in 2013 ([2]).

([1]) OJ L 312 of 22.11.2008.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/framework/support_implementation.htm

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005104/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(17 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Η άδεια λειτουργίας των εργοστασίων εμπλουτισμού και αποθήκευσης της Hellas Gold σε Ολυμπιάδα και Στρατώνι παραβιάζει την Οδηγία «SEVESO II»

Στις 19/12/2012 εγκρίθηκε από το ΥΠΕΚΑ, «άδεια λειτουργίας του εργοστασίου εμπλουτισμού μικτών θειούχων μεταλλευμάτων στην περιοχή της Ολυμπιάδας». Αντίστοιχη έγκριση δόθηκε για τη λειτουργία των εγκαταστάσεων εμπλουτισμού και αποθήκευσης του Στρατωνίου. Τα παραγόμενα και αποθηκευόμενα υλικά είναι αποδεδειγμένα τοξικά και επικίνδυνα, ταξινομούνται με βάση τον κανονισμό της (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1272/2008 (CLP) και υπάγονται στην κατηγορία «πολύ τοξικά» και «τοξικά» του άρθρου 20, Παράρτημα I, Μέρος 2, της Οδηγίας «SEVESO II». Τα παραγόμενα και αποθηκευόμενα υλικά εμπλουτισμού της Ολυμπιάδας (πυρίτες) υπάγονται επιπλέον στην κατηγορία «εύφλεκτα» του άρθρου 20, Παράρτημα I, Μέρος 2, της Οδηγίας «SEVESO II» αφού ταξινομούνται σαν «αυταναφλέξιμα» σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 87 παρ. 3 του Κώδικα Μεταλλευτικών & Λατομικών Εργασιών. Είναι πρώτη ύλη τροφοδοσίας (καύσιμο, 40% περιεκτικότητα σε θείο) καμίνων παραγωγής διοξειδίου του θείου και, από αυτό, θειικού οξέος. Οι ποσότητες αποθήκευσης υπερβαίνουν κατά πολύ τα όρια που αναφέρονται στο άρθρο 20, Παράρτημα I, Μέρος 2, της Οδηγίας «SEVESO II», και μάλιστα υπόκεινται στην στήλη 2 (άρθρο 8) που απαιτεί εφαρμογή πλήρων μέτρων ασφαλείας.

Παρόλ' αυτά, στις άδειες λειτουργίας τα συμπυκνώματα δεν χαρακτηρίζονται ως «τοξικά και επικίνδυνα» και δεν προβλέπονται ειδικά μέτρα υγιεινής και ασφάλειας των εργαζομένων και των περιοίκων και προστασίας του περιβάλλοντος όπως προβλέπει η Οδηγία «SEVESO II». Ο δε χειρισμός των συμπυκνωμάτων γίνεται χύδην σαν να ήταν αδρανή (άμμος ή χαλίκι) και αποθηκεύονται σε πρόχειρα εκτεθειμένα στέγαστρα. Επιπλέον, η χωροθέτηση των εργοστασίων εμπλουτισμού έχει γίνει χωρίς να ληφθεί υπόψη το άρθρο 12 της Οδηγίας «SEVESO II» όσον αφορά στις αποστάσεις ασφαλείας από οικισμούς, οδικό δίκτυο, χώρους αναψυχής, με αποτέλεσμα οι εγκαταστάσεις να λειτουργούν σαν εν δυνάμει τοξικές «βόμβες» για την ευρύτερη περιοχή.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Παραβιάζει η άδεια λειτουργίας των εργοστασίων εμπλουτισμού και αποθήκευσης της Hellas Gold σε Ολυμπιάδα και Στρατώνι την Οδηγία «SEVESO II»; Είναι υποχρεωμένη η ελληνική διοίκηση να ανακαλέσει την άδεια λειτουργίας και να εφαρμόσει τις διατάξεις της ανωτέρω οδηγίας;

Απάντηση του κ. Potočnik εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(18 Ιουνίου 2014)

Οι εγκαταστάσεις που καλύπτονται από την οδηγία Seveso II ([1]) υπόκεινται σε μια σειρά διατάξεων, ανάλογα με το είδος των εκάστοτε χημικών ουσιών και των ποσοτήτων. Στις διατάξεις αυτές περιλαμβάνονται μέτρα για την πρόληψη ατυχημάτων, συμπεριλαμβανομένων μέτρων για τον σχεδιασμό της χρήσης γης και την εξασφάλιση της ετοιμότητας για ατυχήματα, όπως είναι τα συστήματα διαχείρισης της ασφάλειας και τα σχέδια έκτακτης ανάγκης.

Ενδέχεται, ωστόσο, οι δραστηριότητες εμπλουτισμού και αποθήκευσης της εταιρείας «Ελληνικός Χρυσός» να μην εμπίπτουν στο πεδίο εφαρμογής της οδηγίας, αφού το άρθρο 4 στοιχείο ε) εξαιρεί ορισμένες δραστηριότητες που αφορούν την εκμετάλλευση ορυκτών, με εξαίρεση εργασίες χημικής και θερμικής επεξεργασίας και αποθήκευσης που σχετίζονται με τις εργασίες αυτές, στις οποίες υπεισέρχονται οι επικίνδυνες ουσίες. Χρειάζονται περισσότερες πληροφορίες για να εκτιμηθεί κατά πόσον ισχύει η εξαίρεση.

Επειδή η οδηγία Seveso δεν περιλαμβάνει σύστημα αδειοδότησης, η Επιτροπή δεν μπορεί να κρίνει κατά πόσον κάποια άδεια που εκδίδεται στο πλαίσιο του ελληνικού συστήματος είναι νόμιμη. Τα κράτη μέλη είναι ελεύθερα να αποφασίζουν τον κατάλληλο τρόπο συμμόρφωσης με τις απαιτήσεις της οδηγίας και οι εθνικές αρμόδιες αρχές είναι υπεύθυνες για την ορθή εφαρμογή της οδηγίας σε όλες τις εγκαταστάσεις που εμπίπτουν στο πεδίο εφαρμογής της.

Εάν κατατεθούν στην Επιτροπή στοιχεία που να αποδεικνύουν ότι οι εν λόγω δραστηριότητες, εφόσον καλύπτονται από την οδηγία Seveso II, ασκούνται κατά παράβαση της νομοθεσίας της ΕΕ, θα λάβει όλα τα αναγκαία μέτρα για την αντιμετώπιση της κατάστασης.

([1]) ΕΕ L 10 της 14.1.1997, σ. 13 — Οδηγία 96/82/ΕΚ του Συμβουλίου, της 9ης Δεκεμβρίου 1996, για την αντιμετώπιση των κινδύνων μεγάλων ατυχημάτων σχετιζόμενων με επικίνδυνες ουσίες.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005104/14
to the Commission
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Operating licence of Hellas Gold enrichment and storage facility in Olympiada and Stratoni in breach of SEVESO II Directive

On 19 December 2012, the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change approved an operating licence for a facility to enrich mixed ore sulphides in Olympiada. A similar operating licence was also granted for an enrichment and storage facility in Stratoni. The materials produced and stored are demonstrably toxic and hazardous, and are classified under Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008 (CLP Regulation) as 'very toxic' and 'toxic' in accordance with Article 20, Annex I, Part 2 of the Seveso II Directive. The materials that are produced and stored in Olympiada (silica) are also classed as 'flammable' under Article 20, Annex I, Part 2 of the Seveso II Directive and as 'self-combusting' under Article 87(3) of the Mining Code. This is raw material (fuel, 40% sulphur content) used to fire furnaces that produce the sulphur dioxide used to produce sulphuric acid. The quantities stored vastly exceed the limits stipulated in Article 20, Annex I, Part 2 of the Seveso II Directive and fall under column 2 (Article 8), which stipulates that comprehensive safety measures need to be taken.

Despite this, the operating licences do not class the condensates as 'toxic and hazardous' and no special health and safety measures for employees and nearby residents or environmental protection measures have been taken in accordance with the Seveso II Directive. The condensates are handled in bulk as if they were inert (sand or gravel) and are stored in makeshift, exposed hangars. Moreover, planning permission for the enrichment factory was granted without due regard for Article 12 of the Seveso II Directive in terms of safety distances from residential areas, road networks and recreational areas, meaning that the installations act as potential toxic 'bombs' which are endangering the greater area.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

Is the operating licence granted to the Hellas Gold enrichment and storage facilities in Olympiada and Stratoni in breach of the Seveso II Directive? Is the Greek Government obliged to revoke the operating licence in application of the provisions of the aforementioned Directive?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(18 June 2014)

Establishments covered by Seveso II ([1]) are subject to a range of provisions depending on the type of chemicals and quantities concerned. These include measures to prevent accidents, including in relation to land-use planning, and to ensure preparedness for accidents such as safety management systems and emergency plans.

It is possible, however, that the activities of the Hellas Gold enrichment and storage facility do not fall within the scope of the directive, as Article 4(e) excludes certain activities in relation to the exploitation of minerals, with the exception of chemical and thermal processing operations and storage related to those operations which involve dangerous substances. More information would be required to evaluate whether the exception applies.

As the Seveso Directive does not include a licensing system, the Commission cannot judge whether or not a permit issued under a Greek system is legal. Member States are free to decide on the suitable means to ensure compliance with the requirements of the directive and it would be for the national competent authorities to ensure that the directive is applied correctly to all establishments falling under its scope.

Should the Commission receive evidence that the activities in question, if covered by the Seveso II Directive, are carried out in violation of EU legislation, it will take all necessary measures to redress the situation.

([1]) OJ L 10, 14.1.1997, p. 13 — Council Directive 96/82/EC of 9.12.1996 on the control of major-accident hazards involving dangerous substances.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005105/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(17 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Οικονομική ενίσχυση των κατοίκων της Κεφαλονιάς

Έχουν περάσει σχεδόν τέσσερεις μήνες από τον σεισμό των 5,9 βαθμών της κλίμακας Ρίχτερ που συγκλόνισε την Κεφαλονιά και οι κάτοικοι του νησιού εξακολουθούν να βρίσκονται αντιμέτωποι με τις καταστροφικές συνέπειές του. Τουλάχιστον πεντακόσιοι εξ αυτών παραμένουν άστεγοι, οι ζημιές που υπέστησαν δεκάδες σπίτια δεν έχουν αποκατασταθεί, ενώ παραμένουν σοβαρά προβλήματα στο οδικό δίκτυο και τα λιμάνια, ειδικά στο νότιο μέρος του νησιού. Σοβαρά προβλήματα εξακολουθεί να αντιμετωπίζει και το αρχαιολογικό μουσείο της Κεφαλονιάς, ενώ σε λίγες ημέρες αρχίζει η τουριστική περίοδος. Η ελληνική κυβέρνηση έχει αφήσει ουσιαστικά αβοήθητους τους κατοίκους του νησιού. Υπέβαλε, ωστόσο, αίτημα προς το ταμείο αλληλεγγύης της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης για οικονομική ενίσχυση των πληγέντων το οποίο ακόμα δεν έχει απαντηθεί.

Ερωτάται η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή:

Πότε αναμένεται να απαντηθεί το αίτημα για οικονομική ενίσχυση του νησιού;

Σε ποιες άλλες ενέργειες ενίσχυσης των κατοίκων της Κεφαλονιάς μπορεί να προβεί, δεδομένου ότι η περιοχή έχει κηρυχθεί σεισμόπληκτη;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(13 Ιουνίου 2014)

Η Επιτροπή έλαβε την αίτηση της Ελλάδας για βοήθεια από το Ταμείο Αλληλεγγύης της ΕΕ στις 28 Μαρτίου 2014. Μόλις η Επιτροπή ολοκληρώσει την αξιολόγηση της αίτησης και εάν πληρούνται τα κριτήρια για τις περιφερειακές καταστροφές, θα ζητήσει την έγκριση της προτεινόμενης ενίσχυσης από το Συμβούλιο και το Κοινοβούλιο. Η εν λόγω διαδικασία μπορεί να διαρκέσει μερικούς μήνες.

Η χρηματοδοτική συνδρομή από το Ταμείο μπορεί να χρησιμοποιηθεί μόνο για ενέργειες έκτακτης ανάγκης, όπως ορίζεται στον κανονισμό. Οι ζημιές σε ιδιωτικές περιουσίες δεν μπορούν να καλυφθούν από το Ταμείο.

Επιπλέον, υποβλήθηκε μια αίτηση χρηματοδότησης (στο πλαίσιο των διαρθρωτικών ταμείων) για την αποκατάσταση του δικτύου ύδρευσης στο Ληξούρι από τη ΔΕΥΑ Κεφαλονιάς στην ενδιάμεση διαχειριστική αρχή των Ιονίων Νήσων (αρμόδια αρχή για την επιλογή των σχεδίων και τη διαχείριση του περιφερειακού προγράμματος) με προϋπολογισμό ύψους 2 530 000 ευρώ. Η ενδιάμεση διαχειριστική αρχή των Ιονίων Νήσων αξιολόγησε αμέσως την εν λόγω αίτηση και το σχέδιο βρίσκεται αυτή τη στιγμή στο στάδιο εφαρμογής.

Τέλος, όσον αφορά τα άμεσα μέτρα πολιτικής προστασίας μετά την καταστροφή, ο ενωσιακός μηχανισμός πολιτικής προστασίας μπορεί να παράσχει βοήθεια σε είδος κατόπιν αιτήματος οποιουδήποτε κράτους μέλους. Η Ελλάδα δεν έχει ζητήσει βοήθεια από τον εν λόγω μηχανισμό για τον σεισμό στην Κεφαλονιά.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005105/14
to the Commission
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Financial aid granted to residents of Kefalonia

Almost four months have passed since an earthquake measuring 5.9 on the Richter scale shook Kefalonia and the island's residents are still suffering its devastating consequences. At least five hundred people are homeless, the damage sustained by dozens of houses has yet to be repaired and there are still major problems with the road networks and ports, especially on the south of the island. The archaeological museum of Kefalonia is still experiencing serious issues and the tourism season is set to begin in a few days. The Greek Government has basically left the island's residents to fend for themselves. However, it has filed an application for financial aid for victims with the EU Solidarity Fund which has yet to be addressed.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

When can the application for financial aid for the island expect to be addressed?

What other measures to support the residents of Kefalonia have been taken, given that the area has been declared an earthquake disaster zone?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(13 June 2014)

The Commission received the application for EU Solidarity Fund assistance by Greece on 28 March 2014. Once the Commission completes its assessment of the application and if the criteria for a regional disaster are met, it will ask for the approval of the proposed aid from the Council and the Parliament. This procedure could take a few months.

Financial assistance from the Fund may only be used for essential emergency operations as set out in the regulation. Any private damage cannot be compensated from the Fund.

In addition, an application for financing (under the Structural Funds) to repair the water supply net-work in Lixouri was submitted by the DEYA of Kefalonia to the intermediary managing authority of Ionian Islands (competent authority for the selection of projects and management of the regional programme) for a budget of EUR 2 530 000. The intermediary managing authority of Ionian Islands immediately assessed this application and the project is currently under implementation.

Finally, as regards immediate post-disaster civil protection measures, the Union Civil Protection Mechanism may provide in-kind assistance upon a request of any Member State. Greece has not requested assistance from this Mechanism for the earthquake in Kefalonia.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005106/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(17 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Η άδεια λειτουργίας καζίνο στο Ελληνικό συνιστά παράνομη κρατική ενίσχυση στη Lamda Development

Σύμφωνα με δημοσιεύματα του Τύπου, πρόσφατα η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή ζήτησε από την ελληνική κυβέρνηση εξηγήσεις για την ιδιωτικοποίηση του ΟΠΑΠ σχετικά με την παροχή, στη νέα ιδιωτικοποιημένη εταιρεία, παράνομης κρατικής ενίσχυσης μέσω της νομοθέτησης μονοπωλίου για το διαδικτυακό στοίχημα. Από την άλλη μεριά, οι ίδιες πληροφορίες αναφέρουν ότι στη σύμβαση πώλησης του 33% του ΟΠΑΠ, προβλέπεται ότι, στην περίπτωση που δεν αποδοθεί το αποκλειστικό δικαίωμα στο διαδικτυακό στοίχημα, το ελληνικό Δημόσιο είναι υποχρεωμένο να επιστρέψει στην Emma Delta 60 εκατ. ευρώ, από τα 632 εκατ. που έχει (έως σήμερα) καταβάλει. Ωστόσο, μια τέτοια καταβολή μπορεί να θεωρηθεί παράνομη κρατική ενίσχυση.

Παρόμοια κατάσταση έχει δημιουργηθεί με την ιδιωτικοποίηση της περιοχής του πρώην αεροδρομίου του Ελληνικού και του Αγίου Κοσμά. Σε απάντηση σχετικού ερωτήματος της Επιτροπής Κεφαλαιαγοράς, στις 9 Απριλίου η Lamda Development ανέφερε ότι η χορήγηση από το ελληνικό Δημόσιο άδειας λειτουργίας καζίνο στο ακίνητο που θα ανήκει στη Lamda Development είναι προϋπόθεση για την ολοκλήρωση της συμφωνίας με το ΤΑΙΠΕΔ. Το ελληνικό Δημόσιο, όταν προκηρύσσει άδειες λειτουργίας καζίνο, καθορίζει τις περιοχές της χώρας στις οποίες θα λειτουργήσει καζίνο. Στην προκείμενη περίπτωση, το ελληνικό Δημόσιο δεσμεύεται στο πλαίσιο σύμβασης με ιδιώτη ότι θα προκηρύξει άδεια καζίνο μόνο στα όρια του οικοπέδου του συγκεκριμένου ιδιώτη.

Με βάση τα ανωτέρω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Συνιστά παράνομη κρατική ενίσχυση στη Lamda Development η παραχώρηση άδειας λειτουργίας καζίνο στο συγκεκριμένο ακίνητο;

Συνιστά παραβίαση της ευρωπαϊκής νομοθεσίας για τις δημόσιες συμβάσεις, δεδομένου ότι η προκήρυξη αφορά ένα συγκεκριμένο οικόπεδο που θα ανήκει σε ιδιώτη και όχι μία περιοχή της χώρας και περιορίζει, ως εκ τούτου, έμμεσα τον αριθμό των συμμετεχόντων στον διαγωνισμό;

Απάντηση του κ. Almunia εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(2 Ιουλίου 2014)

Η Επιτροπή δίνει ιδιαίτερη προσοχή στα δημοσιεύματα βάσει των οποίων συγκεκριμένη συμφωνία μεταξύ της εταιρείας Lamda Development και του Ταμείου Αξιοποίησης Ιδιωτικής Περιουσίας του Δημοσίου (ΤΑΙΠΕΔ) τελεί υπό την επιφύλαξη ότι το ελληνικό κράτος θα χορηγήσει άδεια λειτουργίας καζίνου σε εκτάσεις που θα ανήκουν στην εταιρεία Lamda Development.

Η εν λόγω συμφωνία δεν είχε προηγουμένως τεθεί σε γνώση των υπηρεσιών της Επιτροπής, οι οποίες, στο παρόν στάδιο, δεν διαθέτουν επαρκείς πληροφορίες για να εκτιμήσουν κατά πόσο αυτή θα μπορούσε να συνιστά κρατική ενίσχυση προς την εταιρεία Lamda Development.

Απαιτείται, ως εκ τούτου, περαιτέρω διερεύνηση του θέματος.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005106/14
to the Commission
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Operating licence granted for casino in Helliniko is illegal state aid to Lamda Development

According to press reports, the European Commission recently asked the Greek Government for an explanation with regard to the privatisation of OPAP, in connection unlawful state aid granted to the newly privatised company in the form of a monopoly on online gambling. On the other hand, the same reports claim that the sales contract for 33% of OPAP states that, in the event that exclusive rights are not granted for online gambling, the Greek Government is obliged to reimburse Emma Delta EUR 60 million of the EUR 632 million it has invested (to date). However, this type of payment might be construed as illegal state aid.

A similar situation has arisen following the privatisation of the site of the former airport in Helliniko and Agios Kosmas. In response to a question raised by the Capital Market Commission on 9 April, Lamda Development stated completion of the agreement with the Hellenic Republic Asset Development Fund (HRADF) depends on an operating licence being granted by the Greek State for a casino on land that will belong to Lamda Development. When the Greek State issues a notice for a casino operating licence, it specifies the areas of the country in which the casino will operate. In this case, the Greek State is bound under the contract with a private entity to issue a notice for a casino operating licence within the borders of the plot owned by said private entity.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

Does the licence granted to Lamda Development to operate a casino on this specific property constitute unlawful state aid?

Does it infringe European legislation governing public contracts, given that the notice concerns a specific plot that will belong to a private entity, as opposed to an area of the country, and therefore indirectly limits the number of bidders in the tender?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(2 July 2014)

The Commission takes note of the reports that an agreement between Lamda Development with the Hellenic Republic Asset Development Fund (HRADF) depends on an operating licence being granted by the Greek State for a casino on land that will belong to Lamda Development.

The Commission services have not been previously informed of this agreement and do not have at this stage enough information, to assess whether it could involve state aid to Lamda Development.

Further investigation of the matter will therefore be necessary.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005107/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(17 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: «Κουρεύει» αιφνιδιαστικά η ελληνική κυβέρνηση τις εγγυημένες τιμές στα οικιακά φωτοβολταϊκά

Το ελληνικό Κοινοβούλιο πρόσφατα ψήφισε νόμο ο οποίος μειώνει τις εγγυημένες τιμές στα οικιακά και αγροτικά φωτοβολταϊκά σε ποσοστά που αγγίζουν πρακτικά μέχρι και το 40%, στο όνομα της μείωσης του ελλείμματος του Λειτουργού Αγοράς Ηλεκτρικής Ενέργειας (ΛΑΓΗΕ). Με τον τρόπο αυτό τροποποιεί μονομερώς και προς το δυσμενέστερο τους όρους υφιστάμενων συμβάσεων με τους παραγωγούς ενέργειας. Δημιουργείται ένα αρνητικό κλίμα σε σχέση με τη διείσδυση των ΑΠΕ, στοχοποιώντας ειδικότερα την αποκεντρωμένη ηλεκτροπαραγωγή.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Είναι σύμφωνη με το ευρωπαϊκό δίκαιο νομοθετική παρέμβαση που τροποποιεί μονομερώς προς το δυσμενέστερο υφιστάμενες συμβάσεις με τους μικρούς παραγωγούς ενέργειας;

Η συγκεκριμένη πολιτική επιλογή δεν αντιτίθεται στην επίτευξη των στόχων για τη διείσδυση των ΑΠΕ που θέτουν οι ευρωπαϊκές πολιτικές για το κλίμα, εφόσον αποθαρρύνει ουσιαστικά τους μικρούς αποκεντρωμένους παραγωγούς;

Απάντηση του κ. Oettinger εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(4 Ιουνίου 2014)

Μέχρι στιγμής, η Επιτροπή δεν έχει διαπιστώσει την αντίθεση των μέτρων που αναφέρει ο κ. βουλευτής με τη νομοθεσία της ΕΕ. Ωστόσο, η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή έχει εκφράσει δημοσίως και επανειλημμένως πολιτικούς προβληματισμούς σχετικά με εθνικά μέτρα που μεταβάλουν αναδρομικά τις οικονομικές συνθήκες υφισταμένων επενδύσεων σε ανανεώσιμες πηγές ενέργειας, δεδομένου ότι απειλούν να υπονομεύσουν την εμπιστοσύνη των επενδυτών πέρα από το χρονικό διάστημα του ίδιου του μέτρου και ενέχουν τον κίνδυνο να υπονομευθεί η μελλοντική αξιοποίηση των ανανεώσιμων πηγών ενέργειας.

Με βάση την αρχή της επικουρικότητας, η Ελληνική Κυβέρνηση είναι υπεύθυνη για την εξεύρεση του πλέον κατάλληλου τρόπου επίτευξης των δεσμεύσεων που έχει αναλάβει δυνάμει του μνημονίου συνεννόησης, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των τρόπων εξάλειψης του ελλείμματος του ελληνικού Ταμείου για τις ανανεώσιμες πηγές ενέργειας, έως το τέλος του 2014.

Σύμφωνα με τα τελευταία στοιχεία της Eurostat ([1]), το μερίδιο των ανανεώσιμων πηγών ενέργειας στην Ελλάδα ήταν 15,1% το 2012, ποσοστό που υπερβαίνει την ενδεικτική πορεία που ορίζεται στην οδηγία (9,1% για την περίοδο 2011-2012). Ως εκ τούτου, η Ελλάδα θα πρέπει να διασφαλίσει ότι η πορεία αυτή διατηρείται μέσω ενός σταθερού και υποστηρικτικού εθνικού ρυθμιστικού πλαισίου για την επίτευξη του εθνικού στόχου ανανεώσιμης ενέργειας 18% έως το 2020.

([1]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/energy/other_documents

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005107/14
to the Commission
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Unexpected Greek Government cuts to guaranteed prices for domestic photovoltaic systems

The Greek Government recently passed a law reducing the guaranteed prices for domestic and agricultural photovoltaic systems to rates close to 40%, apparently in order to reduce the deficit of the Operator of Electricity Market (LAGIE). It has thus unilaterally changed the terms of existing contracts with energy producers for the worse. This is putting the penetration of RES at risk by targeting decentralised power production.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

Is a legislative intervention unilaterally amending existing contracts with small energy producers for the worse compatible with Union law?

Does this particular political choice conflict with the objective laid down in European policies of increasing the penetration of RES, by basically discouraging small decentralised producers?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(4 June 2014)

So far the Commission has not found the measures mentioned by the Honourable Member to be legally in breach the EU legislation. However, the European Commission has publicly and repeatedly expressed political concerns over any national measures that retroactively change the economic conditions of existing renewable energy investments, as they threaten to undermine investor confidence well beyond the time-span of the measure itself and risk undermining future renewable energy deployment.

Following the subsidiarity principle, the Greek Government is responsible for identifying the most appropriate way to achieve its commitments under the memorandum of understanding, including on how to eliminate the deficit of the Greek renewable energy fund by the end of 2014.

According to the latest Eurostat figures ([1]), in 2012 the share of renewable energy was 13.83%, above the indicative trajectory set out in the directive (9.1% for 2011-2012). Greece should therefore ensure that this trajectory is maintained through a stable and supportive national regulatory framework in order to reach its national renewable energy target of 18% by 2020.

([1]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/energy/other_documents

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005108/14
to the Commission
Roberta Metsola (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Euromed process

The Union for the Mediterranean was set up to promote economic integration and democratic reform across 16 neighbouring countries to the EU's south in North Africa and the Middle East. Can the Commission provide information on its future plans for the Euromed process?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(13 June 2014)

The EU will continue to support activities of the Union for the Mediterranean.

The organisation was given a strong impetus since in 2012 the EU took over the function of the UfM Co-Presidency (together with Jordan). The Commission intends to further support the UfM, both politically, as well as financially during the next programming period (2014-2020) under the European Neighbourhood Instrument. Support will be provided both to the Secretariat of the UfM (together with support provided by Member States) and to selected projects labelled by the UfM.

The UfM serves as an important and a unique forum, grouping together all Mediterranean and all EU countries. It is essential in debating political and economic problems of the region, supporting dialogue with civil society and local authorities as well as a catalyst for new regional projects.

With the revival of thematic Ministerial meetings (5 were organised since 2013 on topics such as: Women, Transport, Energy, Industry and Environment) the UfM entered a dynamic phase and the UE will work towards maintaining this momentum. The Commission will fully engage in upcoming Ministerial Meetings.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-005111/14
till kommissionen
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(17 april 2014)

Angående: Dataskydd, den digitala industrin och Google Analytics inom EU-institutionernas webbadministration

EU har antagit strategier för att uppmuntra till marknadspenetration inom Europas digitala industri. En överväldigande majoritet av EU-institutionernas webbplatser använder Google Analytics. Förespråkar parlamentet, kommissionen och EU-organen, mot bakgrund av detta och det ovannämnda, kommunikationsstrategier som stöder EU-företag eller uppmuntrar till användning av lösningar med öppen källkod?

Hur motiverar kommissionen och EU-organen sin fortsatta användning av Google Analytics, med tanke på den utredning som gjorts av artikel 29-arbetsgruppen under ledning av CNIL (*Commission nationale de l'informatique et des libertés*) och de senare utredningar som gjorts och böter som utdömts av flera olika europeiska datatillsynsmyndigheter, bland annat böter på grund av att data hanterats genom Google Analytics?

Svar från Viviane Reding på kommissionens vägnar
(19 juni 2014)

Europeiska kommissionens generaldirektorat med ansvar för kommunikation främjar inte användningen av Google Analytics för EU-institutionernas webbplatser (europa.eu.). Kommissionen har inte inkluderat Google Analytics på sin förteckning över rekommenderade IT-produkter som är tillgängliga för kommissionens avdelningar. För information om situationen i de övriga institutionerna bör dessa kontaktas direkt.

För sin kommunikationsstrategi använder kommissionen den lämpligaste kombinationen av kommunikationskanaler och verktyg för att nå fram till målgrupperna på deras egna språk. Dessutom strävar kommissionen efter att göra kommunikationen mer enhetlig, relevant och kostnadseffektiv. I sin upphandling av kommunikationstjänster och verktyg är kommissionen bunden av principerna och bestämmelserna i budgetförordningen (nr 966/2012) och väljer lösningar i enlighet med detta. I detta sammanhang har kommissionen åtagit sig att främja öppen källkod ([1]).

([1]) Se http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/informatics/oss_tech/index_en.htm och https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005111/14
to the Commission
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Data protection, digital industries and Google Analytics in EU institutional web management

The EU has adopted policies to encourage uptake in Europe's digital industries. In light of this and given the fact that the vast majority of the EU institutions' websites use Google Analytics, do Parliament, the Commission and the EU agencies advocate communication policies in support of EU companies or which encourage the use of open-source solutions?

Taking into account the investigation by the article 29 Working Party, led by the CNIL (Commission nationale de l'informatique et des libertés), and the subsequent investigations and fines imposed by several European data protection authorities, including penalties for the handling of data through Google Analytics, how do the Commission and the EU agencies continue to justify their use of Google Analytics?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2014)

The European Commission's Directorate-General responsible for communication does not promote the use of Google Analytics for the Europa sites. More generally, the Commission has not included Google Analytics on its list of recommended IT products made available to Commission services. For information on the situation in the other institutions, these should be contacted directly.

Regarding the implementation of its communication policies, the Commission uses the most suitable mix of communication channels and tools to make sure that it reaches its audiences in the languages they understand. Furthermore, the Commission strives to render its communication more coherent, relevant and cost-effective. In its procurement of communication services and tools, the Commission is bound by the principles and rules of Financial Regulation no 966/2012 and chooses solutions fit for purpose accordingly. Within the context described herewith, the Commission is committed to promoting the use of open source ([1]).

([1]) Please refer to our publication on. http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/informatics/oss_tech/index_en.htm and https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-005112/14
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(17 avril 2014)

Objet: Décision de justice remise en cause par le Parlement

La vice-présidente de la Commission européenne n'a pas caché son courroux hier, réagissant à la condamnation d'Uber, une société américaine proposant une application de covoiturage. La vice-présidente de la Commission s'est dite outrée de la décision prise par le tribunal de commerce.

Les Taxis Verts, qui avaient attaqué Uber en justice, ont gagné la première manche judiciaire. En effet, la semaine dernière, le tribunal de commerce de Bruxelles a rendu un jugement ordonnant à Uber de cesser ses activités dans la capitale, sous peine d'une astreinte de 10 000 euros en cas d'infraction. Cette interdiction a été décidée car, à ce stade, les chauffeurs roulant pour Uber ne bénéficient pas de l'autorisation de la Région bruxelloise pour ce faire. Personne n'était joignable hier chez Uber pour réagir à cette information. La société américaine n'avait pas non plus pris d'avocats pour se défendre contre cette action intentée par les Taxis Verts. L'interdiction devrait entrer en vigueur à partir du moment où le jugement sera signifié à Uber. En attendant, les chauffeurs Uber continuaient à rouler dans la capitale hier. «Sont-ils sérieux? De quel type de système juridique s'agit-il?», s'est-elle demandé sur son blog. Pour la commissaire en charge de l'agenda numérique européen, cette décision vise essentiellement à protéger le cartel des taxis bruxellois. Particulièrement remontée, Neelie Kroes a encore laissé entendre que la ministre bruxelloise des transports, Brigitte Grouwels, mériterait largement le titre de «ministre de l'anti-mobilité».

1. La commissaire s'est-elle exprimée en son nom propre?

2. Est-il normal qu'un commissaire ne se contente pas de commenter mais attaque une décision de justice?

3. Est-il normal qu'un commissaire européen insulte, ou du moins raille, un élu régional dans le cadre de ses fonctions?

4. Quelle est la réaction de la Commission?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Kroes au nom de la Commission
(27 mai 2014)

La Commission a exprimé son point de vue sur le contexte et les effets de l'arrêt du tribunal et n'avait pas l'intention de critiquer ni de railler le tribunal ou ses agents. La Commission partage l'avis que certains services doivent faire l'objet d'une réglementation et que les fournisseurs de services devraient s'acquitter de taxes et protéger les consommateurs. Elle cherche également à favoriser l'esprit d'entreprise, l'innovation et la concurrence. L'interdiction, de principe ou de fait, de certains services entraîne pour l'innovation un effet de dissuasion qui n'est pas souhaitable. Une bonne politique permettrait aux entrepreneurs d'innover tout en respectant la loi.

De manière plus générale, la Commission a toujours souligné que l'économie numérique, ainsi que les outils et les services numériques, peuvent libérer le potentiel des entreprises novatrices, offrir aux consommateurs un choix plus large à des prix plus compétitifs, créer des emplois et stimuler la croissance économique. La Commission estime que les mesures législatives et les initiatives aux niveaux européen et national devraient appuyer ce développement économique et social avantageux.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005112/14
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Court order challenged by the Parliament

The Vice-President of the European Commission did not hide her anger yesterday when reacting to the sentencing of Uber, an American company offering a car-sharing application. She professed herself outraged by the decision taken by the commercial court.

The *Taxis Verts* [Green Taxis], which took Uber to court, won the first judicial round. Last week, the commercial court of Brussels delivered a judgment ordering Uber to cease its activities in the capital, on pain of a penalty of 10 000 euros in case of breach. This ban was decided because, at this point, the Uber drivers do not enjoy the approval of the Brussels regional government to do so. No-one was contactable yesterday at Uber to react to this news. The American company had also not instructed lawyers to defend it against this action undertaken by the *Taxis Verts*. The ban was due to come into force as soon as the ruling had been communicated to Uber. Meanwhile, Uber's drivers continued to drive in the capital yesterday. 'Are they serious? What kind of legal system is that?' she asked on her blog. For the Commissioner responsible for Europe's digital agenda, this decision is designed essentially to protect the Brussels taxi cartel. Neelie Kroes, who was particularly angry, was further heard to say that the Brussels transport minister, Brigitte Grouwels, deserved to be known as the 'anti-mobility minister'.

1. Was the Commissioner expressing a personal opinion?

2. Is it normal for a Commissioner not just to pass comment, but to attack a court ruling?

3. Is it normal for a European Commissioner to insult, or at least to mock, an elected regional representative on matters for which she is responsible?

4. What is the reaction of the Commission?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(27 May 2014)

The Commission expressed its opinion on the context and the effects of the court ruling and did not intend to criticize or mock the court or its officers. The Commission agrees that certain services require regulation and that service providers should pay taxes and protect consumers. It also is keen to promote entrepreneurship, innovation and competition. Banning or effectively banning services creates unwanted chilling effects on innovation. Good policy would allow entrepreneurs to innovate and to comply with the law at the same time.

More broadly, the Commission has consistently stressed that the digital economy, digital tools and services can unlock the potential of innovative entrepreneurs, can give consumers wider choice at more competitive prices, can create jobs and trigger economic growth. The Commission believes that laws and policy initiatives at EU and national level should support this positive economic and social development.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-005113/14
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(17 avril 2014)

Objet: Performance énergétique belge

La Commission européenne a décidé, le mercredi 16 avril 2014, d'assigner la Belgique et la Finlande devant la Cour de justice de l'Union européenne, estimant que les deux pays ont manqué à leurs obligations relatives à la transposition de la directive sur la performance énergétique des bâtiments.

Elle demande de fixer des astreintes journalières de quelque 42 000 euros pour la Belgique et de 19 000 euros pour la Finlande.

1. Sur quelle base la Commission a-t-elle pris cette décision?

2. Sur quelle base la Commission a-t-elle fixé les astreintes?

3. La Commission peut-elle envisager un délai supplémentaire?

Réponse donnée par M. Oettinger au nom de la Commission
(11 juin 2014)

1. La décision de proposer une astreinte journalière à l'encontre de la Belgique et de la Finlande est fondée sur l'article 260, paragraphe 3, du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne (TFUE). Cette disposition permet à la Commission, en saisissant la Cour en vertu de l'article 258 du TFUE au motif que l'État membre a manqué à son obligation de communiquer des mesures de transposition d'une directive adoptée conformément à une procédure législative, de préciser le montant de la «somme forfaitaire ou de l'astreinte» à payer par l'État membre.

2. La base du calcul de l'astreinte est décrite dans la communication de la Commission concernant la mise en œuvre de l'article 260, paragraphe 3, TFUE *(JO C 12 du 15.1.2011)*, qui renvoie à la communication de 2005 sur la mise en œuvre de l'article 228 du traité CE *[SEC(2005) 1658]*. Ce calcul repose sur trois critères fondamentaux: la gravité de l'infraction (importance des règles violées et incidence de l'infraction sur les intérêts généraux et particuliers), sa durée et la nécessité d'assurer l'effet dissuasif de la sanction pour éviter les récidives (en appréciant la capacité de paiement de l'État membre). Les montants spécifiques servant à calculer le troisième critère sont régulièrement modifiés *[voir la communication de la Commission C(2013) 8101 final du 21.11.2013]*.

3. Le délai de transposition de la directive 2010/31/UE sur la performance énergétique des bâtiments *(JO L 153 du 18.6.2010, p. 13)* a expiré le 9 juillet 2012 et ne peut pas être prorogé par la Commission. Toutefois, si les États membres concernés remplissent leurs obligations avant le prononcé de l'arrêt de la Cour, la Commission peut envisager de se désister dans cette affaire. Enfin, la décision d'imposer l'astreinte journalière proposée ne peut être prise que par la Cour.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005113/14
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Belgian energy performance

The European Commission decided on Wednesday 16 April 2014 to refer Belgium and Finland to the Court of Justice of the European Union, deeming that both countries have failed in their obligations relating to transposition of the directive on the energy performance of buildings.

It is seeking daily penalty payments of some 42 000 euros for Belgium and 19 000 euros for Finland.

1. On what basis did the Commission take this decision?

2. On what basis did the Commission set the penalty payments?

3. Can the Commission envisage an additional time period?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2014)

1. The decision to propose daily penalty against Belgium and Finland is based on Article 260(3) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). This provision allows the Commission, when referring a case to Court pursuant to Article 258 TFEU on the grounds that the Member State has failed to fulfil its obligation to notify measures transposing a directive adopted under a legislative procedure, to specify the amount of 'the lump sum or penalty payment' to be paid by the Member State.

2. The basis of the penalty calculation are detailed in the communication from the Commission on the Implementation of Article 260(3) TFEU (OJ C12 of 15.01.2011), which refers to the communication on the application of Article 228 EC Treaty of 2005 (SEC(2005)1658). The calculation is based on three fundamental criteria: the seriousness of the infringement (importance of the rules breached and the impact of the infringement on general and particular interests), its duration and the need to ensure that the penalty itself is a deterrent to further infringements (reflecting Member State's ability to pay). The specific amounts for calculating the third criterion are regularly amended (see Commission communication of 21.11.2013, C(2013)8101 final).

3. The transposition deadline for Directive 2010/31/EU on the energy performance of buildings (OJ L 153, 18.6.2010, p. 13-35) expired on 9 July 2012 and this deadline cannot be extended by the Commission. However, should the concerned Member States comply with their obligations before the delivery of the Court judgment; the Commission may consider withdrawing the case. Finally, imposing the proposed daily penalty may only be decided by the Court.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-005114/14
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(17 avril 2014)

Objet: Crise de la vache folle

Au terme de seize ans d'investigations au pôle santé publique de Paris, le parquet a requis un non-lieu général dans un des plus grands scandales agroalimentaires français, l'affaire de la vache folle.

La crise de la vache folle avait plombé l'industrie de la viande et généré la panique chez les consommateurs, avec ces images dérangeantes de bêtes incapables de tenir debout et de cheptels entiers abattus.

Alors qu'une épidémie massive et sans précédent d'encéphalopathie spongiforme bovine (ESB) ravageait le cheptel bovin britannique, le gouvernement britannique avait reconnu pour la première fois en mars 1996 l'existence d'un «lien» possible entre la maladie bovine et l'apparition de cas d'une nouvelle forme de maladie humaine, la maladie de Creutzfeldt-Jakob (MCJ), du nom des deux neurologues qui l'ont décrite presque simultanément en 1920 et 1921.

Une information judiciaire avait été lancée en 1997 après une série de plaintes, dont la première avait été déposée en juin 1996 par l'Union française des consommateurs (UFC) pour «tromperie sur la qualité substantielle d'un produit» et «falsification».

Des associations professionnelles agricoles s'étaient portées partie civile, de même que les familles de personnes décédées de la variante humaine de l'ESB.

Devant le nombre important de contaminations par l'ESB en Grande-Bretagne, la France avait décidé unilatéralement en mars 1996 de suspendre l'importation de viandes bovines britanniques, décision entérinée quelques jours plus tard à l'échelon communautaire par la Commission européenne. Cet embargo français avait été levé en septembre 2002.

Quelle est la réaction de la Commission sur ce dossier? 16 ans d'investigations pour ne tirer aucune conclusion.

La Commission investigue-t-elle encore ou attendait-elle le résultat de cette enquête?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(12 juin 2014)

La Commission n'a pas suivi cette procédure judiciaire et n'a donc pas de remarque particulière à formuler. Toutefois, il convient de noter que la situation relative à l'ESB dans l'Union s'est nettement améliorée au cours des 13 dernières années grâce aux mesures de contrôle très strictes adoptées par le Parlement et le Conseil, ainsi que par la Commission. La Commission continue à surveiller la situation de très près sans relâcher ses efforts.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005114/14
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Mad cow crisis

After 16 years of investigations in the Paris public health centre, the public prosecutor's office has requested that the case be dismissed in one of France's greatest food scandals, the mad cow affair.

The mad cow crisis crippled the meat industry and created panic among consumers, with those disturbing images of animals unable to stand up and entire livestock populations slaughtered.

While a massive unprecedented epidemic of bovine spongiform encephalitis (BSE) ravaged the British cattle population, the British Government acknowledged for the first time in March 1996 the existence of a possible 'link' between the bovine disease and the emergence of cases of a new form of human disease, Creutzfeldt-Jakob Disease (CJD), named after two neurologists who described it almost simultaneously in 1920 and 1921.

A judicial enquiry was launched in 1997 after a series of complaints, the first of which was lodged in June 1996 by the *Union française des consommateurs* (UFC) [French Consumers' Union] in relation to 'deception over the substantial quality of a product' and 'falsification'.

Professional farming associations associated in cases brought by the public prosecutor, as did the families of people who had died from the human variant of BSE.

In view of the large number of cases of BSE contamination in Great Britain, France decided unilaterally in March 1996 to suspend imports of British beef, a decision ratified a few days later at Community level by the European Commission. This French embargo was lifted in September 2002.

What is the reaction of the Commission to this affair? Sixteen years and no conclusions.

Is the Commission still investigating, or was it expecting this outcome to the enquiry?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2014)

The Commission did not follow this particular case and has no particular comments to make. However, it has to be noted that the BSE situation in the Union has greatly improved over the last 13 years due to the very stringent control measures adopted by the Parliament and the Council, and by the Commission. The Commission is still monitoring the BSE situation very closely and without complacency.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005115/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(17 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Separazione dei coniugi, emergenza abitativa

In Italia le disposizioni legislative in materia di scioglimento del matrimonio e separazione dei coniugi prevedono che l'autorità giudiziaria competente possa assegnare, in caso di separazione, la casa familiare ad uno dei due coniugi in considerazione dell'interesse prioritario dei figli.

Così talvolta accade che la casa, pur essendo di esclusiva proprietà di uno dei due coniugi, viene assegnata in godimento come casa familiare all'altro coniuge, al fine di preservare l'habitat familiare dei figli, che in verità viene spesso turbato dalla presenza di un nuovo compagno/a per il coniuge assegnatario della casa.

In definitiva il legittimo proprietario della casa, pur dovendo continuare a sopportarne le spese, non può disporre del bene e viene spogliato forzatamente di una componente importante della proprietà privata, vale a dire della facoltà di godere dello stesso e di disporne in modo pieno ed esclusivo.

Recentemente è stato evidenziato come la separazione aggravi fino a quattro volte l'emergenza abitativa, costringendo gli ex coniugi a tornare a casa dei genitori o a essere ospitati da amici, in attesa di trovare soluzioni sostenibili economicamente. Anche il ricorso ai dormitori aumenta fortemente dopo la rottura di un legame di coppia.

Nonostante il diritto di famiglia sia di competenza esclusiva degli Stati membri, potrebbe far sapere la Commissione:

1. se le disposizioni legislative nazionali che prevedono l'assegnazione della casa di esclusiva proprietà di un coniuge all'altro coniuge non siano in contrasto con i principi fondanti alla base della legislazione europea;

2. se è a conoscenza delle pratiche nazionali che regolano la questione e se siano state individuate degli esempi di buone prassi?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(19 giugno 2014)

Per quanto riguarda i procedimenti di divorzio, la legislazione europea disciplina attualmente solo le questioni procedurali relative alla competenza giurisdizionale, al riconoscimento e all'esecuzione delle decisioni (regolamento Bruxelles II bis) e la legge applicabile (regolamento Roma III). Le questioni accessorie che insorgono a seguito del divorzio, come l'uso di una proprietà comune da parte di uno dei coniugi, sono regolamentate dal diritto sostanziale di famiglia degli Stati membri e, in quanto tali, non rientrano nell'ambito di competenza dell'UE, ma unicamente in quello degli Stati membri.

Spetta quindi esclusivamente agli Stati membri elaborare le norme nazionali conformemente alle rispettive tradizioni giuridiche e culturali, e la Commissione non è competente per valutarne la compatibilità con i principi europei.

Sebbene non raccolga le migliori prassi al riguardo, la Commissione ha reso disponibili sul portale europeo della giustizia elettronica le informazioni relative alle disposizioni nazionali pertinenti.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005115/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Separation of couples, housing crisis

In Italy the legislative provisions relating to divorce and legal separation allow the competent legal authority, in case of separation, to award the marital home to one of the two spouses in consideration of the priority interests of the children.

Thus, it happens on occasion that although the house is solely owned by one of the two spouses, a beneficial interest in it is assigned to the other as the family home, in order to preserve the children's family environment, which in fact is often disrupted by the presence of a new partner of the spouse awarded the house.

In short, the legal owner of the house, although required to continue meeting the costs of maintaining it, cannot dispose of the asset, and is forcefully stripped of a significant component of private ownership, that is to say, the ability to enjoy and make full and sole use of it.

It has recently been shown that separation makes the housing crisis up to four times worse, forcing ex-spouses to return to the parental home or to be put up by their friends, until such time as financially sustainable solutions can be found. The use of dormitories also increases significantly after the breakdown of a relationship.

Although family law is the sole responsibility of Member States, can the Commission advise:

1. whether national legislative measures which provide for awarding a home solely owned by one spouse to the other contravene the founding principles on which European legislation is based;

2. whether it is aware of any national practices governing this matter which have been identified as examples of good practice?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2014)

With regard to divorce proceedings, the European legislation covers currently only the procedural matters relating to jurisdiction, recognition and enforcement of judgments (Brussels IIa regulation) and the applicable law (Rome III Regulation). The ancillary matters following a divorce such as the use of a common property by one of the spouses belong to national substantive family law. As such, they do not fall within the EU's competence but remain under the sole responsibility of the Member States.

It is therefore a matter exclusively for the Member States to design their respective rules in accordance with their legal traditions and culture. In this respect, the Commission has no competence to assess their compatibility with European principles.

Although the Commission does not collect any best practices in this respect, it has made available on the e-Justice Portal the information concerning the relevant national provisions.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005116/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(17 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Possibili finanziamenti per un'attività relativa alla vendita e somministrazione di prodotti tipici regionali

È in fase di studio un progetto che prevede l'apertura di un'attività commerciale relativa alla vendita e somministrazione di prodotti tipici della Regione Campania nella Regione Lombardia, in Provincia di Monza e della Brianza. L'attività mira alla promozione delle eccellenze gastronomiche, di comprovata qualità e di tracciabilità garantita, provenienti dal territorio campano.

Il progetto mira altresì a creare nuove opportunità di impiego legate alla promozione dei prodotti e del servizio ai clienti, con positive ricadute occupazionali su molti giovani.

Alla luce di quanto premesso, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se esistono possibili finanziamenti per la realizzazione del progetto descritto e, in generale, per la promozione dei prodotti agricoli e alimentari di qualità;

2. quali sono i finanziamenti previsti nella nuova programmazione 2014-2020 per il sostegno di attività commerciali dirette alla promozione delle eccellenze gastronomiche e dei prodotti DOP, IGP, STG?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(16 giugno 2014)

Per quanto riguarda la prima domanda, le microimprese e le piccole e medie imprese possono beneficiare di un sostegno finanziario per la trasformazione e la commercializzazione di prodotti agricoli e forestali ([1]). Possono fruire di un sostegno finanziario anche le attività di informazione e promozione dei regimi di qualità dei prodotti agricoli e alimentari svolte da associazioni di produttori nel mercato interno e finalizzate a promuovere prodotti certificati in conformità ai regimi di qualità comunitari, a regimi di qualità riconosciuti dagli Stati membri o a regimi facoltativi di certificazione dei prodotti agricoli ([2]). Queste misure di sostegno continueranno a essere finanziate dal FEASR (Fondo europeo agricolo per lo sviluppo rurale) e, in funzione dell'analisi strategica dei fabbisogni di un determinato paese o regione, possono essere inserite nel pertinente programma di sviluppo rurale per il periodo 2014-2020.

Con riguardo alla seconda domanda, le associazioni di produttori nel mercato interno possono beneficiare di un sostegno per prodotti DOP, IGP e STG. Potrebbe essere possibile ottenere un finanziamento per le eccellenze gastronomiche a condizione che rientrino in uno dei regimi sopra menzionati.

Poiché l'attuazione delle misure contemplate dal programma di sviluppo rurale e la selezione dei singoli progetti sono di competenza delle autorità di gestione regionali italiane, è a loro che dovrebbero essere chieste ulteriori informazioni al riguardo.

Per la promozione all'interno e all'esterno dell'UE, un sostegno finanziario è disponibile anche alle condizioni stabilite nel regolamento (UE) n. 501/2008 della Commissione ([3]) relativo ad azioni di informazione e di promozione dei prodotti agricoli sul mercato interno e nei paesi terzi. Per ulteriori informazioni si veda il sito: http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/promotion/index_en.htm

([1]) Articolo 17 del regolamento (UE) n. 1305/2013 (GU L 347 del 20.12.2013).
([2]) Articolo 16, paragrafo 2, del regolamento (UE) n. 1305/2013 (GU L 347 del 20.12.2013).
([3]) GU L 147 del 6.6.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005116/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Possible funding for activities concerning the sale and supply of typical regional products

Research is being done on the possibility of launching a commercial endeavour concerning the sale and supply of typical products of Campania in Lombardy, in the Province of Monza and Brianza. The aim would be to promote high-quality, traceable gastronomic specialities sourced in Campania.

A further aim of the scheme would be to create new job opportunities associated with promoting products and providing customer services, which would have a positive impact in terms of providing employment for a significant number of young people.

Can the Commission answer the following questions in the light of the above:

1. Is there any funding available for this scheme, and for the promotion of high-quality agricultural and food products in general?

2. What funding is available under the new 2014-2020 programme to support commercial endeavours promoting gastronomic specialities and PDO, PGI and TSG products?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(16 June 2014)

Regarding the first question, financial support can be provided to micro, small and medium-sized enterprises for the processing and marketing of agricultural and forestry products ([1]). Information and promotion activities about food quality schemes implemented by groups of producers in the internal market can also be supported to promote products that have been certified in accordance with the Community quality schemes, quality schemes recognised by the Member State or voluntary agricultural product certification schemes ([2]). These support measures will continue to be provided by the EAFRD (European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development) and can according to the strategic analysis of the needs in a given country or region be addressed under the relevant Rural Development Programme for the period 2014-2020.

With regard to the second question, possible support for PDO, PGI and TSG products can be provided for groups of producers in the internal market. Supporting gastronomic specialities could be possible under the condition that theses specialities are subject to any of the schemes mentioned above.

Since the implementation of Rural Development Programme measures and the selection of individual projects are the responsibility of the Regional Managing Authorities in Italy, it is at that level that further information on this issue should be sought.

For promotion within and outside the EU, financial support is also available under the conditions set out in Commission Regulation (EU) No 501/2008 ([3]) on information provision and promotion measures for agricultural products on the internal market and in third countries. For more information, please visit the website: http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/promotion/index_en.htm

([1]) Article 17 of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013, OJ L 347, 20.12.2013.
([2]) Article 16 (2) of Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013, OJ L 347, 20.12.2013.
([3]) OJ L 147, 6.6.2008.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005117/14
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Carlo Fidanza (PPE)
(17 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Crisi in Ucraina e problemi di approvvigionamento energetico per gli Stati membri

In questi giorni di alta tensione nella penisola di Crimea e in Ucraina ci si interroga sulle ripercussioni in campo energetico di questa crisi. Oggi contiamo sulla Russia per circa un terzo del nostro fabbisogno di gas in tutta l'UE, sebbene questa media mascheri una dipendenza superiore al 50 per cento per alcuni paesi, tra cui Austria, Finlandia, Grecia, Polonia, Ungheria e Repubblica ceca.

Considerando quanto segue:

— l'UE, a causa della vicenda ucraina, rischia di compromettere le proprie relazioni con la Russia nonostante la stretta dipendenza energetica;

— appare sempre più chiaro che l'indipendenza energetica garantisce indipendenza politica nelle relazioni internazionali;

— il presidente americano, nella sua recente visita a Bruxelles, si è detto disponibile a rifornire l'UE di gas americano, il cosiddetto *shale gas*, puntando a sostituire nel lungo termine la Russia quale fornitore di gas per l'Europa;

— oltre a dover rinegoziare forniture e contratti, il gas americano non potrebbe arrivare in Europa prima del 2016, essendo ancora da ultimare le strutture necessarie quali ad esempio terminali di liquefazione, navi per il trasporto del gas, rigassificatori;

— alcuni Stati membri hanno effettuato investimenti nei gasdotti di transito;

può il Vicepresidente della Commissione/Alto Rappresentante dell'Unione per gli affari esteri e la politica di sicurezza rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. è al corrente della situazione?

2. quali azioni intende intraprendere per sollecitare i membri sull'urgenza di creare un sistema energetico europeo che garantisca una sicurezza e un'indipendenza energetica completa per tutti gli Stati membri?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(27 giugno 2014)

L'AR/VP è perfettamente consapevole della situazione dell'UE per quanto riguarda la sicurezza energetica e le relazioni con la Russia nel campo dell'energia, di cui si è discusso in modo approfondito durante le riunioni del Consiglio Affari esteri.

Le questioni connesse all'energia vengono inoltre discusse regolarmente con gli Stati Uniti nell'ambito del relativo dialogo UE-USA, la cui ultima riunione si è tenuta all'inizio di maggio 2014.

Il 28 maggio 2014 la Commissione europea ha adottato una Strategia europea di sicurezza energetica (COM(2014) 330) di cui si discuterà al Consiglio europeo di giugno. La strategia riguarda le misure da adottare in previsione del prossimo inverno e propone una serie di azioni supplementari a medio-lungo termine per ridurre la dipendenza dell'UE dalle importazioni di energia.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005117/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Carlo Fidanza (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Crisis in the Ukraine and energy procurement problems for Member States

In these days of high tension in the Crimean peninsula and Ukraine, questions are being asked on the repercussions of this crisis on the energy sector. Today we rely on Russia for around a third of our gas requirement throughout the EU, although this is an average figure which masks a dependency of over 50% in the case of other countries such as Austria, Finland, Greece, Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic.

Considering that:

— because of the situation in the Ukraine, there is a risk that the EU may compromise its relations with Russia despite our heavy energy dependency;

— it is becoming increasingly clear that energy independence is a guarantee of political independence in international relations;

— during his recent visit to Brussels, the American president declared his readiness to make up the EU's energy requirement with US gas (shale gas) with a view to substituting Russia as Europe's gas supplier in the long term;

— leaving aside the need to renegotiate procurement and contracts, American gas could not reach Europe before 2016 because the necessary structures (e.g. liquefaction terminals, gas tanker ships and re-gasification terminals) are not yet complete;

— a number of Member States have invested in interstate gas pipelines;

can the Commission's Vice-President/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy answer the following questions:

1. Is she aware of this situation?

2. What action does she intend to take to persuade members of the urgency of creating a European energy system which would guarantee full energy independence and security for all Member States?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2014)

HR/VP is fully aware of the EU's situation as regards energy security and its energy relations with Russia. This item has been extensively discussed at the EU Foreign Affairs Council meetings.

EU-US energy issues are also discussed regularly with the US at the EU-US energy dialogue, the most recent took place beginning of May 2014.

On 28 May 2014 the European Commission adopted a comprehensive European Energy Security Strategy (COM(2014)330) in view of it being discussed at the European Council in June. This strategy addresses the measures to be taken in view of the next winter and proposes a series of additional Medium to long term action to reduce the EU energy import dependence.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005118/14
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Carlo Fidanza (PPE)
(17 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Libia e milizie islamiche

La Libia sta cominciando a disintegrarsi e una conseguenza paradossale del cosiddetto intervento umanitario in difesa del popolo libico è stata il proliferare delle forze islamiste e fondamentaliste. In Libia, nonostante abbiano spesso scarso appoggio popolare, questi movimenti riescono a esercitare una notevole pressione sul governo con numerose azioni violente.

Il caos si sta diffondendo in tutta la regione in modo inquietante. Il paese è inondato da 15 milioni di fucili e di altre armi e, in questo mese, un rapporto del comitato di esperti dell'ONU ha trovato che la «Libia è diventata una sorgente primaria di armi illegali». Tali armi stanno alimentando il caos in 14 paesi, tra cui Somalia, Repubblica centrafricana, Nigeria e Niger. Il Qatar aiuta a consegnare gli armamenti alla Siria, dove le armi di fabbricazione russa e provenienti dai depositi del regime di Gheddafi vengono fornite ai ribelli islamisti fondamentalisti.

Vi è una reale possibilità che il paese cada nella guerra civile o si sgretoli.

A meno che non siano avviati seri negoziati in merito ai suoi molteplici problemi, la Libia certamente continuerà la sua discesa nel caos, con il rischio che l'intera regione possa essere trascinata nel pantano.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può il Vicepresidente della Commissione/Alto Rappresentante dell'Unione per gli affari esteri e la politica di sicurezza rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. è al corrente della situazione?

2. intende, di concerto con i paesi membri coinvolti, le autorità libiche e i paesi confinanti, prendere iniziative tese a evitare che un paese così strategico per gli interessi europei cada nell'anarchia, sulla falsariga di quanto successo in Somalia?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(26 giugno 2014)

L'AR/VP segue con la massima attenzione la situazione in Libia, che giudica preoccupante sia sul piano politico che sotto il profilo della sicurezza.

L'UE ha sostenuto fin dall'inizio la transizione in Libia attraverso un programma globale, la cui dotazione ammonta attualmente a 130 milioni di EUR, incentrato sui seguenti aspetti: riconciliazione, elezioni e rispetto dei diritti umani; capacità della pubblica amministrazione; sviluppo dei media e società civile; migrazioni; sanità e istruzione; riforma del settore della sicurezza e controllo/distruzione di armi e munizioni.

Erano stati avviati colloqui esplorativi sulla ripresa dei negoziati relativi a un accordo quadro UE-Libia, che riprenderanno non appena la situazione lo consentirà.

In occasione della conferenza tenutasi il 6 marzo a Roma, la comunità internazionale ha riconosciuto all'unanimità la necessità di prestare urgentemente attenzione al deterioramento della situazione politica e della sicurezza in Libia. La mancanza di una soluzione politica mette a repentaglio il processo di transizione democratica nel paese.

L'AR/VP è fermamente decisa ad aumentare l'impegno dell'UE a favore della transizione in Libia e ha nominato come inviato personale per la Libia Bernardino León, che dal 1º giugno 2014 è incaricato di mantenere i contatti con le controparti libiche e con i partner internazionali per tentare di sostenere la popolazione in queste circostanze critiche.

Si cercherà di operare, sotto l'egida delle Nazioni Unite, in stretto coordinamento con interlocutori chiave come la Lega araba e gli Stati Uniti per proseguire le discussioni su una strategia rafforzata per la Libia.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005118/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Carlo Fidanza (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Libya and Islamic militias

Libya is beginning to disintegrate, and a paradoxical consequence of the so-called humanitarian intervention in defence of the Libyan people has been a proliferation of Islamic fundamentalist forces. In Libya, although popular support for them is often scarce, these movements manage to exercise significant pressure on the government, with numerous violent actions.

The chaos is spreading alarmingly throughout the region. The country is flooded with 15 million rifles and other weapons, and, this month, a report by the UN expert committee has found that 'Libya has become a prime source of illegal weapons'. These weapons are feeding the chaos in 14 countries, including Somalia, the Central African Republic, Nigeria and Niger. Qatar helps to ship armaments to Syria, where Russian-made weapons and those from the Gaddafi regime's stockpiles are supplied to the Islamic fundamentalist rebels.

There is a real possibility that the country may descend into civil war or split.

Unless serious negotiations are begun with regard to its many problems, Libya will certainly continue its descent into chaos, with the risk that the whole region may be dragged into the mire.

In view of the above, can the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy state:

1. whether she is aware of the situation;

2. whether she intends, together with the Member States involved, the Libyan authorities and neighbouring countries, to adopt initiatives intended to prevent such a strategic country for European interests from falling into anarchy, along the lines of events in Somalia?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(26 June 2014)

The HR/VP closely follows the situation in Libya and is concerned about the security and political situation.

The EU has supported the Libyan transition from the start with a comprehensive programme, which now stands at EUR 130 million focusing on: reconciliation, elections and respect for human rights; public administrative capacity; media development and civil society; migration; health and education; Security Sector Reform and arms and ammunition control/destruction.

Exploratory talks had started to discuss the resumption of negotiations of an EU-Libya Framework Agreement; these talks will resume as soon as the situation allows.

At the Rome Conference of 6 March, the International Community agreed on the pressing need to focus attention on the deteriorating political and security situation in Libya. The lack of a political settlement is putting the democratic transition process in this country at risk.

The HR/VP is determined to step up EU's engagement in support of the Libyan transition. She has appointed a personal envoy for Libya, Mr Bernardino León. As of 1 June 2014, he has been assigned to engage with Libyan counterparts and international partners in EU efforts to support the Libyan people at this critical juncture.

Close coordination under the auspices and coordination of the United Nations with key players such as the Arab League and the United States will be sought to further discuss an enhanced strategy towards Libya.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005119/14
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Carlo Fidanza (PPE)
(17 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Attacco chimico del 21 agosto 2013 a Damasco

Secondo un autorevole giornalista investigativo, l'attacco del 21 agosto 2013 nei sobborghi di Damasco non fu causato dal governo siriano, ma dai ribelli. Le accuse ad Assad servivano per provocare l'intervento americano nella guerra civile. Si trattava di un complotto in cui era coinvolta la Turchia di Erdogan.

Secondo la fonte riservata utilizzata dal giornalista fu l'intelligence britannico, in collaborazione con i servizi russi, a fornire le prove che gli agenti chimici utilizzati non provenivano dagli arsenali del governo siriano, bensì dai ribelli. L'intelligence americana sapeva che i ribelli di Al-Nusra, sostenuti dalla Turchia, stavano producendo armi chimiche, mentre il premier Erdogan aveva assoluto bisogno, in quella fase, che gli Stati Uniti intervenissero a fianco dei ribelli che stavano perdendo la guerra.

Alla luce di quanto esposto, può l'Alto Rappresentante per la politica estera e di sicurezza comune far sapere:

1. se è al corrente della situazione;

2. se, dopo aver verificato l'attendibilità di questa notizia, intende prendere alcuna iniziativa;

3. come intende agire nei confronti della Repubblica araba di Siria, sconvolta della guerra civile ivi in atto?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(7 luglio 2014)

Il Segretario generale delle Nazioni Unite ha costituito una squadra di indagine che si è recata in Siria per raccogliere prove del presunto utilizzo di armi chimiche nei pressi di Damasco. Tale squadra, in stretta collaborazione con l'Organizzazione per la proibizione delle armi chimiche (OPCW), ha redatto una relazione, resa pubblica nel novembre 2013, nella quale si conferma l'uso di sarin senza tuttavia indicare chi siano i responsabili degli attacchi. L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente non si pronuncia su notizie date dai media o su informazioni provenienti da terzi che non siano state verificate dalle competenti organizzazioni internazionali.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005119/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Carlo Fidanza (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Chemical attack on Damascus on 21 August 2013

According to an authoritative investigative reporter, the attack on 21 August 2013 on the suburbs of Damascus was not caused by the Syrian government, but by the rebels. The accusations made against Assad were intended to bring about American intervention in the civil war. This was a plot involving Prime Minister Erdogan of Turkey.

According to the anonymous source quoted by the journalist, it was British intelligence, in cooperation with the Russian services, which furnished proof that the chemical agents used did not come from the arsenals of the Syrian government, but from the rebels. US intelligence was aware that the Al-Nusra rebels, backed by Turkey, were producing chemical weapons, whereas at the time Prime Minister Erdogan desperately wanted the United States to intervene in support of the rebels who were losing the war.

In view of the above, can the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy state:

1. whether she is aware of the situation;

2. whether, after verifying the credibility of this information, she intends to adopt any initiatives;

3. how she intends to act in relation to the Syrian Arab Republic, which is being devastated by the civil war taking place there?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(7 July 2014)

The United Nations Secretary-General (UNSG) has set up an investigation team which has visited Syria with the purpose of collecting evidence of the alleged use of chemical weapons in the vicinity of Damascus. This team in close cooperation with the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) has produced a report made public in November 2013, in which the use of sarin was acknowledged, but the report fell short of attributing responsibility as to the perpetrators of the attack. The HR/VP does not comment on media reports or third sources' information, which have not been verified by the competent international organisations.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005120/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(17 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Nuova ondata di profughi in Italia: maggiore sostegno e coinvolgimento delle autorità locali

Considerando le recenti dichiarazioni del ministro dell'Interno italiano Angelino Alfano, secondo il quale dai 300 ai 600 000 clandestini sarebbero pronti a sbarcare sulle coste italiane; considerando che, una volta sbarcati, gli immigrati vengono spostati dalle strutture di prima accoglienza e destinati a risiedere, a spese dello Stato, in comuni di tutto il territorio italiano; considerando che 40 presunti profughi sono stati assegnati a strutture alberghiere della provincia di Vicenza, in Veneto, senza la previa consultazione delle autorità locali;

può la Commissione far sapere:

1. come intende agire per supportare l'Italia in questa nuova emergenza migratoria verso le sue coste?

2. se non ritiene necessario coinvolgere le autorità dei comuni nei quali si sceglie di ospitare gli immigrati entrati irregolarmente in Italia?

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(24 giugno 2014)

Per quanto riguarda la prima domanda, sul sostegno fornito all'Italia per la gestione delle pressioni subite dai suoi sistemi di migrazione e di asilo, la Commissione invita l'onorevole parlamentare a consultare la risposta all'interrogazione parlamentare E-4055/2014.

Per quanto concerne il coinvolgimento delle autorità locali nelle scelte relative alla sistemazione dei migranti e dei richiedenti asilo, la Commissione osserva che si tratta di una decisione assunta a livello nazionale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005120/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: New wave of refugees in Italy: better support and involvement with local authorities

Considering recent statements by Italian Interior Minister Angelino Alfano that between 300 and 600 000 illegal immigrants are about to disembark on Italian shores; considering that, once they have landed, immigrants are moved from the reception facilities and allocated to residential accommodation, at the cost of the State, in municipalities throughout Italy; considering that 40 alleged asylum-seekers have been allocated to hotel accommodation in Vicenza Province, in Veneto, without prior consultation of the local authorities,

1. How does the Commission intend to act to support Italy in this new emergency of migration towards its shores?

2. Does the Commission consider it necessary to involve local authorities in the areas in which it is decided to accommodate those immigrants who have entered Italy illegally?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(24 June 2014)

Concerning the first question on support to Italy to manage the pressures it faces on its migration and asylum systems, the Commission refers the Honourable Member to its reply to Parliamentary Question E-4055/2014.

As regards the involvement of local authorities in the decisions on the accommodation of migrants and asylum-seekers, the Commission notes that this is a decision taken at national level.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005121/14
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(17 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Ludopatia, gioco d'azzardo e tasse

La ludopatia è una patologia scientificamente riconosciuta, che colpisce ogni anno milioni di cittadini europei, specialmente nei momenti di crisi in cui le famiglie hanno bisogno di soldi, e che porta le persone a spendere tutti i propri risparmi in cerca di fortuna, portando interi nuclei familiari sul lastrico. La Commissione non è ancora ben riuscita a chiarire se il gioco d'azzardo rientri o meno tra le sue prerogative, dal momento che la raccolta dei guadagni avviene da parte di società private o dai monopoli statali, anche se l'Unione europea legifera sul tema come dimostra il rapporto Fox sul gioco d'azzardo online.

Si chiede alla Commissione di rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Può chiarire quali aspetti della legislazione sul gioco d'azzardo rientrino tra le competenze dell'UE?

2. Non ritiene di dovere invitare gli Stati membri ad aumentare le tassazioni sul gioco d'azzardo per svantaggiarlo e di utilizzare le maggiori entrate per la lotta alla ludopatia?

3. Ha intenzione di sviluppare norme come quella promossa dalla Regione Lombardia per tenere le sale slot e gli esercizi in cui si pratica il gioco d'azzardo lontane da luoghi sensibili?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(25 giugno 2014)

La Commissione condivide le preoccupazioni dell'onorevole deputata circa i rischi associati al gioco d'azzardo e, come illustrato nella sua comunicazione del 2012 dal titolo «Verso un quadro normativo europeo approfondito relativo al gioco d'azzardo on-line», sta intervenendo nel settore.

1. Attualmente il gioco d'azzardo non è disciplinato da una normativa specifica. Le prerogative della Commissione derivano esclusivamente dalle disposizioni del trattato sull'Unione europea, in particolare dagli articoli 49 e 56 del TFUE, che disciplinano la libertà di stabilimento e la libertà di prestazione dei servizi, e, per quanto riguarda la protezione dell'integrità dello sport, dall'articolo 165 del TFUE. Il gioco d'azzardo è anche disciplinato da alcuni atti della legislazione unionale orizzontale, ad esempio dalla direttiva 2005/29/CE ([1]), che vieta una vasta gamma di pratiche commerciali ingannevoli o aggressive. Inoltre, la Commissione ha proposto di estendere la normativa UE antiriciclaggio a tutte le forme di gioco d'azzardo.

2. Gli Stati membri godono di ampia libertà nel definire i propri sistemi fiscali e stabilire i livelli di tassazione nel modo più idoneo a raggiungere gli obiettivi di politica interna, anche se, nell'esercizio dei loro diritti di tassazione, essi devono rispettare gli obblighi derivanti dai trattati dell'Unione. La Commissione può presentare proposte legislative volte a migliorare il funzionamento del mercato interno, che diventeranno legge solo se gli Stati membri le approvano all'unanimità. Il livello di tassazione del gioco d'azzardo non è stato armonizzato a livello UE: spetta pertanto agli Stati membri fissarlo.

3. La risoluzione del Parlamento europeo del 2011 sul gioco d'azzardo on-line nel mercato interno ([2]) ha respinto l'ipotesi di introdurre un atto legislativo europeo che armonizzi la disciplina del settore del gioco d'azzardo. Una posizione analoga è stata espressa dal Consiglio. Norme relative all'ubicazione degli stabilimenti in cui sono situate le slot-machine sono stabilite a livello nazionale o locale.

([1]) Direttiva sulle pratiche commerciali sleali tra imprese e consumatori (GU L 149 dell'11.6.2005, pag. 22).
([2]) 2011/2084(INI).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005121/14
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Compulsive gambling, games of chance and taxation

Compulsive gambling is a scientifically recognised pathology which affects millions of European citizens every year, in particular at times of crisis in which families need money and which is leading people to spend all their savings in search of winnings, reducing entire family units to ruin. The Commission has not yet been able to clarify whether gambling does or does not fall within its prerogatives, given that gambling profits go to private companies or State monopolies, although the European Union does legislate on this matter, as demonstrated by the Fox report on online gambling.

The Commission is asked the following questions:

1. Can it identify which aspects of gambling legislation fall within EU jurisdiction?

2. Does it not consider that it should ask Member States to increase taxation on gambling to create a disincentive and apply the income thereby generated to discourage compulsive gambling?

3. Does it intend to formulate regulations, such as that introduced in the Lombardy Region, to ensure that slot machines and outlets where gambling is practiced are kept remote from sensitive areas?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(25 June 2014)

The Commission shares the Honourable Member's concerns about the risks associated with gambling. Accordingly, it is taking action in this area, as set out in its 2012 Communication 'Towards a comprehensive European framework on online gambling'.

1. There is currently no EU-specific legislation on gambling. The Commission's prerogatives derive exclusively from the provisions of the EU Treaty, notably Art. 49 and 56 TFEU governing the freedom of establishment and the freedom to provide services respectively and Art. 165 TFEU, where the protection of the integrity of sport is concerned. In addition, some horizontal EU legislation also covers the gambling sector, e.g. Directive 2005/29/EC ([1]) bans a wide range of misleading or aggressive business practices and the Commission has proposed to extend the EU anti-money laundering rules to all forms of gambling.

2. Member States have a broad freedom to design their tax systems and set taxation levels in the most appropriate way to meet their domestic policy objectives, although, in the exercise of their taxation rights, they must respect their obligations under the EU Treaties. While the Commission can make proposals for legislation to improve the functioning of the internal market, the proposals will only become law if EU Member States unanimously agree to them. The level of taxation of gambling has not been harmonised at EU level and it is thus for the Member States to set.

3. The Parliament's 2011 Resolution on Online Gambling in the internal market ([2]) rejected a European legislative act uniformly regulating the gambling sector. A similar view has been expressed by the Council. Rules relating to the location of establishments where slot machines are located are thus established at national or local level.

([1]) Directive on Unfair Business-to-Consumer Commercial Practices OJ L 149, 11.6.2005, p. 22.
([2]) 2011/2084(INI).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005125/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Al Qaeda nella penisola arabica

È stato di recente rilasciato sul web un video che ritrae Nasir al Wuhayshu, testa della rete di al Qaeda nella penisola arabica, insieme a diversi seguaci, mentre lancia diversi moniti e minacce contro gli USA e altri Stati occidentali. Il filmato sarebbe stato girato in Yemen e viene considerato da molti analisti come una vera e propria sfida contro l'aumento dell'utilizzo di droni da ricognizione e attacco da parte degli Stati Uniti e una dimostrazione che la rete terroristica è tutt'altro che sconfitta.

Può la Commissione chiarire se:

1. è a conoscenza del video in questione?

2. Ha motivo di ritenere che la penisola arabica possa divenire un nuovo teatro di attacchi terroristici di matrice qaedista, o un nuovo hub da cui la rete possa gestire nuovi attacchi mirati contro l'UE e i propri alleati?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(24 giugno 2014)

L'Unione europea è consapevole dell'aumento delle minacce alla sicurezza dello Yemen, che è in particolare dovuto alla presenza di militanti del gruppo Al-Qaeda nella Penisola arabica (AQAP). Le violenze e le minacce provenienti dall'AQAP si sono ripetute costantemente nel corso degli ultimi anni e sono aumentate dopo la conclusione della conferenza del dialogo nazionale. In particolare, i rappresentanti della comunità internazionale presenti nello Yemen sono recentemente stati oggetto di attacchi terroristici, ad esempio quello che ha causato la morte di un addetto alla sicurezza della delegazione dell'UE e il ferimento di altri due il 5 maggio 2014.

L'Unione europea condanna con la massima fermezza questi atti di violenza e ha invitato il governo dello Yemen a prendere tutti i provvedimenti necessari per ristabilire la sicurezza nel paese.

L'Unione europea contribuisce inoltre allo sforzo della comunità internazionale per rafforzare la sicurezza nello Yemen e ha deciso di aumentare il sostegno alla ristrutturazione del ministero dell'interno e all'introduzione di misure che rendano più efficaci le attività di sorveglianza sul terreno.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005125/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Al-Qaeda on the Arabian peninsula

A video has recently been posted on the web showing Nasir al Wuhayshu, head of the Al-Qaeda network on the Arabian peninsula, together with several of his followers, issuing various warnings and threats to the US and other Western States. The film appears to have been made in Yemen and many analysts see it as an act of defiance in the face of growing use of reconnaissance and attack drones by the US, and a demonstration that the terrorist network is far from defeated.

Can the Commission clarify the following:

1. Is it aware of the video in question?

2. Does it have reason to think that the Arabian peninsula might become a new theatre for Al-Qaeda-backed terrorist attacks, or a new hub from which the network might organise new attacks on the EU and its allies?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(24 June 2014)

The European Union is aware of the increasing security threat in Yemen which is notably due to the presence in Yemen of Al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula. Violence and threats emanating from AQAP have been a constant pattern over the last years and have been growing following the conclusion of the National Dialogue Conference. The international community in Yemen has been particularly targeted by terrorist attacks recently, as was sadly the case with the killing of a member of the team providing security to the EU Delegation and the wounding of two others on 5 May 2014.

The EU condemns in the strongest terms these acts of violence and has called on the government of Yemen to take all the necessary measures to restore security in the country.

The EU is also engaged in contributing to the international community's effort to reinforce security in Yemen and will increase its support for the restructuring of the ministry of interior and introducing more effective policing on the ground.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005126/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Google e privacy

Google, che è già stato protagonista di una lunga diatriba con la Commissione europea, ha aggiornato il proprio documento che specifica i termini d'uso e le condizioni in merito alla privacy legate ai propri servizi, esplicitando che una serie di «sistemi automatizzati analizzano i contenuti degli utenti (comprese le mail) per fornire servizi sempre più mirati come risultati di ricerca personalizzati, pubblicità su misura e rilevazione di malware e spam. Questa analisi è condotta quando il contenuto è inviato, ricevuto e conservato». In altre parole, l'azienda afferma in maniera chiara che può analizzare il contenuto dei messaggi di posta elettronica scambiati tra utenti.

Google è stato anche oggetto di una class action avviata da alcuni utenti statunitensi che lamentavano queste violazioni della privacy, ma la corte americana non ha dato il via all'azione legale. La linea di difesa dell'azienda si è incentrata sul fatto che le verifiche dei contenuti avvengono tramite un software automatizzato e rispettano l'anonimato degli iscritti.

Può la Commissione chiarire se ritiene che questi termini di servizio possano rappresentare una violazione della normativa europea sulla privacy?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(30 giugno 2014)

La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alla sua risposta dettagliata all'interrogazione E-000007/2014 ([1]). Nello specifico, fatte salve le competenze della Commissione europea in qualità di custode dei trattati, il controllo e l'applicazione della normativa in materia di protezione dei dati sono di competenza delle autorità nazionali, segnatamente dei giudici e delle autorità preposte alla protezione dei dati.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2014-000007&language=EN.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005126/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Google and privacy

Google, which has already been involved in a long dispute with the European Commission, has updated its document setting out the terms of use and privacy conditions governing its services, explaining that a series of 'automated systems analyse your [i.e. users'] content (including emails) to provide you personally relevant product features, such as customised search results, tailored advertising, and spam and malware detection. This analysis occurs as the content is sent, received, and when it is stored'. In other words, the company is clearly saying that it can analyse the content of email messages exchanged between users.

Google has also been subject to a class action launched by some American users who were complaining about these breaches of privacy, but the US court refused to hear the case. The company's line of defence was based on the fact that content checks are made using automated software and respect subscribers' anonymity.

Can the Commission clarify whether it thinks these terms of service might be in breach of European privacy law?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(30 June 2014)

The Commission would like to refer the honourable Member of Parliament to its detailed answer to Question E-000007/2014 ([1]). In particular, without prejudice to the competence of the European Commission as guardian of the Treaties, the supervision and enforcement of data protection legislation falls within the competence of national authorities, in particular the data protection supervisory authorities (DPAs) and courts.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2014-000007&language=EN

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005127/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Forniture di gas naturale dalla Bolivia

Nella diatriba sulle forniture di gas naturale per l'UE, scaturita in seguito alla crisi politica ucraina, la Bolivia, principale esportatore latinoamericano nel settore, si è proposta per sostenere la domanda energetica europea. Il vice-presidente boliviano ha infatti proposto il paese come fornitore alternativo di gas naturale, ma in realtà la proposta potrebbe nascondere un'antica diatriba territoriale tra Bolivia e Cile per l'ottenimento di uno sbocco sul mare della prima. La Bolivia per il momento utilizza Arica (in Cile, sul Pacifico) come hub dei propri traffici internazionali marittimi, ma non dispone di un corridoio extra-doganale, e nel frattempo ha anche esplorato la possibilità di affidarsi all'Uruguay per ottenere uno sbocco sull'Atlantico.

Qual è la posizione della Commissione in merito alla proposta della Bolivia, anche alla luce delle considerazioni sopra riportate?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(5 giugno 2014)

Per il momento l'UE non prevede di rifornirsi di gas dalla Bolivia per soddisfare la domanda europea. La Bolivia, inoltre, ha già difficoltà ad attrarre gli investimenti necessari per individuare le fonti di gas supplementari necessarie per far fronte alla domanda dei paesi vicini (Brasile e Argentina).

Di conseguenza, l'opzione boliviana non viene giudicata realistica a breve termine e quindi non ha alcuna incidenza sulla vertenza territoriale sottoposta alla Corte internazionale di giustizia nell'aprile 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005127/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Natural gas supplies from Bolivia

In the dispute over natural gas supplies for the EU, triggered by the political crisis in Ukraine, Bolivia, the industry's main Latin-American exporter, has offered to meet Europe's energy demand. The Bolivian Vice-President has in fact put the country forward as an alternative supplier of natural gas, but the proposal could be concealing an old territorial dispute between Bolivia and Chile about the former securing access to the sea via the latter. At the moment, Bolivia is using Arica (on the Pacific coast in Chile) as a hub for its international sea traffic, but it does not have a customs-free corridor and has been exploring the possibility of turning to Uruguay for access to the Atlantic.

What is the Commission's position on Bolivia's proposal, taking account of the considerations outlined above?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2014)

At present there are no concrete EU plans to use Bolivia's gas supplies to meet Europe's gas demand. Furthermore, the country is already facing the challenge to attract the investments needed to identify additional gas resources to meet existing demand from neighbouring countries (Brazil and Argentina).

Under the circumstances, the Bolivian option does not seem realistic in the short term and therefore has no impact on the existing territorial dispute which has been submitted to the International Court of Justice since April 2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005128/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Lavoro nero in Europa

Il lavoro nero è una piaga economica che affligge diversi paesi europei, almeno secondo le ultime rilevazioni delle indagini Eurobarometro. Secondo queste indagini, ad esempio, in Grecia il 30 % dei cittadini ha buone ragioni di credere che dietro beni e servizi acquistati negli ultimi dodici mesi si celasse anche lavoro sommerso. In Olanda la percentuale scende al 29 %, mentre in Danimarca si attesta al 23 %, in Italia al 12 %, nel Regno Unito all'8 %, in Germania al 7 % e così via, per una media europea che si aggira intorno all'11 %. Il settore economico in cui l'incidenza del lavoro nero è più alta è l'edilizia, seguita dalla manutenzione dell'auto e dai lavori domestici.

In merito a questi dati, può la Commissione chiarire a quanto ammonta il danno economico causato dal lavoro sommerso nell'UE? Quali sono le principali cause che alimentano questa distorsione del mercato e quali sono le misure di contrasto adottate a livello europeo?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(4 giugno 2014)

È estremamente difficile stimare il costo del lavoro nero che reca pregiudizio alle tradizionali politiche economiche, finanziarie e sociali impostate sulla crescita. Il lavoro nero riduce il gettito fiscale e erode il finanziamento dei sistemi di sicurezza sociale intaccando la fiducia negli stessi. Esso tende a distorcere la concorrenza tra le imprese e a ridurne l'efficienza poiché le imprese del sommerso evitano di solito di ricorrere a servizi e fattori produttivi dell'economia ufficiale e tendono quindi a rimanere di dimensioni contenute. Il lavoro nero è all'origine inoltre del deterioramento delle condizioni lavorative e del mancato rispetto delle regole in materia di salute e di sicurezza.

Il lavoro nero è riconducibile a diversi fattori come i costi e la pressione fiscale sul lavoro elevati o la loro percezione in quanto tali, gli oneri burocratici eccessivi, la scarsa fiducia nel governo, la mancanza di meccanismi di controllo, la mancanza di posti di lavoro regolari sul mercato del lavoro e tassi elevati di esclusione sociale e povertà.

Nel 2012 e nel 2013 diversi Stati membri hanno ricevuto raccomandazioni specifiche per paese ([1]) in materia di lavoro nero, di economia sommersa, di evasione fiscale e/o di rispetto degli obblighi tributari.

Il 9 aprile 2014 la Commissione ha presentato una proposta ([2]) relativa all'istituzione di una Piattaforma europea per il rafforzamento della cooperazione a livello dell'UE tra gli Stati membri per lottare in modo più efficace contro il lavoro sommerso.

Il Fondo sociale europeo sostiene gli Stati membri nei loro sforzi per migliorare la qualità dell'amministrazione pubblica e della governance e portare quindi avanti le riforme strutturali. Gli Stati membri sono incoraggiati a far uso delle risorse del Fondo sociale europeo messe a disposizione nell'ambito del Quadro finanziario pluriennale 2014-20 per migliorare la loro capacità di lottare contro il lavoro sommerso.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/index_en.htm
([2]) Proposta di decisione del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio relativa all'istituzione di una Piattaforma europea per il rafforzamento della cooperazione volta a prevenire e scoraggiare il lavoro sommerso (COM(2014) 221 final del 9 aprile 2014).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005128/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Undeclared work in Europe

Undeclared work is an economic scourge in several European countries, at least according to the latest Eurobarometer survey figures. These surveys reveal that, in Greece for example, 30% of citizens have good reason to believe that clandestine employment lay behind goods and services they had purchased over the past twelve months. In the Netherlands, the percentage drops to 29%, falling to 23% in Denmark, 12% in Italy, 8% in the UK, and 7% in Germany, with a European average of around 11%. The economic sector with the highest incidence of undeclared work is the construction industry, followed by car maintenance and domestic work.

With regard to these figures, can the Commission clarify how much economic damage is being caused by clandestine employment in the EU? What are the main reasons for this distortion of the market and what measures are being taken at European level to correct it?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(4 June 2014)

It is extremely difficult to estimate the cost of undeclared work, which impedes conventional growth-oriented economic, budget and social policies. It reduces tax revenue and undermines the financing of, and trust in, social security systems. It tends to distort competition between firms and to reduce efficiency, since informal businesses typically avoid having recourse to formal services and inputs, and hence tend to remain small. In addition, it is the cause of deterioration in working conditions and neglect of health and safety rules.

Undeclared work is driven by various factors, such as high labour taxes and costs, or the perception thereof, excessive red tape, weak trust in government, a lack of control mechanisms, a lack of regular jobs on the labour market, and high rates of social exclusion and poverty.

In 2012 and 2013 several Member States received country-specific recommendations ([1]) concerning undeclared work, the shadow economy, tax evasion and/or tax compliance.

On 9 April 2014 the Commission put forward a proposal ([2]) to establish a European Platform to improve cooperation at EU level between the Member States in tackling undeclared work more effectively.

The European Social Fund supports the Member States in their efforts to improve the quality of public administration and governance and thus to push ahead with structural reforms. The Member States are encouraged to use European Social Fund resources provided under the Multiannual Financial Framework for 2014-20 to improve their capacity to tackle undeclared work.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/index_en.htm
([2]) Proposal for a decision of the European Parliament and of the Council on establishing a European Platform to enhance cooperation in the prevention and deterrence of undeclared work (COM(2014) 221 final of 9.4.2014).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005129/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Lotta contro la diffusione della malaria

La malaria è una malattia ancora piuttosto diffusa a livello globale, presente in oltre cento paesi, che genera pesanti costi sia in termini umani che socio-economici. Nonostante la lotta globale contro questa malattia abbia raggiunto fino ad oggi importanti risultati, raggiungendo talvolta un calo della diffusione superiore al 50 % in paesi dove è considerata endemica, resta ancora molto da fare prima di poter considerare vinta questa guerra.

In merito a quanto detto, può la Commissione chiarire quale sia l'impegno dell'UE nella lotta contro la malaria, in special modo nei paesi poveri e in via di sviluppo, e quali i risultati da essa raggiunti?

Risposta di Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione
(17 giugno 2014)

L'UE sostiene la lotta alla malaria utilizzando vari canali: promuove il rafforzamento dei sistemi sanitari, in modo che i casi di malaria possano essere adeguatamente curati nelle strutture sanitarie. L'UE ha sostenuto i sistemi sanitari pubblici in circa 40 paesi in via di sviluppo, con un finanziamento medio di circa 250 milioni di euro l'anno. Un altro canale importante è il finanziamento tematico, che, per quanto attiene alla malaria, riguarda in ampia misura il Fondo mondiale per la lotta contro l'HIV/AIDS, la tubercolosi e la malaria. Tramite questo canale di sostegno, l'UE ha, tra l'altro, finanziato la distribuzione di zanzariere da letto trattate con insetticidi per un importo di 18 milioni di euro. Per quanto riguarda il contributo dell'Unione europea alla ricerca nella lotta alla malaria, si rimanda l'onorevole parlamentare alla risposta data all'interrogazione E-4551/14 ([1]).

L'UE ha contribuito al compimento di progressi sostanziali verso l'obiettivo fissato dall'Assemblea mondiale della Sanità di ridurre i tassi di mortalità da malaria del 75 % entro il 2015. Su scala mondiale, tra il 2000 e il 2012, i tassi previsti di mortalità da malaria sono diminuiti del 45 %, per tutti i gruppi di età e del 51 % per i bambini di età inferiore ai cinque anni.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary questions.html;jsessionid=987EC3257DF4C7A682B41123ABBD3EED.node1

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005129/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Anti-malaria campaign

Malaria is still a very common disease in some parts of the world, being present in more than a hundred countries and leading to heavy costs in both human and socioeconomic terms. Although the global campaign against the disease has achieved some significant results, with the number of cases in countries where it is considered endemic falling in some cases by more than 50%, there is still a long way to go before we can consider the battle won.

In view of this, can the Commission clarify the EU's contribution to the anti-malaria campaign, especially in poor developing countries, and the results that have been achieved?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2014)

The EU supports the fight against malaria through several channels: it promotes the strengthening of health systems so that malaria cases can be appropriately taken care of in health facilities. The EU has been supporting public health systems in some 40 developing countries, with average funding of about EUR 250 million per year. Another major channel is thematic funding, which, regarding malaria, goes to a large extent to the Global Fund against HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria. With this support, the EU has, *inter alia*, financed the distribution of 18 million insecticide-treated bed nets. Regarding the EU's research contribution to the fight against malaria, the Honourable Member is referred to the reply to Question E-4551/14. ([1])

The EU has contributed to substantial progress towards the World Health Assembly target of reducing malaria mortality rates by 75% by 2015. Worldwide between 2000 and 2012, estimated malaria mortality rates fell by 45% in all age groups and by 51% for children less than five years of age.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary questions.html;jsessionid=987EC3257DF4C7A682B41123ABBD3EED.node1

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005130/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Sicurezza alimentare

La sicurezza alimentare è un tema politico che ha assunto particolare rilevanza negli ultimi anni, in particolare a causa dell'aumento del prezzo dei cibi iniziato nel 2008. Inoltre, il quadro è ulteriormente complicato dal mutare delle tendenze economiche e demografiche globali, che hanno conseguentemente portato a importanti mutamenti nel consumo globale di alimenti e biocarburanti. La sicurezza alimentare è pertanto diventata un problema globale che necessita di una risposta globale e condivisa, pena l'insorgere di nuove crisi di natura politica come quelle che hanno scosso il Nord Africa a partire dal 2011.

Può la Commissione chiarire qual è l'impegno dell'UE in merito alla proposta di soluzioni multilaterali condivise al problema della sicurezza alimentare? Quali sono stati i principali strumenti posti in essere ad oggi?

Risposta di Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione
(24 giugno 2014)

L'impennata dei prezzi mondiali dei prodotti alimentari nel 2007/08 e la conseguente elevata volatilità dei prezzi dei prodotti alimentari hanno indotto a ripensare la sicurezza alimentare a livello globale. Da allora, la posizione dell'UE sulla scena internazionale è divenuta ancora più prominente. Oggi, l'UE è infatti il principale donatore mondiale nel campo della sicurezza alimentare e nutrizionale, mentre la sicurezza alimentare è diventata una priorità fondamentale del contributo dell'UE alla cooperazione allo sviluppo.

La Commissione concorda pienamente sul fatto che la sicurezza alimentare è una sfida mondiale che richiede una risposta su scala mondiale ed è attiva nei diversi consessi multilaterali e nell'ambito di iniziative volte a rafforzare la governance globale della sicurezza alimentare. Nei paesi soggetti a crisi frequenti, l'UE promuove un approccio alla sicurezza alimentare basato sulla capacità di risposta e di recupero. L'approccio all'assistenza alimentare fa invece proprie le istanze umanitarie di sostegno alle fasce più vulnerabili della popolazione.

L'UE sostiene l'operato del Comitato per la sicurezza alimentare mondiale (CFS), il principale forum di governance globale della sicurezza alimentare. Nell'approccio della Commissione rientra anche il sostegno alla gestione del territorio (ad esempio, mediante gli orientamenti volontari sulla governance della terra, adottati dal CFS nel 2012, e altre iniziative connesse) e le attività del CFS sugli sprechi alimentari.

L'UE ha sostenuto tutte le iniziative del G8, dall'AFSI del 2009 ([1]), con 1 miliardo di EUR all'anno, fino alla nuova alleanza per la sicurezza alimentare e la nutrizione del 2012, e l'evento «Nutrition for Growth» del 2013, stanziando 3,5 miliardi di EUR per il periodo 2014-2020. L'UE sostiene inoltre il movimento Scaling-up Nutrition che si prefigge di mantenere la sicurezza nutrizionale tra le priorità dell'agenda internazionale.

Grazie a queste iniziative, l'UE garantisce un collegamento saldo fra agricoltura e la capacità di sfamare le fasce più vulnerabili della popolazione. La Commissione ha sempre svolto un ruolo di primo piano, coordinando la propria azione con quella degli Stati membri dell'UE e promuovendo la posizione dell'UE in materia di sicurezza alimentare a livello mondiale.

La Commissione è inoltre impegnata nella ricerca e proposta di soluzioni in materia di sprechi alimentari.

([1]) Iniziativa per la sicurezza alimentare dell'Aquila (2009).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005130/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Food security

Food security is a political issue that has become particularly important over the past few years, especially because of the constant rise in food prices that began in 2008. The picture is also further complicated by changes in economic trends and global demographics, which have led to significant changes in global consumption of food and biofuels. Food security has thus become a global problem that requires a concerted global response if we are to prevent new political crises like the ones that have been shaking north Africa since 2011.

Can the Commission clarify what the EU has done in terms of proposing multilateral joint solutions to the problem of food security? What are the main measures set in place so far?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(24 June 2014)

Soaring global food prices in 2007/08 and the subsequent high food price volatility sparked a rethink of global food security. Since then the EU position on the international scene has become even more prominent: the EU is now the largest donor for food and nutrition security worldwide and food security is a key priority for EU development cooperation.

The Commission fully agrees that food security is a global challenge which requires a global response and has been an active player in different multilateral fora and initiatives to strengthen the global governance of food security. In countries facing recurrent crises, the EU promotes a resilience-based approach to food security. Humanitarian considerations are reflected by a food assistance approach, which supports the most vulnerable.

The EU supports the work of the Committee on World Food Security as the main forum for global governance of food security. This includes support to land governance (i.e. through the Voluntary Guidelines on Land Tenure adopted by the CFS in 2012 and other related initiatives) and CFS work on food waste.

The EU has supported all G8 initiatives, from AFSI ([1]) in 2009 with EUR 1 billion per year, to the 2012 New Alliance for Food security and nutrition and the 2013 Nutrition for Growth, with EUR 3.5 billion for 2014-2020. The EU also supports the Scaling-up Nutrition movement to maintain nutrition security high on the international agenda.

Through these initiatives the EU ensures strong links between agriculture and its ability to feed the most vulnerable. The Commission has been at the forefront in coordinating with EU Member States and in promoting the EU position on food security issues at the global level.

The Commission is also working to propose solutions on food waste.

([1]) L'Aquila Food Security Initiative (2009).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005131/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Profughi siriani in Turchia

Le più recenti stime firmate dalle Nazioni Unite parlano di circa 1,5 milioni di rifugiati siriani totali diretti verso la Turchia, in cerca di riparo dalla guerra che sta dilaniando il paese. La Turchia ha fino ad ora gestito in maniera piuttosto ordinata il flusso, creando anche un'agenzia apposita per gestire le richieste d'asilo. Probabilmente questo approccio però rischia di non essere sostenibile nel lungo periodo, dal momento che i campi profughi sono già quasi al completo e solo la metà dei rifugiati stimati dall'ONU ha già attraversato il confine tra i due paesi. Tra l'altro, si stima che circa il 65 % dei rifugiati siriani in Turchia non alloggi nei campi predisposti, bensì nelle aree urbane del paese.

Può la Commissione chiarire se l'UE abbia fornito o meno assistenza alla Turchia per la gestione dei flussi di rifugiati? In caso affermativo, l'assistenza si è limitata al sostegno finanziario o sono stati attivati altri strumenti?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(11 giugno 2014)

Nelle sue conclusioni del dicembre 2013, il Consiglio ha riconosciuto il ruolo della Turchia nella crisi siriana e, in particolare, l'importante sostegno umanitario fornito ai cittadini siriani che attraversano il confine per fuggire dalle violenze. Nelle conclusioni del Consiglio Affari esteri del maggio 2014, l'Unione europea ha di nuovo espresso il proprio riconoscimento ai paesi vicini che offrono rifugio a un gran numero di profughi siriani e ha ribadito il proprio impegno nel sostenere i governi e le comunità ospitanti di tali paesi.

La Commissione ha finora stanziato oltre 40 milioni di euro per assistere la Turchia in questa emergenza, ricorrendo a vari strumenti, tra cui l'aiuto umanitario, lo strumento per la stabilità (IFS) e lo strumento di preadesione (IPA); la maggior parte di questi fondi è già stata assegnata. Oltre la metà dei finanziamenti è stata destinata all'assistenza dei rifugiati siriani in Turchia mediante l'aiuto umanitario fornendo, ad esempio, assistenza alimentare, prodotti non alimentari, tende e sostegno logistico.

Nell'aprile 2012, le autorità turche hanno inoltre presentato una richiesta di assistenza finanziaria e in natura per far fronte all'afflusso di rifugiati siriani. In risposta, è stato attivato il meccanismo di protezione civile dell'UE, attraverso il quale vari paesi europei hanno offerto il loro aiuto. Le autorità turche hanno accettato l'offerta di tende e altri prodotti non alimentari da Austria, Francia e Ungheria. La Mezzaluna rossa turca ha indicato il campo di Islahiyeluogo come il luogo più bisognoso di assistenza. L'Italia ha espresso la propria volontà di allestire un ospedale da campo con personale in caso di necessità.

L'UE rimane in stretto contatto con la Turchia sulla questione con l'intento di migliorare il sostegno offerto al paese per gestire i forti flussi di profughi siriani, anche nelle aree urbane e rurali al di fuori dei campi profughi, che attualmente accolgono la maggioranza dei rifugiati.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005131/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Syrian refugees in Turkey

The most recent figures released by the UN suggest that a total of some 1.5 million Syrian refugees will head towards Turkey to escape the war that is tearing the country apart. So far, Turkey has managed the flow very effectively, and has set up a special agency to deal with requests for asylum. However, it is unlikely that this approach will be sustainable in the long term, since the refugee camps are already almost full and only half the number of refugees anticipated by the UN have so far crossed the border between the two countries. It is also estimated that about 65% of Syrian refugees in Turkey are living in urban areas rather than in the refugee camps.

Can the Commission clarify whether the EU has provided Turkey with help to manage the flows of refugees? And, if so, has this aid been limited to financial support, or have other measures been put in place?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2014)

In its 2013 December conclusions, the Council recognised Turkey's role on Syria, especially with regard to the important humanitarian support provided to Syrians fleeing violence across the border. In the Foreign Affairs Council Conclusions of May 2014, the EU once again commended the neighbouring countries for providing safe havens for large numbers of Syrian refugees adding that EU pledges to continue its support to the governments and host communities of Syria's neighbours.

The Commission has so far allocated over EUR 40 million to help Turkey in this regard using various instruments, e.g. humanitarian aid, Instrument for Stability, IPA; most of this money has now been contracted. Over half of this funding has been allocated to assist Syrian refugees inside Turkey with humanitarian aid including e.g. food assistance, non-food items, tents and logistical support.

In addition, in April 2012 Turkish authorities issued a request for financial and in kind assistance in order to face the influx of Syrian refugees. Consequently, the European Union Civil Protection Mechanism has been activated through which several European countries have offered assistance. The offers of tents and other non-food items from Austria, France and Hungary were accepted by the Turkish authorities. The Islahiye camp was identified by the Turkish Red Crescent as a place where the assistance was most needed. Italy has expressed its willingness to deploy a field hospital with staff in case of need.

The EU remains in close contact with Turkey on this issue and is looking into ways of enhancing support to Turkey to deal with the consequences of the influx of large number of Syrian refugees, including for the urban and rural out of camps refugees, who now represent the majority.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-005132/14
Komisijai
Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE)
(2014 m. balandžio 17 d.)

Tema: Dėl diskriminacijos sveikatos apsaugos sektoriuje

Sveikatos apsauga ir su tuo susiję klausimai tebėra valstybių narių kompetencijos klausimas. Nepaisant to, esu įsitikinusi, jog paslaugos pacientams valstybėse narėse turi būti teikiamos jų nediskriminuojant pagal jokį požymį.

Lietuvoje yra devyni asmenys (iš jų – septyni vaikai), sergantys sunkia genetine liga – *Maroteaux-Lamy* sindromu (VI tipo mukopolisacharidoze). Moksliškai įrodyta, jog vienintelis efektyvus šios ligos gydymas yra vaistiniu preparatu *Galsulfaze* (*Naglazyme*). Mano žiniomis, ne viena ES valstybė ligoniams kompensuoja gydymą šiuo vaistiniu preparatu. Nors Lietuvos ekspertai taip pat yra pateikę išvadas, jog tikslinga įtraukti minimą vaistą į kompensuojamų vaistų sąrašą, LR Sveikatos apsaugos ministerija atsisako tą padaryti. Lietuvos Lygių galimybių kontrolieriaus įstaiga net yra nustačiusi, jog toks neveikimas vertintinas kaip diskriminacija.

Nepaisant to, ministerija ir toliau laikosi pozicijos, jog preparato *Galsulfaze* (*Naglazyme*) įtraukimas į kompensuojamų vaistų sąrašą būtų per didelė našta valstybės biudžetui.

Ar toks Lietuvos institucijų neveikimas ir ekspertų nuomonės nepaisymas, paliekant pacientus be galimybės gauti efektyvų gydymą už prieinamą kainą, nėra laikytinas ES Sutarties 2 ir 3 straipsnių, numatančių, kad viena iš ES vertybių yra nediskriminavimas, pažeidimu?

T. Borgo atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2014 m. birželio 12 d.)

Pagal Sutarties dėl Europos Sąjungos veikimo 168 straipsnį dėl visuomenės sveikatos, valstybės narės atsako už sveikatos paslaugų ir sveikatos priežiūros organizavimą ir teikimą, o ES savo veikloje pripažįsta valstybių narių atsakomybę šioje srityje. Todėl sprendimai dėl to, už kuriuos vaistus turi būti kompensuojama, priklauso nacionalinei kompetencijai, o Komisija čia neturi įgaliojimų imtis veiksmų.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005132/14
to the Commission
Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Discrimination in the health sector

Health protection and related issues continue to be matters that pertain to the competence of Member States. Nevertheless, I am convinced that services to patients in the Member States must be provided without discrimination of any character.

In Lithuania, there are nine individuals (including seven children) with the severe genetic disease *Maroteaux-Lamy* syndrome (mucopolysaccharidosis type VI). It is scientifically proven that the only effective treatment for this disease is the drug galsulfase (Naglazyme). To my knowledge, none of the EU Member States compensates treatment for this drug. Although Lithuanian experts have also submitted conclusions that it is appropriate to include the mentioned medical product on the list of reimbursed medicines, the Ministry of Health of the Republic of Lithuania refuses to do so. The Lithuanian Equal Opportunities Ombudsman's Office has even determined that such an omission is to be regarded as discrimination.

Nevertheless, the Ministry continues to hold the position that the inclusion of the drug galsulfase (Naglazyme) on the list of reimbursed medicines would be a huge burden on the state budget.

Should this inaction of Lithuanian authorities and disregard of the opinion of experts, leaving patients without access to effective treatment at an affordable price, be treated as an infringement of Articles 2 and 3 of the EU Treaty, given that one of the EU's values is non-discrimination?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2014)

According to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Article 168 on Public Health, Member States are responsible for the organisation and delivery of health services and medical care and EU action shall respect Member States responsibility in this area. In this context, decisions about which pharmaceuticals are to be reimbursed are a national competence and the Commission has no mandate to intervene.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005134/14
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Settimo programma quadro, fondi utilizzati da alcuni comuni dell'Italia meridionale

Il settimo programma quadro di ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico (7° PQ), adottato il 18 dicembre 2006, ha costituito per il periodo di programmazione 2007-2013 il principale strumento di finanziamento con cui l'Unione europea ha sostenuto in Europa l'attività di ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico delle imprese, degli enti locali e delle strutture di ricerca, al fine di rispondere alle esigenze dell'Unione europea in materia di crescita e di occupazione.

Operativamente il 7° PQ si articolava in quattro programmi specifici che corrispondevano ad altrettanti obiettivi fondamentali della politica europea di ricerca. Questi sono il programma cooperazione, a sua volta articolato in 10 sottotematiche (salute; prodotti alimentari, agricoltura e biotecnologie; tecnologie dell'informazione e della comunicazione; nanoscienze, nanotecnologie, materiali e nuove tecnologie di produzione; energia; ambiente; trasporti; scienze socioeconomiche e scienze umanistiche; sicurezza; spazio), il programma idee, il programma persone e il programma capacità.

Tra i beneficiari del 7° PQ vi sono anche gli enti locali e le pubbliche amministrazioni. Il periodo di programmazione si è concluso lo scorso dicembre 2013 con l'entrata in vigore del nuovo programma Orizzonte 2020, che coprirà i prossimi 7 anni di programmazione fino al 2020.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione chiarire quali fondi diretti sono stati chiesti e ottenuti dai comuni riportati nella seguente lista, nell'arco temporale 2007-2013 a titolo del 7° PQ?

— Abbateggio, Andria, Bolognano, Cappelle sul Tavo, Caramanico Terme, Castiglione a Casauria, Catignano, Città Sant'Angelo, Civitaquana, Corvara, Farindola, Lettomanoppello, Montebello di Bertona, Moscufo, Pacentro, Roccaspinalveti, Rosciano, Salle, San Buona, San Giovanni Lipioni, San Pio delle Camere, Santa Maria Imbaro, Santo Stefano di Sessanio, Schiavi di Abruzzo, Taranta Peligna, Tornareccio, Torrebruna, Torrevecchia Teatina, Treglio, Vacri, Villalfonsina, Villamagna.

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(10 giugno 2014)

Il Settimo programma quadro per le attività di ricerca, sviluppo tecnologico e dimostrazione (7° PQ, 2007-2013) finanzia per la maggior parte progetti di ricerca e sviluppo tecnico pluriennali con più partner, previa disamina da parte di esperti indipendenti delle proposte presentate in risposta agli inviti pubblicati nell'ambito del 7° PQ. Il principale criterio di valutazione è l'eccellenza e non è subordinato a considerazioni di carattere geografico. Dei 32 comuni italiani cui fa riferimento l'onorevole deputato, tre sono stati attivi nell'ambito del 7° PQ. Più nello specifico, dai dati di cui dispone la Commissione risulta che gli enti dei comuni di Santa Maria Imbaro, Torrevecchia Teatina e Città Sant'Angelo hanno partecipato a 38 proposte presentate in risposta agli inviti pubblicati nell'ambito del 7° PQ. Delle 38 proposte, ce ne sono state dieci che hanno superato la procedura di valutazione e selezione e per le quali è stata firmata una convenzione di sovvenzione con l'UE. In allegato alla presente risposta viene fornita una tabella dettagliata in cui sono indicati il numero di domande, le convenzioni di sovvenzione e l'importo dei finanziamenti ricevuti da enti appartenenti ai comuni in questione e alle rispettive regioni.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005134/14
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Seventh Framework Programme, funds used by various southern Italian municipalities

The Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development, adopted on 18 December 2006, has, during the 2007-2013 programming period, been the main financing tool with which the European Union has maintained the research and technological development activity of European companies, local authorities and research establishments, in order to meet the demands of the European Union in terms of growth and employment.

Operationally, the Seventh Framework Programme comprised four specific programmes which related to a similar number of fundamental objectives of European research policy: the Cooperation programme, which in turn comprised 10 subthemes (health; food, agriculture and biotechnology; information and communication technologies; nanosciences, nanotechnologies, materials and new production technologies; energy; environment; transport; socioeconomic sciences and humanities; security and space), the Ideas programme, the People programme, and the Capacities programme.

The beneficiaries of the Seventh Framework Programme include local authorities and public administrations. The programming period concluded in December 2013 when the new programme Horizon 2020, which will cover the next seven years of programming until 2020, came into effect.

In view of the above, can the Commission clarify what direct funds have been applied for and obtained by the municipalities listed below in the period 2007-2013 under the Seventh Framework Programme?

— Abbateggio, Andria, Bolognano, Cappelle sul Tavo, Caramanico Terme, Castiglione a Casauria, Catignano, Città Sant'Angelo, Civitaquana, Corvara, Farindola, Lettomanoppello, Montebello di Bertona, Moscufo, Pacentro, Roccaspinalveti, Rosciano, Salle, San Buona, San Giovanni Lipioni, San Pio delle Camere, Santa Maria Imbaro, Santo Stefano di Sessanio, Schiavi di Abruzzo, Taranta Peligna, Tornareccio, Torrebruna, Torrevecchia Teatina, Treglio, Vacri, Villalfonsina, Villamagna.

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(10 June 2014)

The Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013) is funding mostly multi-partner and multi-annual RTD projects following the evaluation by independent experts of proposals submitted in response to published FP7 calls for proposals. The prominent evaluation criterion is 'excellence', independent of geographic considerations. Out of the 32 Italian municipalities referred to by the Honourable Member, three have been active under FP7. More specifically, the Commission's records indicate that organisations from the municipalities of Santa Maria Imbaro, Torrevecchia Teatina and Città Sant'Angelo have participated in 38 proposals submitted in response to FP7 calls. Out of the 38 proposals, ten succeeded the evaluation and selection procedure and signed grant agreements with the EU. The detailed table containing the number of applications, grant agreements and amount of funding received by organisations belonging to the municipalities in question and the respective regions is attached to this reply.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-005135/14
aan de Commissie
Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE)
(17 april 2014)

Betreft: Arrest Hof van Justitie inzake dataretentie

In punt 68 van het dataretentie-arrest overweegt het Hof van Justitie dat de dataretentie-richtlijn de nodige waarborgen mist omdat „de richtlijn niet verplicht stelt dat de gegevens op het grondgebied van de EU worden bewaard, zodat niet gesteld kan worden dat een onafhankelijke autoriteit toezicht houdt op de naleving van de vereisten van bescherming en beveiliging, zoals artikel 8, lid 3, van het Handvest van de grondrechten uitdrukkelijk verlangt".

Hoe kan worden gewaarborgd dat opgeslagen data niet vanuit derde landen toegankelijk zijn?

Antwoord van mevrouw Malmström namens de Commissie
(11 juni 2014)

Punt 68 van het arrest van het Hof van Justitie heeft betrekking op het toezicht op bewaarde gegevens. Aangezien de vorige richtlijn geen verplichting bevatte om de gegevens binnen de EU te bewaren, benadrukt het Hof dat dit een weerslag zou kunnen hebben op het toezicht zoals voorgeschreven door artikel 8, lid 3 van het Handvest.

Het Hof bevestigt dat toezicht een essentieel onderdeel vormt van de bescherming van natuurlijke personen in verband met de verwerking van persoonsgegevens. Indien opgeslagen gegevens vanuit derde landen toegankelijk zijn, schrijft artikel 8, lid 3 van het Handvest voor dat het toezicht op de naleving ervan door een onafhankelijke autoriteit moet gebeuren, op basis van EU-regelgeving.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-005135/14
to the Commission
Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Court of Justice judgment on data retention

Paragraph 68 of the judgment of the Court of Justice on data retention highlights the lack of safeguards in the Data Retention Directive, pointing out that 'that directive does not require the data in question to be retained within the European Union, with the result that it cannot be held that the control, explicitly required by Article 8(3) of the Charter, by an independent authority of compliance with the requirements of protection and security, as referred to in the two previous paragraphs, if fully ensured'.

How can it be guaranteed that any data stored is not accessed by third countries?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2014)

Paragraph 68 of the ECJ judgment concerns the issue of the control on the retained data. Given that the former Directive did not require that the data are retained within the EU, the ECJ underlines that this may impact on the control as requested under Article 8(3) of the Charter.

The Court confirms that control is an essential component of the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data. In case of access to retained data by third countries Article 8(3) of the Charter requires control of compliance by an independent authority carried out on the basis of EC law.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-005137/14
alla Commissione
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(17 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Triplice sede delle istituzioni dell'UE

Il 23 ottobre del 2013 la proposta di risoluzione Fox/Häfner «sull'ubicazione delle sedi delle istituzioni dell'Unione europea» sarebbe stata votata a favore dalla maggioranza del Parlamento europeo.

Considerando il supporto ottenuto e che la Commissione sarebbe stata adeguatamente informata;

considerando l'importanza delle problematiche messe in rilievo dalla suddetta relazione in merito agli elevati capitoli di spesa imputabili alla triplice locazione delle istituzioni europee;

considerando la necessità di valutare le ripercussioni finanziarie ed economiche sugli stati membri dovute a queste spese;

Può la Commissione:

1. spiegare cosa intende fare per dare ascolto a quanto sottolineato in questa relazione;

2. indicare le tempistiche entro le quali intende implementare le iniziative ivi proposte?

Risposta di José Manuel Barroso a nome della Commissione
(20 maggio 2014)

La risoluzione del Parlamento europeo del 20 novembre 2013 sull'ubicazione delle sedi delle istituzioni dell'Unione europea (2012/2308(INI)) ([1]) non contiene alcuna richiesta specifica rivolta alla Commissione. Per quanto riguarda il contesto generale, la Commissione rimanda l'onorevole parlamentare alla risposta data all'interrogazione scritta E-947/2010 ([2]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P7-TA-2013-0498+0+DOC+XML+V0//IT
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/it/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer P-005137/14
to the Commission
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Triple seat of the EU institutions

On 23 October 2013 the Fox/Häfner motion for a resolution on 'the location of the seats of the institutions of the European Union' was apparently approved by the majority of the European Parliament.

In view of: the support it secured and the relevant information given to the Commission; the importance of the issues highlighted by the report in question regarding the significant expense involved in the upkeep of this triple seat of the EU institutions, and the need to assess the financial and economic impact of this expenditure on the Member States, can the Commission:

1. explain what it intends to do to pay heed to the issues highlighted in this report;

2. say within what time frame it intends to implement the initiatives proposed in the report?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(20 May 2014)

The European Parliament resolution of 20 November 2013 on the location of the seats of the European Union's Institutions (2012/2308(INI)) ([1]) does not contain any specific request addressed to the Commission. For the general context, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-947/2010 ([2]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=TA&language=EN&reference=P7-TA-2013-0498
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005139/14
a la Comisión
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(17 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: Inversión en conocimiento

La Unión Europea representa un tercio del total mundial de ciencia y producción tecnológica. Sin embargo, la inversión en conocimiento está aumentando más rápidamente en algunas economías —por ejemplo, en las economías de Asia— que en Europa.

Para luchar contra esta situación, Europa se ha marcado el objetivo de destinar un 3 % de su PIB a la investigación y la innovación (Horizonte 2020).

Sin embargo, según ha denunciado la Confederación de Sociedades Científicas de España (COSCE), los presupuestos del ejecutivo español para el ejercicio 2014 en este campo se sitúan a niveles de 2002, muy lejos de los objetivos previstos por la Unión Europea.

Ante esta situación, ¿estima necesario la Comisión incentivar e incrementar los presupuestos destinados por los Estados miembros a investigación e innovación?

Pese a la crisis económica, ¿cree la Comisión justificados los recortes en este ámbito?

¿Toma en consideración la Comisión la posibilidad de unificar criterios para avanzar conjuntamente en los terrenos de la investigación y la innovación en todos los Estados miembros?

Respuesta de la Sra. Geoghegan-Quinn en nombre de la Comisión
(2 de junio de 2014)

La intensidad global de I+D de la UE se situó en 2009 en el 2,01 %, manteniéndose prácticamente igual hasta 2012 (el 2,06 %). De persistir esta tendencia no se alcanzaría el objetivo de Europa 2020 de llegar al 3 % en 2020. Si los Estados miembros cumplen sus objetivos nacionales, la intensidad global de I+D de la EU podrá llegar al 2,6 % en 2020.

En su Estudio Prospectivo Anual sobre el Crecimiento para 2014 ([1]), la Comisión insistió en la necesidad de que los Estados miembros protegieran o fomentaran un gasto público (por ejemplo en investigación e innovación) que reforzara su potencial de crecimiento. En ese estudio también se hacía un llamamiento a los Estados miembros para que aceleraran la modernización de los sistemas nacionales de investigación, ajustándose a los objetivos del Espacio Europeo de Investigación ([2]). El gasto público en I+D debe utilizar instrumentos capaces de potenciar la inversión de las empresas en I+D. El gasto en I+D de las empresas representa dos tercios del total del gasto en I+D de los países que llevan registrando desde hace años los mejores resultados en innovación. Una especialización científica y tecnológica acorde con el potencial de desarrollo de actividades económicas competitivas de cada región puede contribuir también a intensificar la capacidad de las inversiones públicas en I+D para potenciar la inversión privada.

Los logros de la iniciativa emblemática de Europa 2020 ([3]) «Unión por la innovación» han sido notables: en particular, se ha establecido una patente unitaria, se han modernizado las normas de contratación de la UE y se ha creado un pasaporte europeo para fondos de capital riesgo, todo lo cual hace que el entorno empresarial en Europa sea más propicio a la innovación y más atractivo para la inversión privada en I+D.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/2014/ags2014_es.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/index_en.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/innovation-union/index_en.cfm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005139/14
to the Commission
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Investment in knowledge

The European Union represents one third of total world production of science and technology. But investment in knowledge is rising faster in some other economies — in Asian countries, for instance — than in Europe.

In order to tackle this situation, Europe has set itself the goal of allocating 3% of its GDP to research and innovation (Horizon 2020).

However, the Spanish Confederation of Scientific Societies (COSCE) has denounced that the Spanish government's budget in this field for the 2014 financial year is set at the same level as that for 2002, which is a long way behind the aims of the European Union.

In the light of this situation, does the Commission consider it necessary to stimulate and increase the budgets dedicated by Member States to research and innovation?

In spite of the economic crisis, does the Commission believe that cuts in this field are justified?

Is the Commission considering the possibility of unifying criteria so as to move forward jointly in the fields of research and innovation in all the Member States?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(2 June 2014)

The EU's overall R&D intensity was of 2.01% in 2009 and has stayed substantially stable with 2.06% in 2012. The continuation of this trend would not allow reaching the Europe 2020 R&D intensity target of 3% in 2020. If Member States meet their national targets, the EU's overall R&D intensity could reach 2.6% in 2020.

In its Annual Growth Survey 2014 ([1]), the Commission stressed that Member States need to find ways to protect or promote public spending (like spending on research and innovation) that reinforces their growth potential. The Survey also called on Member States to accelerate the modernisation of national research systems in line with the objectives of the European Research Area ([2]). Public expenditure in R&D should use instruments that can leverage business investment in R&D. Business expenditure in R&D accounts for two thirds of total R&D expenditure in countries with a track record of leading innovation performance. Scientific and technological specialisations consistent with each region's potential for the development of competitive economic activities may also contribute to an increased leverage effect of public R&D investment on private investment.

Progress with regards to the implementation of Europe 2020's flagship initiative ([3]) 'Innovation Union' has been remarkable. Examples include the introduction of a unitary patent, modernised EU procurement rules and a European passport for venture capital funds, all of which make the business environment in Europe more innovation-friendly and thereby more attractive for private R&D investment.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/2014/ags2014_en.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/index_en.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/innovation-union/index_en.cfm

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005140/14
a la Comisión
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(17 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: Necesidad de comunicar acerca de Horizonte 2020

A través de asociaciones, el proyecto Horizonte 2020 pondrá en común los recursos de Europa para apoyar la competitividad de los sectores que ofrecen puestos de trabajo de alta calidad, el desarrollo de sinergias más estrechas con los programas nacionales y regionales, y fomentar una mayor inversión privada en la investigación y la innovación.

Ocho asociaciones público-privadas contractuales (cPPPs) de importancia estratégica para la industria europea aprovecharán más de 6 000 millones de euros de las inversiones que se asignarán a través de convocatorias de propuestas. Se espera que cada euro de financiación pública pueda desencadenar inversiones adicionales de entre 3 y 10 euros para el desarrollo de nuevas tecnologías, productos y servicios.

¿Considera la Comisión que se ha realizado una suficiente campaña de información para que las empresas de todo tamaño puedan participar en este ambicioso plan?

¿Cree necesaria una campaña informativa específica para facilitar el acceso de las pymes al mismo?

Respuesta de la Sra. Geoghegan-Quinn en nombre de la Comisión
(10 de junio de 2014)

La Comisión reconoce que las pymes son una fuente primordial de innovación, crecimiento y empleo en Europa y que es necesario que participen activamente en Horizonte 2020.

Horizonte 2020 tiene como objetivo que al menos el 20 % del presupuesto de «Liderazgo en las tecnologías industriales y de capacitación» y «Retos sociales» se destine a pymes. A ello se añadirán más ayudas procedentes de Eurostars ([1]), un programa conjunto para pymes que realizan actividades de investigación.

Horizonte 2020 agrupa a ocho asociaciones público-privadas contractuales, cuyo objetivo es potenciar el emprendimiento y la creación de empresas en ámbitos de gran importancia para la economía europea y fomentar la participación industrial.

Los días 16 y 17 de diciembre de 2013 se celebró la ceremonia de firma de estas asociaciones público-privadas contractuales, que supuso un acto importante con el que quiso escenificar su puesta en marcha. Hubo una nutrida presencia del sector de la industria y de las pymes. Merece la pena destacar asimismo que estas últimas desempeñan un papel activo en las juntas de colaboración de las asociaciones, que elaboran hojas de ruta industriales y ayudan a la Comisión a fijar prioridades.

Además, la Comisión ha llegado a empresas de todas las dimensiones mediante actos selectivos. En el caso de las pequeñas y medianas empresas, que constituyen el núcleo de Horizonte 2020 y representan asimismo más del 99 % del sector privado de la UE, se prepararon específicamente para ellas tres importantes actos informativos transmitidos por Internet. La Comisión dispone asimismo de líneas eficaces de comunicación con los puntos nacionales de contacto y con la red Enterprise Europe, que a su vez se dedican a ayudar a los nuevos agentes, entre ellos las pymes, a acceder a Horizonte 2020.

([1]) https://www.eurostars-eureka.eu/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005140/14
to the Commission
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Need for information about Horizon 2020

The Horizon 2020 project will, through various associations, pool EU resources to aid competitiveness in sectors offering high quality jobs, develop closer synergies with national and regional programmes and boost private investment in research and innovation.

Eight contractual Public-Private Partnerships (cPPPs) of strategic importance for European industry are to benefit from over 6 000 million euros in investments allocated via calls for proposals. It is envisaged that each euro of public funding could lead to further investment of between 3 and 10 euros for the development of new technologies, products and services.

Does the Commission consider that an adequate publicity campaign has been carried out so that enterprises of all sizes can take part in this ambitious project?

Does it think there should be a specific campaign of information to facilitate access to the project by SMEs?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(10 June 2014)

The Commission recognises that SMEs are a crucial source of innovation, growth and jobs in Europe and acknowledges the need for a strong participation of SMEs in Horizon 2020.

The objective in Horizon 2020 is that at least 20% of the budget of 'Leadership in enabling and industrial technologies' and the 'Societal challenges' go to SMEs. More support will come from Eurostars ([1]), a joint programme for research-performing SMEs.

Horizon 2020 includes eight contractual Public-Private Partnerships (cPPPs), whose aim is to boost entrepreneurship and business creation in fields of major relevance to the European economy and to enhance industrial participation.

These cPPPs were launched with a major event and signing ceremony on 16-17 December 2013. There was a large attendance from industry, including SMEs. It is also worth noting that SMEs are active in the partnership boards of the cPPPs, which develop industrial roadmaps and help the Commission set priorities.

In addition, the Commission has reached out to enterprises of all sizes through targeted events. As they are at the core of Horizon 2020 and also represent over 99% of the private sector in the EU, Small and Medium-sized Enterprises were targeted with three major and specific, web-streamed information events. The Commission has also effective lines of communication with the National Contact Points (NCPs) and with the Enterprise Europe Network (EEN), who are in turn active in helping new players access Horizon 2020, including SMEs.

([1]) https://www.eurostars-eureka.eu/

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005141/14
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(17 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: VP/HR — Política de vecindad — Azerbaiyán

El año 2013 ha sido un año decisivo en las relaciones bilaterales entre Azerbaiyán y la UE tras la firma del Acuerdo para la Facilitación de Visados y su participación en la Cumbre de la Asociación Oriental celebrada en Vilnius. Además se están manteniendo negociaciones para desarrollar las relaciones con Azerbaiyán en otras cuestiones económicas y energéticas.

Pese a estas buenas perspectivas, el progreso llevado a cabo por el Gobierno de Azerbaiyán en la democratización de la sociedad y en el área de los Derechos Humanos deja que desear, habiéndose identificado problemas significativos, que incluyen limitaciones en la libertad de expresión, reunión y asociación, y que colocan en una desigualdad manifiesta a otros candidatos a participar en un proceso democrático.

A pesar de la adopción de un Plan de Acción Nacional sobre Derechos Humanos en el año 2011, varias de las previsiones en este incluidas se han quedado en el papel. El clima pre-electoral ha estado marcado por una significativa reducción de las libertades políticas en casi todas las áreas: deterioro de la libertad de expresión, presión a los periodistas y activistas, restricciones a la libertad de reunión y legislación restrictiva de las ONG.

Teniendo en cuenta todo lo anterior,

¿Cómo se van a plantear las negociaciones en curso con Azerbaiyán para que, a la vez que se materializan acuerdos de índole económica, comercial y energética, se inste a su Gobierno a llevar a la práctica el contenido en el Plan de Acción Nacional sobre Derechos Humanos, especialmente con vistas a la implementación de las recomendaciones de la OSCE/ODIHR en las próximas elecciones parlamentarias y municipales?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005142/14
a la Comisión
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(17 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: Política de vecindad — Azerbaiyán

El año 2013 ha sido un año decisivo en las relaciones bilaterales entre Azerbaiyán y la UE tras la firma del Acuerdo para la Facilitación de Visados y su participación en la Cumbre de la Asociación Oriental celebrada en Vilnius. Además se están manteniendo negociaciones para desarrollar las relaciones con Azerbaiyán en otras cuestiones económicas y energéticas.

Pese a estas buenas perspectivas, el progreso llevado a cabo por el Gobierno de Azerbaiyán en la democratización de la sociedad y en el área de los Derechos Humanos deja que desear, habiéndose identificado problemas significativos, que incluyen limitaciones en la libertad de expresión, reunión y asociación, y que colocan en una desigualdad manifiesta a otros candidatos a participar en un proceso democrático.

A pesar de la adopción de un Plan de Acción Nacional sobre Derechos Humanos en el año 2011, varias de las previsiones en este incluidas se han quedado en el papel. El clima pre-electoral ha estado marcado por una significativa reducción de las libertades políticas en casi todas las áreas: deterioro de la libertad de expresión, presión a los periodistas y activistas, restricciones a la libertad de reunión y legislación restrictiva de las ONG.

Teniendo en cuenta todo lo anterior,

¿Cómo se van a plantear las negociaciones en curso con Azerbaiyán para que, a la vez que se materializan acuerdos de índole económica, comercial y energética, se inste a su Gobierno a llevar a la práctica el contenido en el Plan de Acción Nacional sobre Derechos Humanos, especialmente con vistas a la implementación de las recomendaciones de la OSCE/ODIHR en las próximas elecciones parlamentarias y municipales?

Respuesta conjunta del Sr. Füle en nombre de la Comisión
(13 de junio de 2014)

En la actualidad, la UE está negociando un acuerdo de asociación con Azerbaiyán, así como el documento de un acuerdo de modernización estratégica. Al igual que ocurre con otros acuerdos de asociación con países de la Asociación Oriental, los proyectos incluyen disposiciones relativas al respeto de los derechos humanos, el estado de Derecho y la democracia.

El acuerdo de modernización estratégica es un marco de actuación basado en los principios de la democracia, el estado de Derecho, los derechos humanos y las libertades fundamentales. Su aplicación estará sujeta a examen. El acuerdo de asociación y el documento del acuerdo de modernización estratégica van en paralelo y son complementarios.

La evaluación de la aplicación del plan de acción nacional en materia de derechos humanos y las recomendaciones de la OIDDH de la OSCE en materia electoral se reflejan en el informe sobre el progreso en la aplicación de la política europea de vecindad en Azerbaiyán de 2014. (http://eeas.europa.eu/enp/pdf/2014/country-reports/azerbaijan_en.pdf).

Su aplicación, junto con la del plan nacional de acción en materia de derechos humanos, también recibe el apoyo de la UE a través de proyectos específicos en los que participan organizaciones de la sociedad civil.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005141/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — neighbourhood policy: Azerbaijan

The signing of a visa facilitation agreement and Azerbaijan's participation in the Eastern Partnership Summit in Vilnius made 2013 a decisive year for EU-Azerbaijan bilateral relations. Negotiations were also held on developing relations with Azerbaijan in other economic and energy-related areas.

Despite the positive outlook, Azerbaijan's progress in democratising society and supporting human rights has been less than satisfactory. Serious problems have been identified, including restrictions on freedom of expression, association and assembly, which clearly place other candidates at a disadvantage when it comes to participating in a democratic process.

Although a national action plan on human rights was adopted in 2011, several of its provisions have never been implemented. In the run up to the elections, political freedom has been significantly reduced in almost every sphere, with deteriorating freedom of expression, pressure on journalists and activists, restrictions on freedom of assembly and laws passed to restrict nongovernmental organisations.

In light of the above:

How will the negotiations currently underway with Azerbaijan be formulated so that they not only result in economic, trade and energy agreements but also exert pressure on the Government of Azerbaijan to put into practice the content of its national action plan on human rights, especially in terms of implementing the recommendations of the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) in the forthcoming parliamentary and municipal elections?

Question for written answer E-005142/14
to the Commission
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Neighbourhood policy: Azerbaijan

The signing of a visa facilitation agreement and Azerbaijan's participation in the Eastern Partnership Summit in Vilnius made 2013 a decisive year for EU-Azerbaijan bilateral relations. Negotiations were also held on developing relations with Azerbaijan in other economic and energy-related areas.

Despite the positive outlook, Azerbaijan's progress in democratising society and supporting human rights has been less than satisfactory. Serious problems have been identified, including restrictions on freedom of expression, association and assembly, which clearly place other candidates at a disadvantage when it comes to participating in a democratic process.

Although a national action plan on human rights was adopted in 2011, several of its provisions have never been implemented. In the run up to the elections, political freedom has been significantly reduced in almost every sphere, with deteriorating freedom of expression, pressure on journalists and activists, restrictions on freedom of assembly and laws passed to restrict nongovernmental organisations.

In light of the above:

How will the negotiations currently underway with Azerbaijan be formulated so that they not only result in economic, trade and energy agreements but also exert pressure on the Government of Azerbaijan to put into practice the content of its national action plan on human rights, especially in terms of implementing the recommendations of the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) in the forthcoming parliamentary and municipal elections?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(13 June 2014)

At present the EU is negotiating with Azerbaijan an Association Agreement as well as a document on a Strategic Modernisation Partnership. Similarly to other Association Agreements with the countries of the Eastern Partnership the drafts include provisions on the respect for human rights, rule of law and democracy.

The Strategic Modernisation Partnership is a framework for action based on democracy, rule of law, human rights and fundamental freedoms. Its implementation will be subject to a review. The Association Agreement and the document on a Strategic Modernisation Partnership run in parallel and are complementary.

The assessment of the implementation of the national action plan on human rights and the recommendations of OSCE ODHIR regarding elections is reflected in the European Neighbourhood Policy 2014 Progress on Azerbaijan:
(http://eeas.europa.eu/enp/pdf/2014/country-reports/azerbaijan_en.pdf).

Their implementation, together with that of the national action plan for human rights is also supported by the EU via targeted projects involving civil society organisations.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005145/14
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(17 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: VP/HR — Política de vecindad y Georgia

Georgia ha llevado a cabo la mayor parte de las recomendaciones formuladas en la Política Europea de Vecindad en el año 2013, y especialmente en lo que respecta al desarrollo de las elecciones presidenciales dentro de los estándares internacionales, a la vez que ha continuado la reforma del sistema judicial y ha progresado en las reformas sectoriales y en aproximar su normativa al acervo de la Unión Europea.

No obstante, queda trabajo por hacer, en particular mediante la implementación de medidas para mejorar la protección del derecho a la intimidad, abordar los abusos en investigaciones y contra la vigilancia ilegal, así como elaborar una legislación exhaustiva contra la discriminación, asegurando especialmente los derechos de las minorías, especialmente las minorías religiosas.

Teniendo en cuenta todo lo anterior, ¿qué avances ha constatado la Alta Representante de la Unión en Georgia y qué fondos se piensa destinar este año para apoyar las reformas en curso?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005146/14
a la Comisión
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(17 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: Política de vecindad y Georgia

Georgia ha llevado a cabo la mayor parte de las recomendaciones formuladas en la Política Europea de Vecindad en el año 2013, y especialmente en lo que respecta al desarrollo de las elecciones presidenciales dentro de los estándares internacionales, a la vez que ha continuado la reforma del sistema judicial y ha progresado en las reformas sectoriales y en aproximar su normativa al acervo de la Unión Europea.

No obstante, queda trabajo por hacer, en particular mediante la implementación de medidas para mejorar la protección del derecho a la intimidad, abordar los abusos en investigaciones y contra la vigilancia ilegal, así como elaborar una legislación exhaustiva contra la discriminación, asegurando especialmente los derechos de las minorías, especialmente las minorías religiosas.

Teniendo en cuenta todo lo anterior, ¿qué avances ha constatado la Comisión en Georgia, y qué fondos se piensa destinar este año para apoyar las reformas en curso?

Respuesta conjunta del Sr. Füle en nombre de la Comisión
(11 de junio de 2014)

La evaluación de la Comisión y la Alta Representante sobre los progresos realizados por Georgia en el último año se expone en el «documento de trabajo de los servicios conjuntos sobre la aplicación de la Política Europea de Vecindad en Georgia en 2013 y recomendaciones de actuación», publicado el 27 de marzo de 2014 (puede consultarse en : http://eeas.europa.eu/enp/documents/progress-reports/index_en.htm).

Basándose en el cumplimiento de las recomendaciones y en los progresos registrados por Georgia en lo relativo a las reformas para fomentar la profundización de la democracia y el respeto de los derechos humanos, la Comisión anunció el 6 de mayo de 2014 un conjunto de ayudas para Georgia por un valor de 30 millones EUR, concedidas al amparo del mecanismo de «más por más» del nuevo Instrumento Europeo de Vecindad: programa marco multinacional. Este mecanismo premia los avances registrados en materia de reformas democráticas con asignaciones financieras adicionales. Los fondos asignados en el marco del programa de acción anual 2014 para Georgia destinado a apoyar el proceso de reformas ascienden a 101 millones EUR y servirán para financiar las reformas en dos ámbitos cruciales: i) reforma del sector judicial y ii) aplicación de la zona de libre comercio de alcance amplio y profundo (ZLCAP), lo que incluye ayudas a las pequeñas y medianas empresas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005145/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Neighbourhood policy: Georgia

Georgia has carried out most of the recommendations contained in the European Neighbourhood Policy for 2013, particularly with respect to holding presidential elections that meet international standards, and has continued its reform of the justice system and made progress on sectoral reforms and in bringing its legislation closer to that of the EU.

Nevertheless, there is still much to do, particularly when it comes to implementing measures to improve protection of the right to privacy, tackling investigative abuse and illegal surveillance and drafting comprehensive legislation to combat discrimination with special emphasis on protecting the rights of minorities, particularly religious minorities.

In light of all the above, what progress has the Vice-President/High Representative observed in Georgia and what funds are likely to be earmarked this year for supporting the reform process?

Question for written answer E-005146/14
to the Commission
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Neighbourhood policy: Georgia

Georgia has carried out most of the recommendations contained in the European Neighbourhood Policy for 2013, particularly with respect to holding presidential elections that meet international standards, and has continued its reform of the justice system and made progress on sectoral reforms and in bringing its legislation closer to that of the EU.

Nevertheless, there is still much to do, particularly when it comes to implementing measures to improve protection of the right to privacy, tackling investigative abuse and illegal surveillance and drafting comprehensive legislation to combat discrimination with special emphasis on protecting the rights of minorities, particularly religious minorities.

In light of all the above, what progress has the Commission observed in Georgia and what funds are likely to be earmarked this year for supporting the reform process?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2014)

The assessment of the Commission and HR on the progress made by Georgia over the last year is set out in the 'Joint Staff Working Document on the Implementation of the European Neighbourhood Policy in Georgia in 2013 and Recommendations for Action' published on 27 March 2014 (available at http://eeas.europa.eu/enp/documents/progress-reports/index_en.htm).

Based on the fulfilment of recommendations and progress that Georgia made in 2013 on reforms promoting deep democracy and respect for human rights, the Commission announced on 6 May 2014 a support package for Georgia worth EUR 30 million granted through the 'more for more' mechanism of the new European Neighbourhood Instrument: the multi-country umbrella programme. This mechanism rewards progress in democratic reforms with supplementary financial allocations. The funds earmarked under the Annual Action Programme 2014 for Georgia for supporting the reform process amount to EUR 101 million. They will be used to fund reforms in two key areas: (i) Justice sector reform; and (ii) Implementation of the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area (DCFTA), including support to small and medium-sized enterprises.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005147/14
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(17 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: VP/HR — Política de vecindad con Bielorrusia

Las relaciones de la Unión Europea con Bielorrusia están condicionadas por el respeto del imperio de la ley y de los derechos humanos por el Gobierno de ese país, como ha manifestado reiteradamente la UE durante el año 2013.

La UE ha reiterado igualmente su compromiso para con el desarrollo democrático de Bielorrusia mediante la apertura al diálogo y a la participación de Bielorrusia en la Asociación Oriental. A pesar de los esfuerzos en este sentido, las políticas represivas han continuado durante el año 2013, en forma de intimidación a los representantes de la llamada sociedad civil, hostigamiento a pequeña escala, amenazas de desempleo, prohibición de salir al extranjero a ciertos ciudadanos, multas a los activistas e, incluso, sentencias de encarcelamiento de corta o media duración, a veces de manera sucesiva durante un año.

La UE ha recalcado además la importancia de la inmediata liberación y rehabilitación de los presos políticos, pese a lo cual todavía quedan hoy en las cárceles bielorrusas presos políticos de los que solo han sido liberados cuatro y después de haber cumplido íntegramente las sentencias, mientras que se han registrado nuevos casos con una clara motivación política. En septiembre pasado el Parlamento aprobó las recomendaciones sobre la política de la UE con respecto a Bielorrusia tras la visita realizada por el diputado al Parlamento Europeo Paleckis en mayo del mismo año. Como resultado de la correspondiente revisión anual, el pasado mes de octubre el Consejo extendió las medidas restrictivas de la UE con respecto a Bielorrusia ante la falta de respuesta del Gobierno a los hechos antes mencionados.

Desde noviembre de 2013, el Gobierno de Bielorrusia ha tomado nuevas medidas para restringir el espacio democrático y limitar las posibilidades de la oposición política, sin que se haya puesto en práctica ninguna de las recomendaciones de la OSCE/ODIHR.

Teniendo en cuenta todo lo anterior, ¿qué otras medidas va a adoptar la Alta Representante con respecto a Bielorrusia, además de prorrogar las medidas restrictivas ya en vigor, para instar a su Gobierno a cambiar su situación política de manera democrática y transparente?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005148/14
a la Comisión
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(17 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: Política de vecindad con Bielorrusia

Las relaciones de la Unión Europea con Bielorrusia están supeditadas a la condición del respeto por el Gobierno de este país del imperio de la ley y de los derechos humanos, como ha manifestado reiteradamente la UE durante el año 2013.

La UE ha reiterado igualmente su compromiso con el desarrollo democrático de Bielorrusia mediante la apertura al diálogo y a la participación de Bielorrusia en la Asociación Oriental. A pesar de los esfuerzos en este sentido, las políticas represivas continuaron durante el año 2013, en forma de intimidación a los representantes de la llamada sociedad civil, hostigamiento a pequeña escala, la amenaza del desempleo, la prohibición de salir al extranjero a ciertos ciudadanos, las multas a los activistas o, incluso, sentencias de encarcelamiento de corta o media duración, a veces de manera sucesiva durante un año.

La UE ha insistido además en la importancia de la inmediata liberación y rehabilitación de los prisioneros políticos, pese a lo cual a día de hoy todavía se mantiene a prisioneros políticos en las cárceles bielorrusas, de los cuales fueron liberados solo cuatro de ellos y después de haber cumplido íntegramente las sentencias, mientras que se registraron nuevos casos con una clara motivación política. En septiembre pasado el Parlamento aprobó las recomendaciones de sobre la política de la UE con respecto a Bielorrusia, tras la visita realizada por el diputado al Parlamento Europeo señor Paleckis en mayo del mismo año; como resultado de la correspondiente revisión anual, el pasado octubre el Consejo extendió las medidas restrictivas de la UE con respecto a Bielorrusia ante la falta de respuesta del Gobierno en relación con hechos mencionados.

Desde noviembre de 2013, el Gobierno de Bielorrusia ha tomado nuevas medidas para restringir el espacio democrático y limitar las posibilidades de la oposición política, sin que se haya seguido ni haya sido puesta en práctica ninguna de las recomendaciones de la OSCE/ODIHR.

Teniendo en cuenta todo lo anterior:

¿Qué otras medidas va a adoptar la Comisión con respecto a Bielorrusia, además de prorrogar las medidas restrictivas ya en vigor, para instar a su Gobierno a cambiar su situación política de manera democrática y transparente?

Respuesta conjunta del comisario Füle en nombre de la Comisión

(5 de junio de 2014)

La UE sigue activa en una política de compromiso crítico con respecto a Bielorrusia. Esto incluye la cooperación a través de la vía multilateral de la Asociación Oriental y diálogos técnicos en temas específicos de interés común, así como apoyo a la sociedad civil y a la población bielorrusa. Al mismo tiempo, en el contexto de la profunda preocupación de la UE por la falta de progreso en lo que respecta a la situación de los derechos humanos en Bielorrusia, el Consejo aprobó la prórroga (por un año) de las medidas restrictivas.

A lo largo de 2013, la UE ha expresado en numerosas ocasiones su grave preocupación por la falta de respeto de los derechos humanos, el Estado de Derecho y los principios democráticos. La Delegación de la UE y los Estados miembros de la UE han puesto de relieve constantemente, en sus contactos con los interlocutores de la Administración bielorrusa, la importancia de la liberación inmediata y la rehabilitación de los presos políticos, así como las preocupaciones de la UE en lo que respecta al acoso a los defensores de los derechos humanos, la sociedad civil y los activistas de la oposición, o la legislación más restrictiva. La alta representante y vicepresidenta también hizo declaraciones específicas lamentando las nuevas condenas a pena de muerte en Bielorrusia. La alta representante y vicepresidenta Ashton y el comisario Füle hicieron en junio una declaración de apoyo relativa a la adopción, por parte del Consejo de Derechos Humanos de las Naciones Unidas, de una Resolución (23/15) sobre la situación de los derechos humanos en Bielorrusia.

El diálogo europeo sobre modernización con la sociedad bielorrusa constituye un foro para el libre intercambio de ideas en pro de una Bielorrusia moderna. Este diálogo se ve ahora respaldado por un nuevo proyecto de dos años.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005147/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Neighbourhood policy: Belarus

The EU's relations with Belarus are contingent on the Government of Belarus' demonstrating its respect for the rule of law and human rights, as the EU has repeatedly stressed throughout 2013.

The EU has also reiterated its commitment to the democratic development of Belarus through creating space for dialogue and the country's participation in the Eastern Partnership. Although efforts have been made in this respect, 2013 saw the continued application of repressive policies, through intimidation of civil society representatives, small-scale harassment, refusal to allow certain citizens to leave the country, fining of activists and even short or medium-term jail sentences, in some cases applied successively for up to a year.

Although the EU has also insisted that political prisoners must be immediately freed and rehabilitated, they continue to be incarcerated in Belarusian jails. Only four prisoners were released, after having fully completed their sentences, while nine new, clearly politically-motivated cases were recorded. In September 2013, the Belarusian Parliament approved the EU's political recommendations for Belarus following the visit by MEP Justas Paleckis in May of the same year. The respective annual review resulted in the Council extending the restrictive measures applied by the EU to Belarus because of the government's lack of response on a number of the issues raised.

Since November 2013, the Government of Belarus has taken further steps to restrict democratic space and limit the scope of the political opposition and has neither followed nor implemented any of the OSCE/ODIHR recommendations.

In light of the above:

What other action does the Vice-President/High Representative intend to take with regard to Belarus, apart from extending the existing restrictions, in order to exert pressure on its government to change the political situation in a democratic and transparent manner?

Question for written answer E-005148/14
to the Commission
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Neighbourhood policy: Belarus

The EU's relations with Belarus are contingent on the Government of Belarus' demonstrating its respect for the rule of law and human rights, as the EU has repeatedly stressed throughout 2013.

The EU has also reiterated its commitment to the democratic development of Belarus through creating space for dialogue and the country's participation in the Eastern Partnership. Although efforts have been made in this respect, 2013 saw the continued application of repressive policies, through intimidation of civil society representatives, small-scale harassment, refusal to allow certain citizens to leave the country, fining of activists and even short or medium-term jail sentences, in some cases applied successively for up to a year.

Although the EU has also insisted that political prisoners must be immediately freed and rehabilitated, they continue to be incarcerated in Belarusian jails. Only four prisoners were released, after having fully completed their sentences, while nine new, clearly politically-motivated cases were recorded. In September 2013, the Belarusian Parliament approved the EU's political recommendations for Belarus following the visit by MEP Justas Paleckis in May of the same year. The respective annual review resulted in the Council extending the restrictive measures applied by the EU to Belarus because of the government's lack of response on a number of the issues raised.

Since November 2013, the Government of Belarus has taken further steps to restrict democratic space and limit the scope of the political opposition and has neither followed nor implemented any of the OSCE/ODIHR recommendations.

In light of the above:

What other action does the Commission intend to take with regard to Belarus, apart from extending the existing restrictions, in order to exert pressure on its government to change the political situation in a democratic and transparent manner?

Joint answer given by Commissioner Füle on behalf of the Commission

(5 June 2014)

The EU remains committed to a policy of critical engagement towards Belarus. This includes cooperation through the multilateral track of the EaP and technical dialogues on specific topics of common interest, as well as support to civil society and to the Belarusian population at large. At the same time, against the background of the EU's serious concerns about the lack of progress as regards the human rights situation in Belarus, the Council approved the prolongation (by one year) of the restrictive measures.

Throughout 2013, the EU at numerous occasions expressed its grave concern regarding the lack of respect for human rights, the rule of law and democratic principles. The EU Delegation and EU member states have continuously, in contacts with interlocutors in the Belarusian administration, raised the importance of immediately releasing and rehabilitating political prisoners, as well as EU concerns regarding cases of harassment of human rights defenders, civil society and opposition activists, or further restrictive legislation. The HR/VP also made specific statements regretting the issuing of new death sentences in Belarus. The HR/VP Ashton and Commissioner Füle made a supportive statement in June related to the adoption by the UN Human Rights Council of a resolution (23/15) on the Situation of human rights in BY.

The European Dialogue for Modernisation with Belarusian society provides a forum for the free exchange of ideas for a modern Belarus. This Dialogue is now further supported by a new two-year project.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005149/14
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(17 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: VP/HR — Política de vecindad — Israel

Cabe considerar el estado de las relaciones bilaterales con Israel y el progreso en el desarrollo del Plan de Acción del año 2005, del que, no obstante, aún quedan acciones pendientes de implementar. Por ejemplo, es necesario realizar esfuerzos adicionales para asegurar la igualdad de todos los ciudadanos israelíes, en particular, por lo que se refiere a las minorías de origen árabe, como los beduinos del Neguev, y a la situación de los niños sin estatus (menores nacidos en Israel pero que carecen de estatus legal de residente).

Teniendo en cuenta todo lo anterior, ¿de qué manera se están planeando o llevando a cabo proyectos de colaboración con el Gobierno de Israel para que la integración de estos colectivos se produzca sin menoscabo de sus derechos, y especialmente en el caso de los menores en situación irregular?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005150/14
a la Comisión
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(17 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: Política de vecindad — Israel

Cabe considerar el estado de las relaciones bilaterales con Israel y el progreso en el desarrollo del Plan de Acción del año 2005, del que, no obstante, aún quedan acciones pendientes de implementar. Por ejemplo, es necesario realizar esfuerzos adicionales para asegurar la igualdad de todos los ciudadanos israelíes, en particular, por lo que se refiere a las minorías de origen árabe, como los beduinos del Neguev, y a la situación de los niños sin estatus (menores nacidos en Israel pero que carecen de estatus legal de residente).

Teniendo en cuenta todo lo anterior, ¿de qué manera se están planeando o llevando a cabo proyectos de colaboración con el Gobierno de Israel para que la integración de estos colectivos se produzca sin menoscabo de sus derechos, y especialmente en el caso de los menores en situación irregular?

Respuesta conjunta de la alta representante y vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(4 de julio de 2014)

El Instrumento Europeo para la Democracia y los Derechos Humanos y el Instrumento para la Sociedad Civil de la PEV son las herramientas fundamentales para apoyar proyectos que contribuyan al fomento del respeto de los derechos humanos y a la consolidación de un entorno propicio para los agentes no estatales.

Las cuestiones planteadas por Su Señoría se cuentan entre las prioridades establecidas para la financiación de proyectos por la Delegación de la UE en Tel Aviv. Más en concreto, las prioridades para la selección de propuestas fueron en 2013 las siguientes:

Objetivo 1: Apoyo a un entorno propicio para las organizaciones de la sociedad civil y el fomento de los derechos humanos, sobre todo mediante el estímulo de la educación en la materia y el respeto del Estado de Derecho y las normas internacionales, apoyo a las organizaciones en pro de los derechos humanos, salvaguarda de las libertades de asociación y de expresión, lucha contra la xenofobia, el racismo y la discriminación por motivos de religión o creencias y contra cualquier forma de incitación al odio.

Objetivo 2: Fomento de los derechos de los grupos vulnerables o minorías de Israel, especialmente la minoría árabe y los refugiados y solicitantes de asilo.

Objetivo 3: Respeto del Derecho internacional humanitario y de los derechos humanos en los territorios palestinos ocupados, incluidos los derechos de los niños en los conflictos armados.

Además, y con atención especial a los menores, la UE también ha financiado recientemente un proyecto sobre la «Protección de los derechos de los menores refugiados y solicitantes de asilo, migrantes y no acompañados», ejecutado por una coalición de organizaciones dirigida por Hotline for Migrants and Refugees, que ha conseguido garantizar alternativas a la detención para todos los menores migrantes en Israel.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005149/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Neighbourhood policy: Israel

Consideration should be given to the state of bilateral relations with Israel and the progress made in developing the 2005 Action Plan, some parts of which have yet to be implemented. There is, for example, a need for greater effort to ensure that all Israeli citizens enjoy equal rights, particularly the Arab minorities, such as the Negev Bedouin, and stateless minors (children born in Israel but without any legal status there).

In light of the above, on what basis are projects being planned or carried out in collaboration with the Government of Israel to ensure that these citizens are integrated without curtailment of their rights, particularly in the case of irregular minors?

Question for written answer E-005150/14
to the Commission
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Neighbourhood policy: Israel

Consideration should be given to the state of bilateral relations with Israel and the progress made in developing the 2005 Action Plan, some parts of which have yet to be implemented. There is, for example, a need for greater effort to ensure that all Israeli citizens enjoy equal rights, particularly the Arab minorities, such as the Negev Bedouin, and stateless minors (children born in Israel but without any legal status there).

In light of the above, on what basis are projects being planned or carried out in collaboration with the Government of Israel to ensure that these citizens are integrated without curtailment of their rights, particularly in the case of irregular minors?

Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(4 July 2014)

The European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights, as well as the Neighbourhood Civil Society Facility, are the key instruments to support projects contributing to the promotion of respect for human rights and to the reinforcement of an enabling environment for non-state actors.

The issues raised by the Honourable Member are among the priorities set for the funding of projects by the EU Delegation in Tel Aviv. More specifically, in 2013, the priorities for the selection of proposals were the following:

Objective 1: Supporting a favourable environment for civil society organisations and the promotion of Human rights, in particular by fostering human rights education and respect for the rule of law and International standards, supporting human rights defenders and organisations, safeguarding freedom of association and freedom of expression, fighting against xenophobia, racism, and discrimination on the basis of religion or belief, and any form of hate speech;

Objective 2: Advancing the rights of vulnerable groups or minorities within Israel, notably the Arab minority and refugees/asylum-seekers;

Objective 3: Respect for international humanitarian law and human rights in the occupied Palestinian Territory, including the rights of the children in armed conflicts.

Moreover and on minors in particular, the EU also recently funded a project on 'Protection of the Rights of the Refugee-/Asylum Seeker Child, Migrant Child and Unaccompanied Minor', implemented by a coalition of organisations led by Hotline for Migrants and Refugees, which successfully managed to ensure that alternatives to detention are found for all migrant minors in Israel.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005151/14
an die Kommission
Andreas Schwab (PPE)
(17. April 2014)

Betrifft: Leitlinien für vertikale Beschränkungen: Verbot der Nutzung bestimmter Plattformen (eBay, Amazon u. ä.)

Zahlreiche Markenhersteller beschränken den Internetvertrieb, indem sie ihren Händlern die Nutzung unabhängiger Marktplatz-Plattformen (z. B. eBay, Amazon) verbieten. Insbesondere Markenhersteller, die sich eines selektiven Vertriebs bedienen, benutzen dieses Verbot, um im Interesse der Kunden und der Händler das Image ihrer Markenprodukte vor einer Verwässerung zu schützen.

Die Kommission hat in ihren Leitlinien für vertikale Beschränkungen klargestellt, dass Markenhersteller verlangen können, dass Kunden die Website des Händlers nicht über eine Website aufrufen, die den Namen oder das Logo einer Plattform trägt, wie es bei solchen Marktplätzen regelmäßig der Fall ist (Rdnr. 54 der Leitlinien).

Allerdings besteht aktuell Rechtsunklarheit hinsichtlich dieser Passage der Leitlinien. Das deutsche Bundeskartellamt hat beispielsweise unlängst in seinem Hintergrundpapier „Vertikale Beschränkungen in der Internetökonomie“ die Aussagen der Vertikal-Leitlinien zum Verbot der Marktplattformen infrage gestellt. Dort heißt es: „Die Rechtsprechung des EuGH in Sachen Pierre Fabre, die Wettbewerbsbeschränkungen zum Schutz eines etwaigen Markenimages kritisch beurteilt, stellt die Ausführungen in den Leitlinien allerdings in Frage.“ In diesem Hintergrundpapier führt das Amt weiter aus, dass das Verbot der Marktplattformen nicht mit Artikel 101 Absatz 3 AEUV in Einklang stehe. Auch die Rechtsprechung ist in Sachen Verbot der Marktplattformen uneinheitlich.

Es sind keine Entscheidungen andere nationaler Kartellbehörden oder Gerichte in anderen Mitgliedstaaten bekannt, die diese Rechtsunsicherheit mildern könnten.

Für viele Markenhersteller führen diese inkonsistenten Aussagen zu großer Unsicherheit in einem für den europäischen Binnenmarkt wesentlichen Bereich — dem Internetvertrieb. Die einheitliche Anwendung des EU-Kartellrechts scheint gefährdet.

Hält es die Kommission nicht für geboten, Rechtsklarheit wiederherzustellen, indem die Bindungswirkung der Vertikal-Leitlinien geklärt und insbesondere Klarheit hinsichtlich der Nutzung von Marktplattformen geschaffen wird?

Sieht die Kommission angesichts des äußerst dynamischen Internetmarktes keine Notwendigkeit, diese Rechtsklarheit möglichst bald wiederherzustellen?

Antwort von Herrn Almunia im Namen der Kommission
(12. Juni 2014)

Die Leitlinien für vertikale Beschränkungen ([1]) sind für die Kommission verbindlich und dienen Wirtschaftsbeteiligten und anderen Wettbewerbsbehörden als Richtschnur. Diese Leitlinien legen deutlich fest, dass eine Beschränkung, die den Vertriebshändlern den Vertrieb von Produkten über Plattformen Dritter verbietet, die das Logo des Drittanbieters tragen, unter die Safe-Harbour-Bestimmungen der Gruppenfreistellungsverordnung (EU) Nr. 330/2010 ([2]) fallen kann.

Das Urteil in der Rechtssache *Pierre Fabre* ([3]) betraf einen anderen Umstand, nämlich ein Vertriebshändlern auferlegtes vollständiges Verbot, Produkte über das Internet zu verkaufen. Ein solches vollständiges Verbot ist weiterreichend als die Beschränkungen, die den Verkauf auf Plattformen mit Logos von Dritten betreffen. Der Gerichtshof hat geurteilt, dass ein vollständiges Verbot eine bezweckte Beschränkung nach Artikel 101 Absatz 1 AEUV darstellt, und bestätigt, dass es sich um eine Beschränkung im Sinne des Artikels 4 der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 330/2010 handelt ([4]).

In ihrer Antwort auf die Anfrage E-000181/2013 hat die Kommission dargelegt, wie sie die Anwendung der EU-Wettbewerbsvorschriften innerhalb des Europäischen Wettbewerbsnetzes kontinuierlich überwacht, z. B. durch Gespräche mit den nationalen Wettbewerbsbehörden über deren Durchsetzungsmaßnahmen. Darüber hinaus trägt die Kommission auch zur Rechtssicherheit bei, indem sie selbst die Wettbewerbsvorschriften der EU durchsetzt.

([1]) Leitlinien für vertikale Beschränkungen (ABl. C 130 vom 19.5.2010, S. 1).
([2]) Siehe Rdnr. 54 der Leitlinien für vertikale Beschränkungen und Verordnung (EU) Nr. 330/2010 der Kommission vom 20. April 2010 über die Anwendung von Artikel 101 Absatz 3 des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union auf Gruppen von vertikalen Vereinbarungen und abgestimmten Verhaltensweisen (ABl. L 102 vom 23.4.2010, S. 1).
([3]) Urteil des Gerichtshofs vom 13. Oktober 2011, Pierre Fabre/Président de l'Autorité de la Concurrence C-439/09.
([4]) Das Urteil betraf die vorhergehende Gruppenfreistellungsverordnung 2790/1999, doch die betreffende Bestimmung ist dieselbe.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005151/14
to the Commission
Andreas Schwab (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Guidelines on Vertical Restraints: prohibition of the use of certain platforms (eBay, Amazon and the like)

Many manufacturers of branded goods place restrictions on sales via the Internet by prohibiting their distributors from using independent marketplace platforms (e.g. eBay, Amazon). In particular brands which use selective distribution take advantage of this prohibition to protect the image of their branded products against dilution, in the interests of customers and distributors.

In its Guidelines on Vertical Restraints, the Commission made it clear that brands may require that customers do not visit the distributor's website through a website carrying the name or logo of a platform, as is generally the case with such marketplaces (paragraph 54 of the Guidelines).

However, there is currently a lack of legal clarity in relation this passage of the Guidelines. For instance, in its background paper '*Vertikale Beschränkungen in der Internetökonomie*' ('Vertical restrictions in the Internet economy'), the German Federal Cartel Office recently called into question what the Vertical Guidelines say about the prohibition of market platforms. It is stated in the paper: 'However, the case law of the ECJ in the Pierre Fabre case, which takes a critical view of the restrictions on competition for the purposes of the protection of any brand image, calls into question the statements made in the Guidelines'. The Office further states in this background paper that the prohibition on market platforms is not consistent with Article 101(3) TFEU. The case law relating to the prohibition of market platforms is also inconsistent.

There are no known decisions by other national competition authorities or courts in other Member States which might alleviate this legal uncertainty.

For many manufacturers of branded products, these inconsistent statements have led to great uncertainty in a key sector for the European internal market — Internet marketing. It would seem that the uniform application of EU competition law is in jeopardy.

Does the Commission not consider it necessary to restore legal clarity by declaring that the Vertical Guidelines have binding effect and, in particular, clarifying the situation with regard to the use of market platforms?

In view of the Internet market being an extremely dynamic one, does the Commission not consider that it is necessary to restore this legal clarity as soon as possible?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2014)

The Guidelines on Vertical Restraints ([1]) are binding upon the Commission and serve as guidance for stakeholders and other competition authorities. These Guidelines are clear in indicating that a restriction on authorised distributors not to sell through third party platforms carrying the logo of the third party may benefit from the safe harbour of Block Exemption Regulation 330/2010 ([2]).

The judgment in the Pierre Fabre case ([3]) concerned a different issue, namely a total ban on selected distributors from selling on the Internet in any form. Such a total ban is more far-reaching than restrictions limited to sales on platforms displaying a third party logo. The Court of Justice ruled that a total ban is a restriction of Article 101(1) TFEU by object, and confirmed that it constitutes a restriction within the meaning of Article 4 of Regulation 330/2010 ([4]).

In its reply to Question E-000181/2013, the Commission explained how it continuously monitors the application of the EU competition rules within the European Competition Network, including through regular discussions with National Competition Authorities on their enforcement actions. Moreover, the Commission also contributes to legal certainty through its own enforcement of EU competition rules.

([1]) Guidelines on Vertical Restraints, OJ C 130, 19.5.2010, p. 1.
([2]) See point 54 of the Guidelines on Vertical Restraints and Commission Regulation (EU) no. 330/2010 of 20.4.2010 on the Application of Article 101(3) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union to categories of vertical agreements and concerted practices, OJ L 102, 23.4.2010, p. 1. .
([3]) Case C-439/09 (reference for a preliminary ruling from the Cour d'appel de Paris (France)) — Pierre Fabre Dermo-Cosmétique SAS v Président de l'Autorité de la Concurrence, Ministre de l'Économie, de l'Industrie et de l'Emploi.
([4]) The judgment concerned the preceding Block Exemption Regulation 2790/1999, but the relevant provision is the same.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005152/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(17 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Ερμηνεία του κανονισμού (ΕΕ) αριθ. 404/2011 σχετικά με το σφάλμα στίγματος των συσκευών δορυφορικού εντοπισμού αλιευτικών σκαφών

Σύμφωνα με τον εκτελεστικό κανονισμό (ΕΕ) αριθ. 404/2011 της Επιτροπής της 8ης Απριλίου 2011 για τη θέσπιση λεπτομερών κανόνων σχετικά με την εφαρμογή του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1224/2009 περί της θέσπισης κοινοτικού συστήματος ελέγχου για την εξασφάλιση της τήρησης των κανόνων της κοινής αλιευτικής πολιτικής ([1]), και ιδιαίτερα το άρθρο 19, συσκευές δορυφορικού εντοπισμού εγκατεστημένες επί αλιευτικών σκαφών της ΕΕ εξασφαλίζουν τη διαβίβαση δεδομένων στα κέντρα παρακολούθησης σκαφών στα κράτη μέλη. Στο άρθρο 19 παράγραφος 1(β) προβλέπεται ότι οι συσκευές διαβιβάζουν δεδομένα που αφορούν, μεταξύ άλλων, «το πλέον πρόσφατο γεωγραφικό στίγμα του αλιευτικού σκάφους … με ποσοστό αξιοπιστίας 99%» προβλέποντας όμως και «… σφάλμα στίγματος μικρότερο των 500 μέτρων …». Στην Ελλάδα, αλιείς υποστηρίζουν ότι επιβάλλονται λανθασμένα υψηλά πρόστιμα για αλιευτικές παραβάσεις σχετικές με τη χρήση εργαλείων σε μη επιτρεπόμενη, με βάση το σύστημα παρακολούθησης σκαφών (VMS), απόσταση από ακτές, ηπειρωτικές και νησιωτικές. Όμως, οι μετρήσεις αυτές εμφανίζουν αποκλίσεις από τα επιτρεπόμενα όρια νόμιμης αλίευσης κατά μέσον όρο 200 μέτρων, απόστασης δηλαδή που εμπίπτει στο προβλεπόμενο σφάλμα στίγματος.

Με βάση τα παραπάνω και δεδομένης της σημασίας της αλιείας για την Ελλάδα και την πιθανότητα εσφαλμένης επιβολής υψηλών προστίμων που βλάπτουν την οικονομική δραστηριότητα και την παραγωγικότητα, ιδίως στα νησιά και τις παράκτιες περιοχές, η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή ερωτάται:

1. Συνυπολογίζεται το σφάλμα στίγματος προτού επιβληθούν τα πρόστιμα;

2. Πώς ερμηνεύει τη συγκεκριμένη παράγραφο 1(β) του άρθρου 19 ώστε να εξασφαλίζει την ομοιόμορφη και δίκαιη εφαρμογή του πνεύματος και του στόχου του κανονισμού;

3. Έχει γίνει ή προβλέπεται άμεσα απολογισμός της εφαρμογής του εν λόγω κανονισμού γενικότερα αλλά και ειδικότερα ως προς το θέμα του άρθρου 19 παράγραφος 1(β);

4. Έχει δεχθεί παρόμοιες ενστάσεις από άλλα κράτη μέλη;

Απάντηση της κ. Δαμανάκη εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(16 Ιουνίου 2014)

Οι διατάξεις του άρθρου 9 του κανονισμού ελέγχου (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1224/2009 επιβάλλουν στα κράτη μέλη την υποχρέωση να θέσουν σε λειτουργία δορυφορικό σύστημα παρακολούθησης σκαφών (VMS) για την ουσιαστική παρακολούθηση των αλιευτικών δραστηριοτήτων των σκαφών τους, όπου και αν βρίσκονται, και των αλιευτικών δραστηριοτήτων που πραγματοποιούνται στα ύδατά τους. Οι συσκευές VMS που προορίζονται να τοποθετηθούν στα σκάφη τους πρέπει να εγκρίνονται από το κράτος μέλος. Όπως προβλέπεται στο άρθρο 19 του εκτελεστικού κανονισμού (ΕΕ) αριθ. 404/2011 της Επιτροπής, η έγκριση αυτή εξασφαλίζει ότι το σφάλμα στίγματος του αλιευτικού σκάφους πρέπει να είναι μικρότερο από 500 μέτρα και με βαθμό εμπιστοσύνης 99%. Ένα κράτος μέλος μπορεί να επιβάλει στα δικά του σκάφη την υποχρέωση να είναι εξοπλισμένα με συσκευές VMS αυστηρότερων απαιτήσεων, καθώς και αυστηρότερου σφάλματος στίγματος.

Τα τυποποιημένα πρότυπα που ισχύουν για τα σκάφη της ΕΕ, σε σχέση με τις διατάξεις που αφορούν το σύστημα παρακολούθησης σκαφών, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της αξιοπιστίας των δεδομένων, των ελάχιστων διασφαλίσεων και των κοινών προδιαγραφών των συσκευών VMS, έχουν πράγματι καθοριστεί σε επίπεδο ΕΕ μέσω του άρθρου 19 του εκτελεστικού κανονισμού (ΕΕ) αριθ. 404/2011 της Επιτροπής.

Ο κανονισμός ελέγχου (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1224/2009 προβλέπει την αξιολόγησή του κάθε 5 έτη. Το 2015, η Επιτροπή θα καταρτίσει έκθεση, με βάση τα στοιχεία που διαβιβάζουν τα κράτη μέλη καθώς και τις δικές της παρατηρήσεις, όσον αφορά το σύνολο του κανονισμού περί ελέγχου.

Η Επιτροπή δεν γνωρίζει εάν έχουν ανακύψει παρόμοιες ανησυχίες σε άλλα κράτη μέλη σχετικά με το συγκεκριμένο ζήτημα.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:112:0001:0153:EL:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005152/14
to the Commission
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Interpretation of Regulation (EU) No 404/2011 in connection with the position error of satellite-tracking devices installed on board fishing vessels

According to Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 404/2011 of 8 April 2011 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Regulation (EC) No 1224/2009 establishing a Community control system for ensuring compliance with the rules of the common fisheries policy, ([1]) especially Article 19, satellite-tracking devices installed on board EU fishing vessels ensure the automatic transmission of data to fisheries monitoring centres. Article 19(1)(b) states that devices shall transmit data relating, among other things, to 'the most recent geographical position of the fishing vessel, with a position error which shall be less than 500 metres, with a confidence interval of 99%'. In Greece, fishermen are complaining that large fines are being wrongly imposed for fisheries offences in connection with the use of gear within prohibited distances from mainland or island shores based on the vessel monitoring system (VMS). However, those measurements differ from permissible legal fishing limits by an average of 200 metres, i.e. a distance which is covered by the permissible position error.

In view of the above and given the importance of fisheries to Greece and the possibility that large fines are being wrongly imposed, thereby damaging economic activity and productivity, especially in island and coastal areas, will the Commission say:

1. Is the position error included before fines are imposed?

2. How does it interpret Article 19(1)(b) so as to safeguard the uniform and fair application of the spirit and purpose of the directive?

3. Has a report been prepared on the application of this regulation in general and Article 19(1)(b) in particular or is one planned?

4. Has it received similar complaints from other Member States?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(16 June 2014)

The provisions of Article 9 of the Control Regulation (EC) No 1224/2009 bring with them an obligation for Member States to operate a satellite based vessel monitoring system (VMS for effective monitoring of fishing activities of their vessels wherever those vessels may be and of fishing activities within their waters. The VMS devices to be put on board their vessels must be approved by the Member State. As laid down in Article 19 of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 404/2011, this approval shall ensure that the position error of the fishing vessel shall be less than 500 metres with a confidence interval of 99%. A Member State may impose upon its own vessels an obligation to be equipped with VMS devices with stricter requirements, including a more stringent position error.

Standardised conditions applying to EU vessels, with regard to VMS-related provisions, including data reliability and safeguards minimum and common specifications for VMS devices, are indeed set at EU level by means of Article 19 of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 404/2011.

The Control Regulation (EC) No 1224/2009 provides for its evaluation every 5 years. In 2015, the Commission will prepare a report on the basis of input from the Member States and its own observations concerning the full Control Regulation.

The Commission is not aware of similar concerns arising in other Member States on this specific issue.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:112:0001:0153:EN:PDF

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005153/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(17 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Μεταρρύθμιση στην ευρωπαϊκή πολιτική για τα άτομα με αναπηρίες

Σύμφωνα με το European Disability Forum, περίπου το 16% των ευρωπαίων πολιτών είναι άτομα με αναπηρία. Παρά τις πρωτοβουλίες που έχουν ληφθεί από την κοινωνία των πολιτών, την ΕΕ και από τα κράτη μέλη, οι συνθήκες διαβίωσης των συμπολιτών μας με αναπηρία δεν είναι πάντοτε οι επιθυμητές. Βασικές προτεραιότητες για την ενίσχυση της πρόσβασης σε υπηρεσίες και συνολικά της βελτίωσης της ποιότητας ζωής και της προάσπισης των δικαιωμάτων τους, αποτελεί η συνολική ένταξη των τομέων που τους αφορούν σε μία γενική διεύθυνση με αποκλειστική αρμοδιότητα την πολιτική για τα άτομα με αναπηρία, αλλά και την ευκολότερη πρόσβαση σε χρηματοδοτήσεις. Αξίζει να σημειωθεί πως, παρά την πρόοδο που έχει σημειωθεί στην ΕΕ, το κάθε κράτος μέλος εξακολουθεί να ασκεί διαφορετική πολιτική, ακόμη και στην πρόσβαση σε οικονομικούς πόρους, γεγονός που δημιουργεί μεγάλες διαφορές μεταξύ των κρατών μελών. Το European Disability Forum έχει ήδη καταθέσει προς δημόσια διαβούλευση το EDF Manifesto, στο οποίο παρουσιάζονται αναλυτικά σχετικές προτάσεις.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Υποστηρίζει την δημιουργία Γενικής Διεύθυνσης για τα άτομα με αναπηρία, υπό την αρμοδιότητα ενός Επιτρόπου;

Απάντηση της κ. Reding εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(13 Ιουνίου 2014)

Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος στις απαντήσεις που έδωσε στις γραπτές ερωτήσεις E-011019/2013, E-011077/2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005153/14
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Reform of European policy on persons with disabilities

According to the European Disability Forum, approximately 16% of European citizens are disabled. Despite initiatives taken by civil society, the EU and Member States, the living conditions of persons with disabilities are not always ideal. The main priorities to improve their access to services and generally improve their quality of life and safeguard their rights include full integration of sectors that concern them into a directorate general with sole responsibility for disability policies and easier access to funding. It should be noted that, despite the progress made in the EU, the Member States each continue to apply different policies, even in terms of access to financial resources, which in itself creates major differences from one Member State to another. The European Disability Forum has already put forward the EDF Manifesto detailing all the relevant proposals for public consultation.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

Is it in support of the establishment of a Directorate General for persons with disabilities under the responsibility of a single Commissioner?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(13 June 2014)

The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its answers to written questions E-011019/2013, E-011077/2013.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005154/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(17 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Πρόγραμμα για την οικονομική διευκόλυνση δήμων στην Ελλάδα από την Ευρωπαϊκή Τράπεζα Επενδύσεων και το Ταμείο Παρακαταθηκών και Δανείων

Μετά από συμφωνία της Ευρωπαϊκής Τράπεζας Επενδύσεων με το Ταμείο Παρακαταθηκών και Δανείων στην Ελλάδα, προκύπτει ένα κοινό πρόγραμμα συνεργασίας για την χρηματοδότηση δημοτικών έργων με ανταποδοτικό και αναπτυξιακό πρόσημο, ακόμα και στις περιπτώσεις υπερχρεωμένων δήμων. Καταρχήν, θα διατίθενται προς δανεισμό 200 εκ. ευρώ, με χαμηλά επιτόκια, ύψους 3,32% για το κυμαινόμενο και 5,26% για το σταθερό επιτόκιο, 25ετούς διάρκειας. Στην σχετική συμφωνία προβλέπεται ειδική πρόνοια χρηματοδότησης των δήμων ακόμη και για εκπόνηση μελετών, που θα γίνεται σε συνεργασία με την ΠΕΤΑ ΑΕ, την σχετική Αναπτυξιακή Εταιρεία της πρωτοβάθμιας και δευτεροβάθμιας αυτοδιοίκησης στην Ελλάδα. Σημειώνεται πως η Τρόικα έχει υπαγορεύσει την θέσπιση του Παρατηρητηρίου Οικονομικής Αυτοτέλειας των Οργανισμών Τοπικής Αυτοδιοίκησης, που αποτελεί επιπλέον μέτρο παρακολούθησης της οικονομικής δραστηριότητας των δήμων στην Ελλάδα.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει για το θεσμικό πλαίσιο συμφωνίας της Ευρωπαϊκής Τράπεζας Επενδύσεων με το Ταμείο Παρακαταθηκών και Δανείων στην Ελλάδα και αν οι υφιστάμενοι όροι επιλεξιμότητας μπορούν να μεταβληθούν εις βάρος των οργανισμών τοπικής αυτοδιοίκησης;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(13 Ιουνίου 2014)

Σύμφωνα με τις πληροφορίες που παρασχέθηκαν στην Επιτροπή, η ΕΤΕπ έχει υπογράψει δύο συμβάσεις χρηματοδότησης με το Ταμείο Παρακαταθηκών και Δανείων («ΤΠΔ» ή το «Ταμείο») για συνολικό ποσό ύψους 100 εκατ. ευρώ από τους ιδίους πόρους της Τράπεζας και με δικό της κίνδυνο, έτσι ώστε το Ταμείο να δανείσει στη συνέχεια ελληνικές τοπικές αρχές και φορείς του δημοσίου για επιλέξιμα μικρά και μεσαία επενδυτικά σχέδια. Σκοπός των εν λόγω συμφωνιών αναδανεισμού είναι να μπορέσουν οι τελικοί δικαιούχοι να επενδύσουν στους τομείς των μεταφορών, της αποκατάστασης των οδών/του οδικού δικτύου και της βελτίωσης της ασφάλειας της κυκλοφορίας, των εκπαιδευτικών υποδομών, της πολιτιστικής και ιστορικής κληρονομιάς, της αποκατάστασης δημόσιων κτιρίων, καθώς και να λάβουν ορισμένα μέτρα στους τομείς του περιβάλλοντος, της ενεργειακής απόδοσης και της ανάπτυξης των τουριστικών υποδομών.

Η ΕΤΕπ έχει ενημερώσει την Επιτροπή ότι στις συμβάσεις χρηματοδότησης έχει συνομολογηθεί ο όρος ότι κάθε συμφωνία αναδανεισμού πρέπει, πριν την υποβολή της στην ΕΤΕπ ως επιλέξιμη για χρηματοδότηση, να υποβληθεί στο Ελληνικό Ελεγκτικό Συνέδριο προκειμένου να λάβει τη σχετική έγκριση. Επιπλέον, κάθε σχέδιο/κατανομή ποσών που υποβάλλει το ΤΠΔ στην ΕΤΕπ υπόκειται σε μεμονωμένη εξέταση και έγκριση από τις εσωτερικές υπηρεσίες της ΕΤΕπ.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005154/14
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Programme of financial assistance for municipalities in Greece from the European Investment Bank and the Loans and Consignments Fund

A new joint venture has been agreed between the European Investment Bank and the Loans and Consignments Fund in Greece to fund municipal works under an assistance and development banner, even in over-indebted municipalities. Firstly, EUR 200 million will be apportioned for low interest-rate loans (3.32% variable and 5.26% fixed) with a 25-year term. The agreement also makes provision for special municipality welfare funding, even for the purpose of carrying out research studies in collaboration with PETA SA, the development company for central and local government in Greece. It should be noted that the Troika has prohibited economic independence observatories, which are an additional measure used to monitor economic activity in the municipalities of Greece, from being established by local authorities.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

Is it in a position to advise me of the institutional framework of the agreement between the European Investment Bank and the Loans and Consignments Fund in Greece and whether or not the existing eligibility criteria may be changed to the detriment of the local authorities?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(13 June 2014)

According to the information provided to the Commission, the EIB has signed two finance contracts with the Consignment Deposits and Loan Fund ('CDLF' or the 'Fund') for a total of EUR 100 million from the Bank's own resources and at own risk, in order for the Fund to on-lend to Greek local authorities and public bodies for eligible small and medium investment projects. The purpose of these on-lending agreements is to enable the final beneficiaries to invest in the fields of transport, rehabilitation of streets/roads and improvement of traffic safety, educational infrastructures, cultural and historical heritage, public buildings rehabilitation and some measures in the fields of environment, energy efficiency, and development of tourist infrastructure.

The EIB has informed the Commission that it is a condition under the finance contracts that each on-lending agreement is presented to the Greek Court of Audit to receive the latter's approval before it can be submitted to the EIB as eligible for financing. Moreover, each project/allocation submitted by CDLF to the EIB is subject to individual analysis and approval by the EIB's internal services.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005155/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(17 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Μεταρρύθμιση στα Ευρωπαϊκά Σχολεία — Κατάργηση θρησκευτικών και αντικατάσταση μητρικής γλώσσας

Με στόχο την μείωση του κόστους λειτουργίας, το Ανώτατο Συμβούλιο των Ευρωπαϊκών Σχολείων προωθεί, στο Γυμνάσιο, μεταρρύθμιση που προβλέπει την δημιουργία τμημάτων με μεγαλύτερο αριθμό μαθητών. Για να επιτευχτεί αυτό, προτείνεται η διδασκαλία πολλών μαθημάτων, που σήμερα γίνεται στην μητρική γλώσσα, να γίνεται στις γλώσσες εργασίας των ευρωπαϊκών οργάνων. Συγκεκριμένα, για το μάθημα των θρησκευτικών προτείνονται προς ψήφιση τα ακόλουθα: α) 1η-2α Γυμνασίου να παραμείνει το μάθημα ως ομολογιακό στην μητρική γλώσσα, β) 3η-4η-5η Γυμνασίου να είναι το μάθημα ομολογιακό στην δεύτερη γλώσσα των μαθητών (αγγλικά, γαλλικά ή γερμανικά), γ) 6η-7η Γυμνασίου να διδάσκεται αντί για το ομολογιακό μάθημα ένα μάθημα όπου θα διδάσκονται όλες οι θρησκείες και συγχρόνως η αδογμάτιστη ηθική στην δεύτερη γλώσσα των μαθητών. Σημειώνεται πώς, στην περίπτωση αυτή, δεν θα είναι μάθημα θρησκευτικών αλλά ιστορία θρησκευμάτων ή πεποιθήσεων. Με δεδομένο ότι τα παιδιά αυτά μεγαλώνουν σε ένα πολυπολιτισμικό περιβάλλον μακριά από την πατρίδα τους, θα πρέπει να έχουν την απαιτούμενη γνώση και πρόσβαση στην διδασκαλία του ομολογιακού μαθήματος των θρησκευτικών στην μητρική τους γλώσσα σε όλες τις γυμνασιακές τάξεις, συμπεριλαμβανομένων της 6ης και 7ης. Έτσι, θα παραμείνει ενεργός ο βασικός πυλώνας των Ευρωπαϊκών Σχολείων, δηλαδή η διατήρηση της πολιτιστικής ταυτότητας των μαθητών, που αποτελεί θεμελιώδη αρχή των συγκεκριμένων σχολείων. Η θέση αυτή έχει κοινοποιηθεί στο Ανώτατο Συμβούλιο των Ευρωπαϊκών Σχολείων από σχετικούς φορείς.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Ποια είναι η θέση της Επιτροπής σχετικά με την προώθηση της αντικατάστασης των εθνικών γλωσσών με τις γλώσσες εργασίας και της κατάργησης του μαθήματος των θρησκευτικών στην 6η και 7η τάξη του Γυμνασίου;

Απάντηση του κ. Šefčovič εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(19 Ιουνίου 2014)

Η διαχείριση των ευρωπαϊκών σχολείων (ΕΣ) πραγματοποιείται μέσω διακυβερνητικής συνεργασίας των κρατών μελών και της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής. Οι ενδιαφερόμενοι φορείς εκπροσωπούνται στο Ανώτατο Συμβούλιο (ΑΣ), όπου λαμβάνονται αποφάσεις όσον αφορά το σύστημα των ΕΣ. Η παροχή εκπαίδευσης υψηλής ποιότητας για τα παιδιά του προσωπικού της είναι πρωταρχικής σημασίας για την Επιτροπή, η οποία όμως δεν δύναται να ενεργεί μεμονωμένα.

Στο πλαίσιο της συνάντησης του ΑΣ που πραγματοποιήθηκε στις 8-10 Απριλίου 2014, ο Γενικός Γραμματέας των ΕΣ υπέβαλλε με γραπτή διαδικασία πρόταση προς έγκριση σχετικά με τη δομή και την οργάνωση των μαθημάτων στα ΕΣ. Η εν λόγω πρόταση περιλαμβάνει ένα ειδικό σημείο που σχετίζεται με τη χρήση της γλώσσας για το μάθημα θρησκευτικών και ηθικής. Στο στάδιο αυτό, η διαδικασία εξακολουθεί να βρίσκεται σε εξέλιξη και η Επιτροπή αναμένει το αποτέλεσμα εντός των προσεχών ημερών.

Παράλληλα, το τμήμα της πρότασης που αφορά το τέταρτο έως το έβδομο έτος της δευτεροβάθμιας εκπαίδευσης θα υποβληθεί σε εξωτερική αξιολόγηση. Το συγκεκριμένο μέρος της πρότασης προτείνει τη μείωση του αριθμού των μαθημάτων θρησκευτικών και ηθικής στο τέταρτο και πέμπτο έτος, κατά μία ώρα. Για το έκτο και έβδομο έτος, η πρόταση έχει ως στόχο τη δημιουργία ενός νέου μαθήματος μη θρησκευτικού περιεχομένου το οποίο θα διεξάγεται στη δεύτερη γλώσσα των μαθητών. Το εν λόγω μάθημα θα περιλαμβάνει φιλοσοφικούς συλλογισμούς και προβληματισμούς, καθώς και την προέλευση και ιστορία των θρησκευμάτων και της ηθικής.

Η τελική έκθεση θα υποβληθεί στο ΑΣ τον Δεκέμβριο του 2015. Τα αποτελέσματα της μελέτης θα επηρεάσουν σημαντικά τις συζητήσεις και τις μελλοντικές αποφάσεις του ΑΣ.

Η Επιτροπή επέμεινε ως προς την ύπαρξη ανοικτής και περιεκτικής συζήτησης για την αναδιοργάνωση της δευτεροβάθμιας εκπαίδευσης, ούτως ώστε να διασφαλίζεται ότι θα εκτίθενται και θα συζητούνται όλες οι ανησυχίες των ενδιαφερόμενων φορέων και ότι θα υπάρχει αποτελεσματική επικοινωνία με τους γονείς στο εσωτερικό όλων των σχολείων.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005155/14
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Reforms in European Schools — Abolishing religious studies and replacing mother tongue

As part of efforts to cut operating costs, the Board of Governors of European Schools has recommended secondary school reforms that will see departments with larger numbers of pupils. To this end, it is proposing teaching numerous subjects currently taught in pupils' mother tongue in the working languages of European bodies. To be precise, the following changes have been proposed for the subject of religious studies: a) during the first two years of secondary school, the subject will remain a confessional subject taught in mother tongue; b) during the 3rd, 4th and 5th years of secondary school, it will be a confessional subject taught in the students' second language (English, French or German); c) during the 6th and 7th years of secondary school, rather than being a confessional subject, religious studies will be used to teach about all religions and non-dogmatic ethics in students' second language. In should be noted that, in this case, it will not be a religious studies lesson; rather a lesson in the history of religions and faith. Given that these children grow up in a multicultural environment, far from their home country, it is important they receive the necessary education and have access to teaching of religious studies as a confessional subject throughout their secondary education, including in their 6th and 7th years. This will ensure that the basic pillar of European schools remains solid, in the sense of maintaining the cultural identity of students, which is the fundamental principle of these particular schools. The competent bodies have notified the Supreme Council of European Schools of this position.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

What is the Commission's position regarding the proposal to replace national languages with working languages and to abolish religious studies in the 6th and 7th year of secondary school?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2014)

The European Schools are managed by intergovernmental cooperation between the Member States and the European Commission. The stakeholders are represented in the Board of Governors (BoG), where decisions concerning the European School system are taken. It is of primordial importance for the Commission that high quality education for the children of its staff is provided but it cannot act on its own.

In the framework of the meeting of the BoG that took place on 8-10 April 2014, the Secretary-General of the European Schools submitted the proposal related to the structure of studies and the organisation of courses in the European Schools to a written procedure for approval. This proposal includes a specific point related to the use of language for the religion/ethic subject. At this stage, the procedure is still on-going and the Commission is waiting for the result in the coming days.

In parallel, the part of the proposal, concerning secondary years four to seven will be submitted to an external evaluation. This part of the proposal suggests reducing the number of religion/ethics classes in years 4 and 5 by one hour. For years 6 and 7, the proposal is to create a new non-confessional course offered in language 2. This course would include philosophical reasoning and questioning as well as the origin and history of the religions and ethics.

The final report will be presented to the BoG in December 2015. The results of the study will strongly influence the discussions and the future decisions by the Board of Governors.

The Commission has insisted that there should be an open and inclusive debate on the reorganisation of the secondary cycle to ensure that all stakeholders' concerns can be raised and discussed and that an efficient communication towards the parents be ensured inside all the Schools.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005156/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(17 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Διάθεση χρηματοδοτήσεων μέσω του μηχανισμού Jessica για την βιώσιμη αστική ανάπτυξη στην Ελλάδα την περίοδο 2013-2015

Τον τελευταίο ενάμιση χρόνο, η Ελλάδα, έχει παρουσιάσει τεράστια βελτίωση στην απορροφητικότητα των διαθέσιμων πόρων από το ΕΣΠΑ. Σήμερα βρίσκεται στην 4η θέση μεταξύ των κρατών μελών της ΕΕ, με δείκτη απορροφητικότητας που αγγίζει το 67%.

Η ΕΕ, μέσω επιλεγμένων τραπεζών στην Ελλάδα, διαθέτει κονδύλια ύψους 258 εκ. ευρώ για την διετία 2013-2015, μέσω του μηχανισμού Jessica, για την βιώσιμη αστική ανάπτυξη. Οι συγκεκριμένες χρηματοδοτήσεις αφορούν κυρίως την τοπική αυτοδιοίκηση, και ειδικότερα έργα που προκύπτουν από Συμπράξεις Δημοσίου και Ιδιωτικού Τομέα.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Είναι σε θέση να μου διαθέσει σχετικά στοιχεία για την πορεία κατάθεσης σχετικών προτάσεων χρηματοδότησης από δήμους στην Ελλάδα; Ποια η περίπτωση της Περιφέρειας Αττικής;

2. Σε περίπτωση όπου μία από τις επιλεγμένες ως Ταμεία Αστικής Ανάπτυξης (ΤΑΑ) τράπεζες, αναστείλει την λειτουργία της ή απορροφηθεί από κάποια άλλη, απειλείται η ομαλή διάθεση των χρηματοδοτήσεων; Τι θα συμβεί εάν για γραφειοκρατικούς λόγους ξεπεραστεί το προβλεπόμενο διετές χρονοδιάγραμμα;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(17 Ιουνίου 2014)

1. Οι διαχειριστές ταμείων αστικής ανάπτυξης (ΤΑΑ) υπέβαλαν στην Επιτροπή τις ακόλουθες πληροφορίες: στην Ελλάδα, στα τέλη του Απριλίου 2014, υποβλήθηκαν 112 σχέδια με συνολικό προϋπολογισμό ύψους 802 εκατ. ευρώ και ζητήθηκε χρηματοδότηση ύψους 363 εκατ. ευρώ από την πρωτοβουλία Jessica. Από τα σχέδια που υπεβλήθησαν εγκρίθηκαν τα 58, με συνολικό προϋπολογισμό ύψους 502 εκατ. ευρώ και χορηγήθηκαν κονδύλια ύψους 208 εκατ. ευρώ από την πρωτοβουλία Jessica.

Στην Αττική υπεβλήθησαν 23 σχέδια, με συνολικό προϋπολογισμό ύψους 298 εκατ. ευρώ και ζητήθηκε χρηματοδότηση ύψους 126 εκατ. ευρώ από την πρωτοβουλία Jessica. Από τα σχέδια που υπεβλήθησαν εγκρίθηκαν τα 8, με συνολικό προϋπολογισμό ύψους 170 εκατ. ευρώ και χορηγήθηκαν κονδύλια ύψους 62 εκατ. ευρώ από την πρωτοβουλία Jessica. Οι χρηματοδοτήσεις που προέρχονται από την πρωτοβουλία Jessica για τα σχέδια που εγκρίθηκαν για την περιοχή της Αττικής υπερβαίνουν το ποσό της εισφοράς (50 εκατ. ευρώ)

2. Εάν μια τράπεζα η οποία έχει επιλεγεί να ενεργεί ως διαχειριστής ταμείων αστικής ανάπτυξης, εξαγορασθεί από άλλη τράπεζα, οι δραστηριότητές της όσον αφορά τα ταμεία αστικής ανάπτυξης θα πραγματοποιούνται σύμφωνα με τις αρχικές συμφωνίες χρηματοδότησης που υπεγράφησαν. Σε περίπτωση πλήρους αναστολής των λειτουργιών μιας επιλεγμένης τράπεζας, ο αντίκτυπος στις λειτουργίες των ταμείων αστικής ανάπτυξης θα εξαρτηθεί από τις δράσεις που αναλαμβάνουν οι αρμόδιες αρχές για την εξυγίανση της τράπεζας. Σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 62 παράγραφος 1 στοιχείο ε) και το άρθρο 78 παράγραφος 6 του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1083/2006 του Συμβουλίου ([1]), οι επιλέξιμες δαπάνες κατά το κλείσιμο αντιστοιχούν σε επενδύσεις που πραγματοποιούνται από τελικούς αποδέκτες, δηλαδή τα αστικά σχέδια για την πρωτοβουλία Jessica στην Ελλάδα έως τις 31 Δεκεμβρίου 2015.

([1]) Κανονισμός (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1083/2006 του Συμβουλίου, της 11ης Ιουλίου 2006, περί καθορισμού γενικών διατάξεων για το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης, το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο και το Ταμείο Συνοχής και την κατάργηση του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1260/1999, ΕΕ L 210 της 31.7.2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005156/14
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Distribution of funding via Jessica mechanism for viable urban growth in Greece for the period 2013-2015

Over the last eighteen months, Greece has made great progress in the take-up of funds under the NSRF. It is currently 4th among the EU Member States, with a take-up rate of 67%.

The EU has made funds totalling EUR 258 million available for viable urban growth under the Jessica mechanism via selected Greek banks for the period 2013-2015. Funding is intended mainly for local authorities, especially PPP projects.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Is it in a position to provide information on progress by municipalities in Greece in terms of filing funding proposals? What is the situation in the region of Attica?

2. Will the smooth distribution of funding be compromised in the event that one of the banks selected to act as an Urban Growth Fund suspends operations or is taken over by another bank? What will happen if the projected 2-year timeframe is exceeded due to bureaucratic issues?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2014)

1. The Urban Development Fund (UDF) managers have provided the Commission with the following information: in Greece, at the end of April 2014, the number of projects submitted is 112, with a total budget of EUR 802 million and Jessica allocations of EUR 363 million. Of those submitted, 58 projects have been approved with a total budget of EUR 507 million and Jessica allocations of EUR 208 million.

The number of projects submitted in Attica is 23, with a total budget of EUR 298 million and Jessica allocations of EUR 126 million. Of those submitted, 8 projects have been approved with a total budget of EUR 170 million and Jessica allocations of EUR 62 million. Jessica allocations in approved projects in the region of Attica exceed the amount contributed (EUR 50 million).

2. If a bank selected to act as an UDF manager is taken over by another bank, its operations regarding the UDF will be carried out according to the initially signed funding agreements. In the case of a full suspension of operations by a selected bank, the impact on the UDF's operations would depend on the actions taken by the responsible authorities for the resolution of the bank. According to Article 62(1)(e) and Article 78(6) of Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 ([1]), eligible expenditure at closure corresponds to investments made in final recipients, i.e. urban projects for Jessica in Greece by 31 December 2015.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 of 11.7.2006 laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999 , OJ L 210, 31.7.2006.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005157/14
aan de Commissie
Marietje Schaake (ALDE) en Andrew Duff (ALDE)
(17 april 2014)

Betreft: Fraude met EU-middelen in Turkije

Sinds december hebben zich in Turkije ontwikkelingen voorgedaan die een diepe kloof in de Turkse samenleving hebben blootgelegd, alsmede fundamentele problemen betreffende de rechtsstaat en de scheiding der machten. De recente plaatselijke verkiezingen werden ontsierd door beschuldigen van fraude. Vele hooggeplaatste regeringsfunctionarissen zijn verwikkeld in corruptieschandalen. In het kader van het pretoetredingsinstrument en overige Europese programma's ontvangt Turkije geld van de EU om het land te helpen hervormingen door te voeren waardoor het dichter bij de EU komt. In maart bevestigde de Commissie dat zij een onderzoek had gestart naar de EU-middelen die worden overgemaakt voor het Erasmus-programma in Turkije, omdat er naar verluidt onregelmatigheden zou hebben plaatsgevonden.

1. Wanneer verwacht de Commissie de resultaten van dit onderzoek bekend te maken?

2. Houden de onregelmatigheden bij het Turkse agentschap dat de Erasmus-middelen beheert verband met algemenere ontwikkelingen? En zo ja, hoe dan?

3. Heeft de Commissie redenen om aan te nemen dat er met andere EU-middelen in Turkije fraude wordt gepleegd of dat er sprake is van corruptiepraktijken? Zo ja, welke dan?

4. Is de Commissie van plan het gebruik van EU-middelen te evalueren of te controleren? Zo ja, welke middelen?

5. Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie de huidige situatie in Turkije?

6. Is de Commissie het ermee eens dat fraude en corruptiepraktijken waarmee EU-geldis gemoeid indruist tegen de doelstellingen die de EU in Turkije probeert na te streven? Zo neen, waarom niet?

7. Hoe is de Commissie van plan te voorkomen dat dit doorgaat met name gezien de huidige situatie in Turkije?

Antwoord van mevrouw Vassiliou namens de Commissie
(25 juni 2014)

1. Na de voltooiing van de routinematige procedure op tegenspraak zal het definitieve auditverslag naar verwachting in juni beschikbaar zijn. Het verslag zal overeenkomstig de gangbare auditpraktijk worden gericht tot de gecontroleerde (d.w.z. het Turks nationaal agentschap en de nationale autoriteiten). De Commissie zal de resultaten van de audit in voorkomend geval kenbaar maken voor zover zij directe gevolgen hebben voor de begunstigden van het programma.

2. Op basis van de specifieke details van de beschuldigingen tegen het Turks nationaal agentschap lijkt er geen verband te bestaan met de algemenere ontwikkelingen in Turkije. De huidige politieke situatie heeft naar alle waarschijnlijkheid echter wel de interesse van de media aangewakkerd.

3. Op dit moment heeft de Commissie geen reden om fraude of corruptie met andere EU-middelen in Turkije te vermoeden. Als er aanwijzingen voor fraude worden gevonden, dan zullen daarvoor passende maatregelen worden genomen en zal dit worden gemeld aan het Europees Bureau voor fraudebestrijding.

4. Alle EU-programma's worden al onderworpen aan jaarlijkse controles door de auditautoriteit van het gastland, externe audits door de bevoegde diensten van de Commissie en risicogebaseerde audits en een programmagerichte beoordeling overeenkomstig de IPA ([1])-verordeningen.

5. Er is een werkend beheers- en controlesysteem voor de uitvoering van EU-programma's in Turkije, dat echter wel op enkele punten zou kunnen worden verbeterd.

6. De Commissie is het ermee eens dat fraude en corruptie waarmee EU-geld is gemoeid, indruist tegen de doelstellingen die de EU in Turkije probeert na te streven.

7. De Commissie ontwikkelt strenge strategieën ter verkrijging van zekerheid en controlestrategieën om de risico's tot een aanvaardbaar niveau te beperken. De EU-delegatie in Turkije heeft de vormen en aard van de recente beschuldigingen bestudeerd en is nu bezig haar controlemaatregelen verder te verfijnen.

([1]) Instrument voor pretoetredingssteun (Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005157/14
to the Commission
Marietje Schaake (ALDE) and Andrew Duff (ALDE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Fraud and EU funds in Turkey

Since December 2013, there have been revelations of a deep division in Turkish society and fundamental problems regarding the rule of law and the separation of powers. Recent local elections were marred by allegations of fraud. Many high-ranking government officials have been implicated in corruption scandals. Under the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance and other EU programmes, Turkey receives funding from the EU to help it make reforms with the aim of bringing it closer to the EU. In March 2014, the Commission confirmed that it had launched an audit of EU funds transferred to Turkey for the Erasmus programme, following allegations of irregularities.

1. When does the Commission expect to present the results of the audit?

2. Are the irregularities reported at the Turkish agency responsible for handling Erasmus funds linked to the broader developments in Turkey? If so, how?

3. Does the Commission have reason to suspect fraud or corruption with regard to any other EU funds in Turkey? If so, what are the issues?

4. Is the Commission planning a broader evaluation or audit of the use of EU funds in Turkey? If so, which funds?

5. How does the Commission assess the current situation in Turkey?

6. Does the Commission agree that fraud and corruption using EU funds runs contrary to the goals which the EU is trying to achieve in Turkey? If not, why not?

7. How does the Commission plan to prevent the occurrence of fraud in the future, in particular with regard to the current situation in Turkey?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(25 June 2014)

1. Upon completion of the routine adversary procedure, the final audit report is expected to become available in June, and will be addressed to the auditee (i.e. the Turkish National Agency and national authorities), according to standard audit practice. The Commission will communicate the audit results as appropriate in so far as they have a direct impact on programme beneficiaries.

2. On the basis of the specificities of the allegations against the Turkish National Agency, there seems to be no link to the broader developments in Turkey. However, the current political context has most likely enhanced media interest.

3. At this stage, the Commission does not have any reason to suspect fraud or corruption with regard to other EU funds in Turkey. Should there be any indications of fraud, these would be duly addressed and reported to OLAF.

4. All EU programmes are already subject to annual audits by the Audit Authority of the host country, external audits by the relevant Commission services as well as risk-based audits and programme-based evaluations in line with the IPA ([1]) regulations.

5. A functioning management and control system is in place for the implementation of EU programmes in Turkey, although there is some room for improvement.

6. The Commission agrees that fraud and corruption using EU funds runs contrary to the goals which the EU is trying to achieve in Turkey.

7. The Commission develops stringent assurance and control strategies to keep the risks at an acceptable level. The EU Delegation in Turkey has analysed forms and nature of the recent allegations and is in the process of further refining its control measures.

([1]) Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005158/14
a la Comisión
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), Raimon Obiols (S&D), Marietje Schaake (ALDE), Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE), Michael Cashman (S&D) y Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(17 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: Caso Onur Yasen Can

El 2 de junio de 2010, Onur Yaser Can fue arrestado y llevado a la Sección de Narcóticos de la Dirección General de Seguridad de Estambul, como sospechoso de posesión de drogas ilegales. Onur fue objeto de numerosos actos ilegales, como torturas, acoso y abusos sexuales en la Sección de Narcóticos de la Dirección de Policía de Estambul, donde permanecía arrestado. Tras su detención, Onur permaneció de forma ilegal bajo vigilancia constante durante 22 días sin que se registrara su ingreso. Después de un trato tan degradante, Onur se suicidó saltando de la ventana del cuarto piso de su vivienda el 23 de junio de 2010.

En 2012, la familia de Onur interpuso ante el Tribunal Supremo de Jueces y Fiscales una demanda penal, con pruebas escritas y visuales, contra 13 oficiales y jefes de policía con las siguientes acusaciones: torturas y abusos sexuales agravados, falsificación de documentos oficiales y ocultación y destrucción de pruebas. Varios departamentos del Tribunal llegaron a la conclusión de que no había motivos suficientes para iniciar una investigación.

Tras haber defendido incansablemente la causa de Onur durante tres años y medio, su madre, Hatice Can, se tiró por la ventana y falleció el pasado mes de marzo. No obstante, la familia de Onur continúa luchando contra el sistema judicial turco, conscientes de que no son los únicos en sufrir la brutalidad de la policía en Turquía.

A la luz de todo lo expuesto:

1. ¿Es consciente la Comisión de esta situación y de la existencia de casos similares en Turquía en años recientes?

2. El respeto de los derechos humanos es un principio fundamental de la Unión Europea, y los países que pretenden entrar en ella deberían demostrar que lo acatan, tanto en su legislación como en la práctica. ¿Cómo puede la UE promover y fomentar el respeto por los derechos humanos y los derechos fundamentales en Turquía?

Respuesta del Sr. Füle en nombre de la Comisión
(11 de junio de 2014)

La Comisión es consciente de las situaciones a que se refieren Sus Señorías y las ha planteado a las autoridades turcas. Una demanda relativa a las acusaciones de tortura y agresión sexual en cuestión está pendiente ante el Tribunal Europeo de Derechos Humanos, tras la decisión de inadmisión del asunto en Turquía. Está prevista la repetición del juicio a dos agentes de policía implicados en la toma de declaración de Onur Yaser Can en relación con la presunta falsificación de documentos oficiales, tras la decisión del Tribunal de Casación turco. Otra demanda interpuesta por los abogados del Sr. Can contra la Sección de Narcóticos de la Dirección de Policía de Estambul está pendiente ante el Tribunal Constitucional de Turquía.

En general, la Comisión sigue muy de cerca y plantea ante las autoridades turcas todas las cuestiones relacionadas con los derechos humanos, incluida la tortura y el maltrato, e informa al respecto en los informes de situación anuales.

Turquía es un país que está negociando su adhesión a la UE y, por tanto, debe garantizar, jurídicamente y en la práctica, el respeto de los derechos humanos de todos sus ciudadanos.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-005158/14
à la Commission
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), Raimon Obiols (S&D), Marietje Schaake (ALDE), Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE), Michael Cashman (S&D) et Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(17 avril 2014)

Objet: Affaire Onur Yaser Can

Le 2 juin 2010, Onur Yaser Can, soupçonné de possession de drogues illégales, a été arrêté et pris en charge par la division des stupéfiants de la direction de la sécurité d'Istanbul. Onur a été victime de nombreux actes commis au mépris de la loi, comprenant la torture, le harcèlement et les abus sexuels, de la part de la division des stupéfiants de la direction de la police d'Istanbul l'ayant arrêté. Après son arrestation, Onur a été soumis illégalement à une surveillance constante, sans être enregistré pendant 22 jours. Après avoir fait l'objet de ces traitements dégradants, Onur s'est suicidé en se jetant par la fenêtre du quatrième étage de sa maison, le 23 juin 2010.

En 2012, la famille d'Onur a déposé plainte contre 13 officiers et chefs de police, en présentant un dossier composé de preuves écrites et visuelles au Haut Conseil de la magistrature (HSYK), qui listait les accusations suivantes: actes de torture aggravés et abus sexuels, falsification de documents officiels, ainsi que dissimulation et destruction de preuves. Différents services du HSYK sont parvenus à la conclusion «qu'une enquête n'était pas nécessaire».

Après avoir défendu sans relâche la cause de son fils pendant trois ans et demi, la mère d'Onur, Hatice Can, s'est jetée par une fenêtre et est morte en mars dernier. Cependant, les membres de la famille d'Onur continuent à se battre contre le système judiciaire turc, car ils savent qu'ils ne sont pas les seuls à faire face à la brutalité de la police en Turquie.

Compte tenu de ce qui précède:

1. La Commission est-elle au courant de cette situation et de l'existence d'affaires similaires en Turquie au cours de ces dernières années?

2. Le respect des Droits de l'homme est un principe fondamental de l'Union européenne et les pays souhaitant adhérer à l'Union devraient démontrer qu'ils respectent ce principe, à la fois dans leur législation et dans les faits. Comment l'Union peut-elle promouvoir et encourager le respect des Droits de l'homme et des droits fondamentaux en Turquie?

Réponse donnée par M. Füle au nom de la Commission
(11 juin 2014)

La Commission a connaissance des faits mentionnés par les Honorables Parlementaires et les a évoquées avec les autorités turques. Une affaire liée à des allégations de torture et de sévices sexuelles est en instance devant la Cour européenne des Droits de l'homme, suite à une décision de non-lieu en Turquie. Une nouvelle procédure de jugement de deux officiers de police impliqués dans l'interrogatoire d'Onur Yaser Can et accusés de falsification de documents officiels est prévue, suite à la décision de la Cour de cassation turque. Une autre plainte déposée par les avocats de M. Can contre la division des stupéfiants de la police d'Istanbul est en instance devant la Cour constitutionnelle turque.

Plus généralement, la Commission suit de près et aborde avec les autorités turques, s'il y a lieu et de façon appropriée, toutes les questions pertinentes relatives au respect des Droits de l'homme, y compris la torture et les mauvais traitements, et fait rapport à ce sujet dans ses rapports annuels de suivi.

La Turquie, en tant que pays négociant son adhésion à l'UE, doit garantir, sur le plan législatif et dans la pratique, le respect des Droits de l'homme pour tous ses citoyens.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005158/14
aan de Commissie
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), Raimon Obiols (S&D), Marietje Schaake (ALDE), Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE), Michael Cashman (S&D) en Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(17 april 2014)

Betreft: Zaak van Onur Yaser Can

Op 2 juni 2010 werd Onur Yaser Can op verdenking van het bezit van illegale verdovende middelen gearresteerd en naar de narcotica-eenheid van het directoraat Veiligheid van de stad Istanbul (Turkije) overgebracht. Bij de narcoticabrigade van de politie van Istanbul werd hij vervolgens het slachtoffer van foltering, seksuele intimidatie en misbruik. Na te zijn gearresteerd, werd Onur op illegale wijze onder voortdurende observatie gehouden en gedurende 22 dagen niet geregistreerd. Deze vernederende behandeling bracht Onur ertoe op 23 juni 2010 zelfmoord te plegen door uit het raam van zijn woning op de vierde verdieping te springen.

In 2012 diende Onur's familie bij de Hoge Raad van Rechters en Aanklagers (HSYK) van Turkije een strafrechtelijke klacht in (met schriftelijk en visueel bewijs) tegen 13 politie-officieren en de politieleiding op basis van de volgende feiten: ernstige foltering en seksueel misbruik, vervalsing van officiële documenten, en het achterhouden en vernietigen van bewijsmateriaal. Verschillende afdelingen van de HSYK kwamen tot de slotsom dat er „geen reden was voor een onderzoek".

Na zich drie-en-een-half jaar onvermoeibaar voor Onur's zaak te hebben ingezet, sprong Onur's moeder, Hatice Can, afgelopen maart uit een raam en kwam daarbij om het leven. Onur's familie zet de strijd tegen Turkije's justitieel systeem desalniettemin voort, in de wetenschap dat zij niet de enigen zijn die in Turkije met bruut politiegeweld worden geconfronteerd.

Kan de Commissie antwoord geven op de volgende vragen:

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van deze zaak en van vergelijkbare zaken in Turkijegedurende de afgelopen paar jaar?

2. De eerbiediging van de mensenrechten is een grondbeginsel van de EU en landen die lid van de EU willen worden, dienen aan te tonen dat zij dit beginsel zowel op het vlak van de wetgeving, als in de praktijk in acht nemen. Hoe kan de EU de eerbiediging van de mensenrechten en de grondrechten in Turkije bevorderen een aanmoedigen?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(11 juni 2014)

De Commissie is op de hoogte van de door de geachte Parlementsleden aangehaalde kwesties en heeft deze met de Turkse autoriteiten besproken. Als gevolg van een rechterlijke beslissing in Turkije om niet tot vervolging over te gaan, is in verband met deze beschuldigingen van foltering en seksueel misbruik een rehtszaak hangende bij het Europees Hof voor de Rechten van de Mens. Daarnaast is er door een beslissing van het Turkse Hof van Cassatie een nieuw proces gepland voor twee politieagenten die betrokken waren bij het ondervragen van Onur Yaser Can. Hierin worden zij beschuldigd van het vervalsen van officiële documenten. Een andere rechtszaak die de advocaten van de heer Can tegen de narcoticabrigade van de politie van Istanbul hebben aangespannen, is momenteel hangende bij het Turks Grondwettelijk Hof.

In bredere zin volgt de Commissie relevante kwesties inzake mensenrechten, waaronder foltering en mishandeling, van nabij, bespreekt deze met de Turkse autoriteiten waar nodig en passend, en neemt deze op in de jaarlijkse voortgangsverslagen.

Als land dat over zijn toetreding tot de EU onderhandelt, moet Turkije zowel bij wet als in de praktijk de mensenrechten van al zijn burgers eerbiedigen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005158/14
to the Commission
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), Raimon Obiols (S&D), Marietje Schaake (ALDE), Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE), Michael Cashman (S&D) and Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Case of Onur Yaser Can

On 2 June 2010, Onur Yaser Can was arrested and taken to the narcotics branch of the Istanbul Security Directorate on suspicion of carrying illegal drugs. Onur was exposed to many lawless acts, including torture, sexual harassment and abuse at the Narcotic Branch Office of the Istanbul Police Department, where he had been taken under arrest. Following his arrest, Onur was illegally kept under constant surveillance and remained unregistered for 22 days. After being subjected to such degrading treatment, Onur committed suicide by jumping out of the window of the fourth floor of his home on 23 June 2010.

In 2012 Onur's family filed a criminal complaint, containing written and visual evidence, to the Supreme Board of Judges and Prosecutors (HSYK) against 13 police officers and chiefs on the following grounds: aggravated torture and sexual abuse, forgery of official documents, and concealment and destruction of evidence. Various departments at the HSYK concluded that 'there was no need for an investigation'.

After tirelessly defending Onur's cause for three and a half years, Onur's mother, Hatice Can, jumped from a window and died last March. However, Onur's family continues to fight Turkey's judicial system, knowing that they are not the only ones facing police brutality in Turkey.

In light of the above:

1. Is the Commission aware of this situation and the existence of similar cases in Turkey in recent years?

2. The respect of human rights is a fundamental principle of the EU, and countries seeking EU membership should demonstrate that they respect this principle in both law and practice. How can the EU promote and encourage respect for human rights and fundamental rights in Turkey?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2014)

The Commission is aware of the issues raised by the Honourable Members and has raised them with the Turkish authorities. A case related to the torture and sexual assault-related allegations is pending before the European Court of Human Rights, further to a non-prosecution decision in Turkey. The re-trial of two police officers involved in the statement-taking of Onur Yaser Can regarding alleged counterfeiting of official documents is foreseen, further to the decision of the Turkish Court of Cassation. Another case filed by Mr Can's lawyers against the Narcotics department of Istanbul police is pending before the Turkish Constitutional Court.

More broadly, the Commission follows closely and raises with the Turkish authorities, as necessary and appropriate, all relevant issues regarding respect for human rights, including torture and ill-treatment, and reports on them in the yearly Progress Reports.

Turkey, as a country negotiating its accession to the EU, needs to guarantee in law and in practice respect for human rights for all its citizens.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005159/14
alla Commissione
Franco Bonanini (NI)
(17 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Cittadini europei laureati in medicina specializzatisi in Italia dal 1982 al 1992

Considerato che:

i cittadini europei laureati in medicina e iscritti ai corsi di specializzazione in Italia dal 1982 al 1992, specializzatisi nelle varie discipline mediche, durante l'espletamento di tali attività di formazione non hanno percepito dallo Stato italiano alcuna remunerazione;

i titoli conseguiti dagli stessi medici in Italia nell'intervallo temporale di cui sopra non sono riconosciuti in ambito europeo in violazione della normativa comunitaria, trattati europei e giurisprudenza della Corte di Giustizia europea (art. 53 TFUE, art. 4, par. 3 TUE, Causa C-71/76);

la Corte di Giustizia europea ha già condannato con sentenza del 7 luglio 1987 (Causa C-49/86) la Repubblica italiana dichiarando che la stessa è venuta meno agli obblighi in materia alla stessa incombenti in forza del Trattato CE;

lo Stato italiano con il decreto Legislativo 257/1991 non ha sanato l'inadempimento avendo disposto solo in favore dei medici ammessi alle scuole di specializzazione a decorrere dal 1992 in avanti;

la Corte di Giustizia europea ha nuovamente condannato la Repubblica italiana con sentenza del 25 febbraio 1999 (Causa C-131/97) sancendo il diritto alla remunerazione a beneficio di tutti i medici iscritti alle scuole di specializzazione negli anni accademici compresi tra il 1983 e il 1991, sentenza ribadita il 3 ottobre 2000 (Causa C-371/97);

la direttiva 82/76/CEE, trasfusa nella direttiva 93/16/CEE, ha introdotto il concetto di «adeguata remunerazione» cui hanno diritto i medici specializzatisi nelle varie scuole di specializzazione post laurea;

Tutto ciò premesso e considerato, si chiede se la Commissione ritenga necessario e opportuno adottare ogni atto utile affinché la Repubblica italiana adegui prontamente la normativa in materia, onde assicurare il rispetto dei diritti in materia di libertà di stabilimento (art. 49 TFUE), riconoscimento delle qualifiche professionali (direttiva 2005/36/CEE) e dei diritti economici ai cittadini europei laureati in medicina e specializzatisi in Italia dal 1982 al 1992?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(19 giugno 2014)

Al 20 ottobre 2007, termine ultimo di recepimento, la direttiva 2005/36/CE ([1]) («la direttiva») aveva sostituito quindici direttive vigenti nel settore del riconoscimento delle qualifiche professionali, tra cui la direttiva 93/16/CEE ([2]) (che ha sostituito la precedente direttiva 82/76/CEE ([3]) in questo settore). Ai sensi della direttiva ([4]) i posti di medico specializzando vanno adeguatamente retribuiti. La questione sollevata dal firmatario scaturisce dal recepimento tardivo della direttiva 82/76/CEE da parte delle autorità italiane ([5]), a causa del quale, in Italia, le formazioni specializzate che soddisfano tutte le prescrizioni della direttiva 82/76/CEE, compresa la remunerazione degli specializzandi, hanno avuto inizio soltanto nell'anno accademico 1991/92.

La Commissione si è già occupata di questo problema nel 2009 ([6]). Dall'analisi della giurisprudenza italiana emerge che i giudici italiani hanno rispettato i principi stabiliti dalla Corte di giustizia ([7]) accettando, in questi casi, l'applicazione retroattiva del diritto alla remunerazione.

([1]) Direttiva 2005/36/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 7 settembre 2005, relativa al riconoscimento delle qualifiche professionali (GU L 255 del 30.9.2005).
([2]) Direttiva 93/16/CEE del Consiglio, del 5 aprile 1993, intesa ad agevolare la libera circolazione dei medici e il reciproco riconoscimento dei loro diplomi, certificati ed altri titoli.
([3]) Direttiva 82/76/CEE del Consiglio, del 26 gennaio 1982, che modifica la direttiva 75/362/CEE concernente il reciproco riconoscimento dei diplomi, certificati ed altri titoli di medico e comportante misure destinate ad agevolare l'esercizio effettivo del diritto di stabilimento e di libera prestazione dei servizi e la direttiva 75/363/CEE concernente il coordinamento delle disposizioni legislative, regolamentari ed amministrative per le attività di medico.
([4]) Articolo 25, paragrafo 3, della direttiva 2005/36/CE.
([5]) Il termine ultimo per il recepimento della direttiva 82/76/CEE era il 1° gennaio 1983. Con sentenza del 7 luglio 1987, la Corte di giustizia ha dichiarato che l'Italia si era resa inadempiente ai propri obblighi, non avendo recepito entro i termini la direttiva 82/76/CEE. Con il decreto legislativo n. 257/1991 adottato nel 1991 (entrato in vigore il 1° settembre 1991), l'Italia ha sì recepito la direttiva ma ha limitato il diritto alla retribuzione agli anni accademici 1991/92 e seguenti.
([6]) A seguito di una denuncia collettiva protocollata con il n. 2009/4209; proposta di archiviazione della denuncia pubblicata nella GU C 236 dell'1.10.2009, pag. 20.
([7]) Cause C-131/97 Carbonari e C-371/97 Gozza.

Al fine di facilitare il riconoscimento automatico per i medici specialisti italiani interessati, la direttiva 2013/55/UE ([8]) ha introdotto un nuovo diritto acquisito specifico al riguardo. A norma dell'articolo 27, paragrafo 2 *bis*, della direttiva 2005/36/CE modificata, gli Stati membri riconoscono le qualifiche di medico specialista acquisite in Italia nel periodo in questione, nonostante la formazione non soddisfi tutti i requisiti previsti dall'articolo 25 della direttiva 2005/36/CE, se il medico ha la necessaria esperienza professionale.

([8]) Direttiva 2013/55/UE recante modifica della direttiva 2005/36/CE relativa al riconoscimento delle qualifiche professionali e del regolamento (UE) n. 1024/2012 relativo alla cooperazione amministrativa attraverso il sistema di informazione del mercato interno («regolamento IMI»).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005159/14
to the Commission
Franco Bonanini (NI)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: EU medical graduates who specialised in Italy between 1982 and 1992

EU medical graduates who enrolled on various specialisation courses in Italy between 1982 and 1992 did not receive any form of remuneration from the Italian State during their training.

The qualifications awarded to these doctors in Italy during the period referred to above are not recognised everywhere in the EU, which infringes Community regulations, European treaties and the case-law of the European Court of Justice (Article 53 TFEU, Article 4(3) TEU, Case C-71/76).

The European Court of Justice has already found against the Italian Republic in its judgment of 7 July 1987 (Case C-49/86), declaring that it failed to fulfil its obligations in this field under the EC Treaty.

Italy failed to remedy this situation when adopting Legislative Decree No 257/1991 as its provisions only cover doctors admitted to specialist medical colleges from 1992 onwards.

The European Court of Justice again found against the Italian Republic in its judgment of 25 February 1999 (Case C-131/97) in which it ruled that all doctors enrolled at specialist medical colleges in the academic years 1983 to 1991 were entitled to remuneration. The Court's findings were the same in its judgment of 3 October 2000 (Case C-371/97).

Directive 82/76/EEC — and subsequently Directive 93/16/EEC — introduced the notion of 'appropriate remuneration', to which doctors who specialised at various specialist medical colleges are entitled.

In the light of the above, does the Commission not feel it necessary and fitting to take all the appropriate steps to ensure prompt compliance by the Italian Republic with the regulations in this field — i.e. to ensure that the rights of freedom of establishment (Article 49 TFEU), the recognition of professional qualifications (Directive 2005/36/EEC) and the financial entitlements of EU medical graduates who specialised in Italy between 1982 and 1992 are respected?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2014)

Directive 2005/36/EC ([1]) ('the directive') has replaced fifteen existing Directives in the field of the recognition of professional qualifications by 20 October 2007, amongst others Directive 93/16/EEC ([2]) (which replaced the previous Directive 82/76/EEC ([3]) in this field). Under the directive ([4]) ,medical specialist trainee posts shall be subject to appropriate renumeration. The issue raised by the petitioner stems from the late transpositon of Directive 82/76/EEC by the Italian authorities ([5]). As a consequence, Italian specialist trainings fulfilling all the requirements of Directive 82/76/EEC, including the renumeration of trainees, started only in the academic year 1991/92.

The Commission had already dealt with this issue in 2009 ([6]). The analysis of Italian case law suggested that the principles laid down by the ECJ ([7]) had been respected by the Italian national courts, when they accepted the retrospective application of entitlement to renumeration in these cases.

([1]) Directive 2005/36/EC of Parliament and of the Council of 7 September 2005 on the recognition of professional qualifications, OJ L 255, 30.9.2005.
([2]) Council Directive 93/16/EEC of 5 April 1993 to facilitate the free movement of doctors and the mutual recognition of their diplomas, certificates and other evidence of formal qualifications.
([3]) Council Directive 82/76/EEC of 26 January 1982 amending Directive 75/362/EEC concerning the mutual recognition of diplomas, certificates and other evidence of formal qualifications in medicine, including measures to facilitate effective exercise of the right of establishment and freedom to provide services and Directive 75/363/EEC concerning the coordination of provisions laid down by law, regulation or administrative action in respect of activities of doctors.
([4]) Article 25 (3) of Directive 2005/36/EC.
([5]) The deadline for transposing Directive 82/76/EEC was 1 January 1983. In its judgment of 7 July 1987, the ECJ acknowledged that Italy had failed to comply with its obligations by not transposing Directive 82/76/EEC within the deadline laid down. By legislative decree No 257/1991 adopted in 1991 (entry into force: 1 September 1991), Italy had transposed the directive but had limited the right to remuneration to the academic years 1991/92 and after.
([6]) As a result of a collective complaint registered under no. 2009/4209; Planned closure of complaint published in OJ C 236, 01/10/2009, p. 20-21.
([7]) Cases C-131/97 Carbonari and C-371/97 Gozza.

In order to facilitate the automatic recognition of the Italian medical specialist concerned, Directive 2013/55/EU ([8]) introduced a new specific acquired right in this regard. Under Article 27(2a) of the amended Directive 2005/36/EC, Member States shall recognise Italian medical specialist qualifications awarded in the above period, despite the training concerned not satisfying all the training requirements set out in Article 25 of Directive 2005/36/EC, if the doctor has the required professional experience.

([8]) Directive 2013/55/EU amending Directive 2005/36/EC on the recognition of professional qualifications and Regulation (EU) No 1024/2012 on administrative cooperation through the internal market Information System.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005160/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(17 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Associazione Onlus Bonaventura: possibili finanziamenti per la realizzazione di spazi didattici-educativi

L'associazione Onlus Bonaventura, con sede a San Cesareo in Provincia di Roma, è impegnata da anni in corsi di formazione. L'associazione vorrebbe implementare l'attività formativo/educativa, offrendo i propri servizi anche alle scolaresche del Comune in cui ha sede e dei comuni limitrofi e alle comunità parrocchiali presenti sul territorio.

Inoltre, tale associazione ha a disposizione un appezzamento di terra nel quale gli associati possono coltivare prodotti ortofrutticoli oltre che allevare animali da cortile per il proprio sostentamento. L'idea che vorrebbero sviluppare prevede la possibilità di organizzare una fattoria didattica per bambini e giovani. Inoltre, è prevista anche la realizzazione di un laboratorio di produzioni audio e video, dove dare ai giovani studenti dimostrazioni pratiche di come si realizza una produzione.

Un ulteriore spazio dovrebbe essere trasformato in una sala multifunzionale per proiezioni video e filmati didattico-educativi oppure come sala conferenze.

L'associazione, inoltre, è impegnata in un servizio di prima accoglienza alle persone che vivono in situazioni disagiate e persone bisognose.

Tutto ciò premesso, può la Commissione:

1. far sapere se esistono finanziamenti per la realizzazione del progetto suesposto?

2. far sapere quali finanziamenti sono previsti nella nuova programmazione 2014-2020 per il sostegno di progetti diretti all'offerta di attività formativo-educativa?

3. esporre un quadro generale della situazione?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(4 giugno 2014)

1. Le attività educative e formative descritte nel progetto non sembrano destinate a migliorare le possibilità occupazionali né a un'integrazione sostenibile nel mondo del lavoro, che sono due degli ambiti di intervento del Fondo sociale europeo (FSE) ([1]) nel periodo di programmazione 2007-13. Sulla base delle informazioni fornite dall'Onorevole deputata il progetto in quanto tale non avrebbe quindi i titoli per aspirare a un finanziamento dell'FSE. Tuttavia, un sostegno per la realizzazione di fattorie educative e di azioni di formazione professionale e di acquisizione di competenze potrebbe essere fornito dal Fondo europeo agricolo per lo sviluppo rurale (FEASR) se tali attività fossero programmate nell'ambito del Programma regionale di sviluppo rurale (PSR).

2. Anche nel periodo di programmazione 2014-20 l'FSE ([2]) sosterrà iniziative legate ad una delle priorità di investimento enunciate nel regolamento. Le attività formative ed educative potrebbero essere ammissibili nella misura in cui contribuiscono ad una delle priorità d'investimento, come ad esempio l'accesso all'occupazione o l'inclusione attiva. Il FEASR sosterrà la realizzazione di fattorie educative e di azioni di formazione e di acquisizione di competenze anche nel periodo di programmazione 2014-2020 se tali attività saranno previste nel PSR e se esse saranno indirizzate a persone impegnate nel settore agricolo, alimentare e forestale, a gestori del territorio e altri attori economici che rappresentano PMI operanti in ambito rurale.

3. Gli stanziamenti finanziari complessivi per la politica di coesione ([3]) e lo sviluppo rurale in Italia per il periodo 2014-2020 sono pari a 32,2 miliardi di EUR e a 10,4 miliardi di EUR rispettivamente.

([1]) Regolamento (CE) n. 1081/2006 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio del 5 luglio 2006, art. 3.
([2]) Regolamento (UE) n. 1304/2013 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio del 17 dicembre 2013.
([3]) Per l'importo complessivo dei finanziamenti destinati alla politica di coesione nell'UE nei diversi Stati membri si rinvia l'Onorevole deputata all'apposito sito web: http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/what/future/eligibility/index_it.cfm — «Stanziamenti».

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005160/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Associazione Onlus Bonaventura: possible funding for educational spaces

The Associazione Onlus Bonaventura, based at San Cesareo in Rome Province, has for some years been involved in the provision of training. The association would like to carry on training and educational activities by also offering its services to schoolchildren in the municipality in which it is based and in neighbouring municipalities, as well as to parish communities in the area.

Also, the association has the use of a plot of land on which members can grow fruit and vegetables and rear farm animals as a means of self support. The idea they would like to develop involves the possibility of organising a teaching farm for children and young adults. They also plan to set up an audio and video production workshop, where young students can be given practical demonstrations of how to make a production.

Another space would be transformed into a multi-function room for screening videos and educational films or as a conference room.

The association is also involved in providing a reception service for people living in deprived situations and those in need.

In view of all the above,

1. Can the Commission state whether any funding exists for the implementation of this project?

2. What funding is planned for the new programming period 2014-2020 for the support of projects aimed at providing training and educational activities?

3. Can the Commission give a general overview of the situation?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(4 June 2014)

1. The training and educational activities described in the project do not appear to be targeted at improving employment possibilities nor at sustainable integration in employment, two of the fields of intervention of the European Social Fund (ESF) ([1]) in the 2007-13 programming period. Based on the information provided by the Honourable Member, the project as such would not consequently qualify for funding under ESF. However, support for the setting up of educational farms as well as for vocational training and skill acquisition actions could be provided by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) if programmed in the regional rural development programme (RDP).

2. Also in the 2014-20 programming period the ESF ([2]) shall support initiatives contributing to one of the investment priorities set out in the regulation. Training and educational activities could be eligible as far as they contribute to one investment priority, such as e.g. access to employment or active inclusion. The EAFRD will support the setting up of educational farms as well as training and acquisition actions also under the 2014-2020 programming period if foreseen by the RDP and if these actions are targeted towards persons engaged in agricultural, food and forestry sector, land managers and other economic actors which are SMEs operating in rural areas.

3. The overall financial allocations for cohesion policy ([3]) and rural development for Italy for the 2014-2020 period are respectively EUR 32.2 billion and 10.4 billion.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1081/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5.7.2006, art. 3.
([2]) Regulation (EU) No 1304/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17.12.2013.
([3]) For the overall amount of funding for cohesion policy in the EU and for the different Member State the Honourable Member can refer to the dedicated website: http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/what/future/eligibility/index_en.cfm — 'Allocations'.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-005162/14
a Bizottság számára
Kovács Béla (NI)
(2014. április 17.)

Tárgy: Európaiak háborús bűntettei Szíriában

Több európai tagállam elismerte, hogy fiatal állampolgárai harcolnak Szíriában a kormányellenes erők oldalán. Videómegosztó portálokon látható, illetve számos újságíró megerősítette, hogy ezen szabadcsapatok tagjai gyakran követnek el a polgári lakossággal szembeni erőszakos cselekményeket, megsértve a Hágai Egyezmény előírásait. Ezek az önkéntesek veszélyt jelentenek Európa lakosságára is, hiszen uniós állampolgárokként bármikor visszatérhetnek az EU-ba.

Kezdeményezett-e a Bizottság uniós szinten valamiféle vizsgálatot ezzel kapcsolatban?

Korlátozzák-e beutazásukat az EU-ba?

Cecilia Malmström válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2014. június 18.)

Az Európai Bizottság tudatában van a szíriai radikális fegyveres csapatokhoz csatlakozó európai polgárok kapcsán felmerülő potenciális veszélynek. A Bizottság szoros együttműködést folytatott a terrorizmus elleni küzdelem uniós koordinátorával, az EKSZ-szel, az érintett uniós ügynökségekkel és a Tanács előkészítő munkacsoportjain belül a tagállamokkal. 2013 decemberében elemzést készített a külföldi fegyveresekhez kapcsolódó legfőbb uniós biztonsági kockázatokról.

A Bizottság tevékenyen közreműködött a különböző tagállamok által vezetett fellépésekben, amelyek a „külföldi fegyveresek" vagy a „terrorista utazók" dimenzióra irányultak. A Bizottság elismeri a határokon átnyúló megközelítés meghatározó jelentőségét, illetve a nemzetközi együttműködés nélkülözhetetlenségét ezen a területen. Valamennyi érdekelt félnek javasolta a rendelkezésre álló uniós eszközök – például a Schengeni Információs Rendszer (SIS II) – hatékony felhasználását.

Emellett a Bizottság ugyancsak kiterjedt szerepet vállal az európai területen zajló munkában, amelynek célja annak megelőzése, hogy a fiatalok radikalizálódjanak és megpróbáljanak csatlakozni a szíriai fegyveres csapatokhoz. Ezen erőfeszítések elsősorban a 2011 szeptemberében alakult uniós radikalizálódás-tudatossági hálózat keretében valósulnak meg, amely az érintettekkel közvetlenül érintkező szakembereket tömöríti, és célja a civil társadalom szerepvállalásának megerősítése a terrorizmushoz vezető radikalizálódás megelőzésében. A hálózat lehetőséget biztosít a gyakorlati szereplőknek a megelőzéssel és a radikalizálódás felszámolásával kapcsolatos eszmecserére, valamint a bevált gyakorlatok megosztására. A radikalizálódás-tudatossági hálózat tematikus csoportokba szerveződik, amelyek egyike kimondottan a külföldi fegyveresek kérdéskörével foglalkozik.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005162/14
to the Commission
Béla Kovács (NI)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: War crimes committed in Syria by Europeans

Various EU Member States have acknowledged that some of their young nationals are fighting in Syria on the side of the anti-government forces. It is possible to see on video-sharing sites, and many journalists have confirmed, that members of these free corps often commit acts of violence against the civilian population, violating the Hague Convention. These volunteers also constitute a danger to the population of Europe, because, as citizens of the Union, they have the right to return to the EU at any time.

Has the Commission launched any kind of inquiry into this at Union level?

Is entry to the EU being restricted?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(18 June 2014)

The European Commission is aware of the potential threat coming from European citizens who have joined radical fighting groups in Syria. The Commission has worked closely with the EU Counter-Terrorism Coordinator, the EEAS, the relevant EU Agencies and Member States within the Council preparatory working groups. In December 2013, it produced an analysis of the major security risks for the EU from foreign fighters.

The Commission has contributed intensively in all the activities dealing with the 'foreign fighters' or 'terrorist travellers' dimension led by different Member States. The Commission recognises the crucial importance of a cross-border approach and how essential international cooperation in this field is. The efficient use of available EU tools, such as the Schengen Information System (SIS II), has been recommended to all stakeholders.

Besides this, the Commission is also highly involved in work undertaken on European soil to prevent young people from being radicalised and seeking to join the battlefield in Syria. This is done in particular through the EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN), a network of front line practitioners launched in September 2011 to strengthen the involvement of civil society in the prevention of radicalisation leading to terrorism. Within this network, front line players exchange ideas and practices in the field of prevention and de-radicalisation. The RAN is organised in thematic groups, one of which focuses more specifically on the issue of foreign fighters.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-005165/14
a Bizottság számára
Kovács Béla (NI)
(2014. április 17.)

Tárgy: A nyugdíjkorhatár manipulálása

Az európai polgárok egyik legalapvetőbb joga a biztonsághoz való jog, melybe a létbiztonság is beleértendő.

A válságra hivatkozva a tagállamok sok esetben a nyugdíjkorhatár emelésében látják a megoldás kulcsát a magas munkanélküliségi ráta ellenére is. Az állampolgároktól ugyanakkor elvárják, hogy gondosan tervezzék meg életpályájukat, nyugdíjas éveiket.

Hogyan tudja megtervezni egy átlagos állampolgár az életpályáját, ha például – mint a hazámban – amikor elkezd dolgozni, a nyugdíjkorhatár 55 év, majd eltelik 20 év, és ez alatt felemelik a nyugdíjkorhatárt 62 évre?

Sőt a nyugdíjkorhatár elérése előtt 5 évvel ismét emelik a korhatárt 62-ről 65 évre.

A Bizottság európai polgárokban gondolkodik.

Tervezi-e ezért valamiféle általános védőháló kialakítását, melynek része lenne, hogy a nyugdíjkorhatárt egy ember életpályája során ne lehessen, vagy csak igen minimálisan emelni?

Miért nem lép fel a Bizottság annak érdekében, hogy az EU-n belül hatalmasra duzzadó fiatalkori munkanélküliség felszámolása érdekében a tagállamok jelentősen csökkentsék a nyugdíjkorhatárt, ezzel munkahelyeket teremtve?

Andor László válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2014. június 12.)

Ha az egyre magasabb életkort megélő emberek nem maradnak tovább a foglalkoztatásban és nem mennek nyugdíjba később, akkor vagy nem fognak megfelelő nyugdíjban részesülni, vagy pedig a nyugdíjkiadások fognak fenntarthatatlanul megnövekedni. A nyugdíjakról szóló fehér könyvben ([1]) ezért a Bizottság arra inti a tagállamokat, hogy próbáljanak fenntartható egyensúlyt találni az aktív keresőként és a nyugdíjasként eltöltött idő között.

Miután a várható élettartam 1960 óta 5-7 évvel nőtt, de ez csak elvétve járt együtt a nyugdíjkorhatár emelkedésével, és mivel 2060-ig előreláthatólag további 6-7 évvel nőhet az emberek várható élettartama, a tagállamoknak szóló ajánlásában ([2]) a Bizottság a nyugdíjkorhatár megemelését, illetve a jövőbeli várható élettartam-növekedéshez való igazítását, valamint az előrehozott nyugdíj lehetőségeinek szűkítését tartotta kívánatosnak. Egyúttal arra bíztatta a tagállamokat, hogy a nyugdíjreformot támogassák meg a munkahelyi és foglalkoztatási körülményeket javító intézkedésekkel, melyek hozzájárulnak ahhoz, hogy az emberek tovább dolgozhassanak. Ilyen intézkedés lehet például az egészséges időskor támogatása a munkahelyen, az élethosszig tartó tanulás lehetőségének biztosítása, vagy a hosszabb munkaviszonyhoz igazított munkahelyi és a munkaerő-piaci viszonyok. Szintén ide tartozhatnak az idősödő munkavállalók alkalmazását segítő ösztönzők, illetve a pályafutás végén betölthető állások kialakítása.

A fiatalok munkanélküliségét nem azok az idősebb munkavállalók okozzák, akik „túl sokáig” dolgoznak egy olyan munkahelyen, ahova egyébként fiatalokat is felvehetnének. Az idősödő munkavállalók körében magasabb foglalkoztatási rátát felmutató országokban a fiatalok foglalkoztatási aránya is nagyobb. A fiatalok munkanélkülisége inkább az általános gazdasági visszaesésre és/vagy az oktatási rendszerek és a munkaerő-piaci intézmények gyengeségeire vezethető vissza. Az idősebb munkavállalók korai nyugdíjaztatása tehát nem jelent megoldást a fiatalok munkanélküliségére. Egy ilyen intézkedés növelné a nyugdíjrendszer finanszírozásának terheit, és csökkentené az aggregált keresletet, ami a foglalkoztatásra is kihatna, lévén, hogy a nyugdíjasok kisebb vásárlóerőt képviselnek (mivel a nyugdíjak alacsonyabbak a béreknél).

([1]) Fehér könyv: A megfelelő, biztonságos és fenntartható európai nyugdíjak menetrendje, COM(2012) 55 final: http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=7341&langId=hu

([2]) 2013. évi európai szemeszter: Országspecifikus ajánlások: Európa kivezetése a válságból, COM(2013) 350 final: http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/index_hu.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005165/14
to the Commission
Béla Kovács (NI)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Manipulation of pensionable age

One of the most fundamental rights of EU citizens is the right to security, including security of livelihood.

Faced with the economic crisis, in many cases Member States saw the key to the solution in raising the pensionable age, in spite of the high level of unemployment. At the same time, citizens were expected to plan their lives and their retirement years carefully.

How can an average citizen plan his life if, for example — as in Hungary — when he starts working the pensionable age is 55, then 20 years pass and during that time the pensionable age goes up to 62?

Moreover, five years before he reaches the pensionable age, it is put up again from 62 to 65.

The Commission has the interests of European citizens at heart. Does it then plan to create any kind of general safety net, part of which would be to ensure that a person's pensionable age cannot be raised, or only minimally, during his lifetime?

Why is the Commission not taking any action to ensure that, in order to eliminate spiralling youth unemployment in the EU, the Member States significantly reduce the pensionable age, thus creating jobs?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2014)

Unless people, as they live longer, also work longer and retire later, either pension adequacy will suffer or an unsustainable rise in pension expenditure will occur. This is why the Commission in the White Paper on Pensions ([1]) encourages Member States to achieve a sustainable balance between time spent in work and in retirement.

As the 5-7 years growth in life expectancy since 1960 rarely led to higher pensionable ages and since we can expect a further growth in life expectancy of 6-7 years by 2060 the Commission has recommended ([2]) Member States to raise the pensionable age, link it to future life expectancy growth and restrict access to early retirement. It has also recommended countries to underpin pension reforms by enhancing people's ability to work longer through a set of workplace and employment measures. These can include promoting healthy ageing at work, providing access to life-long learning and adapting work place and labour market practices to extended working lives. They can also include incentives for the employment of older workers and promoting end-of-career jobs.

Youth unemployment is not caused by older workers staying 'too long' in jobs that otherwise might go to a young person. Countries with higher employment rates among older workers also have higher youth employment. Youth unemployment tends rather to be a consequence of general economic downturns and/or shortcomings of educational systems and labour market institutions. Sending older workers into early retirement is therefore not the solution to youth unemployment. It would increase the burden of financing retirement benefits and lower aggregate demand including for labour since retired people have less spending power (pensions being lower than wages).

([1]) White Paper: An Agenda for Adequate, Safe and Sustainable Pensions, COM(2012) 55 final: http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=7341&langId=en
([2]) 2013 European Semester: Country Specific Recommendations: Moving Europe Beyond the Crisis, COM(2013) 350 final: http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005166/14
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(17 de abril de 2014)

Assunto: Centro Histórico da cidade do Porto

Elevado a Património Mundial da Humanidade pela Unesco em 1996, o Centro Histórico do Porto tem conhecido um crescente processo de despovoamento e degradação do edificado, não tendo sido, durante estes 17 anos, essa consagração aproveitada como um instrumento para a necessária revitalização e repovoamento desta área da cidade.

Nos últimos 20 anos, o Centro Histórico do Porto perdeu 64 % da sua população residente, perdendo população a um ritmo 3 vezes superior ao da cidade no seu conjunto, sendo que este ritmo foi acelerado nos últimos 10 anos. Ao nível do edificado, dos edifícios que se encontram na Área de Reabilitação Urbana do Centro Histórico, 4 % encontram-se em ruína, 32 % em mau estado de conservação, 17 % encontram-se integralmente devolutos e quase 73 % a necessitarem de obras de intervenção ou construção, acrescendo ainda que 41 % das infraestruturas, tais como os arruamentos, se encontram a necessitar de intervenção urgente de reabilitação. A Câmara Municipal do Porto é um dos principais senhorios desta zona histórica, estando alguns desses edifícios ou devolutos ou em péssimo estado de conservação.

Em 2008, foi reconhecida a necessidade de prever no âmbito do QREN uma linha específica de financiamento para a reabilitação urbana da área classificada pela Unesco.

Na sequência desta informação, perguntamos à Comissão:

1. No âmbito do Quadro Financeiro Plurianual 2007-2013, que fundos comunitários podem ainda ser aplicados à reabilitação urbana?

2. No âmbito do próximo Quadro Financeiro Plurianual 2014-2020, quais são os programas e quais os fundos que podem ser utilizados para a reabilitação urbana, nomeadamente dos centros históricos e patrimónios mundiais? Quais as taxas de cofinanciamento associadas?

3. Está previsto, no âmbito do QREN, alguma linha específica de financiamento da reabilitação urbana da área classificada pela Unesco?

4. Quais são os critérios para a admissibilidade nesses programas?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(20 de junho de 2014)

1. Todos os fundos destinados à renovação urbana em zonas de renovação prioritárias já foram autorizados para o período de 2007-2013.

2. As discussões relativas ao período de 2014-2020 entre Portugal e a Comissão estão ainda em curso e, por isso, ainda não é possível tecer comentários detalhados sobre as possibilidades de financiamento futuro.

3. O centro histórico do Porto beneficiou de 35 projetos no âmbito do Programa Operacional Regional do Norte, com um custo total de 50 milhões de euros, dos quais 28 milhões de euros provenientes do Fundo Europeu de Desenvolvimento Regional.

4. Devido ao princípio da gestão partilhada aplicado à gestão da política de coesão, as autoridades nacionais são responsáveis pela execução dos programas, incluindo os critérios e procedimentos de seleção. Por conseguinte, a Comissão sugere aos Senhores Deputados que contactem diretamente as autoridades portuguesas responsáveis pela gestão dos programas em causa:

Gabinete de Gestão do Programa Operacional Regional do Norte
Rua Rainha D. Estefânia, 251
4150-304 Porto
Telefone: +351 226 086 300
Fax: +351 226 061 489
Correio eletrónico: novonorte@ccdr-n.pt
Sítio Web: http://www.novonorte.qren.pt/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005166/14
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Historic Centre of Porto

In the 17 years since the Historic Centre of Porto was included on the Unesco World Heritage List in 1996, its population has continued to fall, and the general condition of its buildings has steadily deteriorated. World Heritage status has thus failed to stimulate the regeneration and repopulation that this part of the city urgently needs.

In the last 20 years, the number of people living in this area of Porto has fallen by 64%, at a rate which is three times faster than that for the city as a whole and which has speeded up over the last 10 years. In terms of the built environment, 4% of the buildings in the historic centre's Urban Regeneration Area are now in ruins, 32% are in a state of disrepair, 17% are completely empty and almost 73% either need work or need to be rebuilt. What is more, 41% of the area's infrastructure, including its roads, requires urgent renovation. Porto City Council is one of the biggest property owners in the historic centre, so that some of these empty or dilapidated buildings are in fact owned by the council.

In 2008, it was agreed that, as part of the National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF), a specific budget would need to be set aside for the regeneration of this World Heritage site.

1. How much Community funding under the 2007-2013 Multiannual Financial Framework is still available for allocation to urban regeneration?

2. What programmes and what forms of funding under the new Multiannual Financial Framework (2014-2020) can be used for urban regeneration, in particular that of historic centres and World Heritage sites? What are the relevant co-financing rates?

3. Has any NSRF funding been allocated specifically for the regeneration of this Unesco World Heritage site?

4. What are the criteria governing eligibility for these programmes?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2014)

1. All funding earmarked for urban renewal in priority regeneration zones has already been committed for the 2007-2013 period.

2. Discussions for the 2014-2020 period between the Commission and Portugal are still on-going and therefore it is not yet possible to comment on detailed future funding possibilities.

3. The historic centre of Porto has benefitted from 35 projects under the Norte programme with a total cost of EUR 50 million of which EUR 28 million from the European Regional Development Fund.

4. Due to the shared management principle of administering cohesion policy, the national authorities are responsible for the implementation of the programmes, including project selection criteria and procedures. The Commission would therefore suggest that the Honourable Member contact directly the Portuguese authorities in charge of managing the programmes concerned, namely:

Gabinete de Gestão do Programa Operacional Regional do Norte
Rua Rainha D. Estefânia, 251
4150-304 Porto
Tel.: +351 226 086 300
Fax.: +351 226 061 489
E-mail.: novonorte@ccdr-n.pt
Web: http://www.novonorte.qren.pt/

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005167/14
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(17 de abril de 2014)

Assunto: Linha ferroviária de Leixões

A Linha de Leixões é uma ligação ferroviária entre as Estações de Contumil, na Linha do Minho, e Leixões, no concelho de Matosinhos, em Portugal.

Há cerca de quatro anos foi inaugurado, após vários trabalhos de adaptação da linha e de eletrificação e duplicação da via, o serviço de transporte de passageiros. Do projeto anunciado apenas foi concluído o ramal entre São Gemil (Maia) e S. Mamede de Infesta.

Não foram também criadas as condições para serem servidos grandes aglomerados populacionais, tais como Pedrouços, Águas Santas ou o polo da Asprela, que abrange o Centro Escolar, o Hospital de S. João e o Instituto Português de Oncologia e zonas industriais. Além disso não foram construídas as estações ou paragens necessárias.

Não foram, por isso, concretizadas as potencialidades previstas de ligação a outros meios de transporte, como o metro no Hospital de S. João ou no terminal de Matosinhos, as carreiras da STCP e outras linhas de caminho-de-ferro.

Que fundos no âmbito do Quadro Financeiro Plurianual 2014-2020 poderão ser utilizados para a construção de apeadeiros e paragens necessárias para a utilização plena da linha de Leixões? Quais as taxas de cofinanciamento associadas?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(10 de junho de 2014)

As discussões relativas ao período de 2014-2020 entre Portugal e a Comissão estão ainda em curso e, por isso, ainda não é possível tecer comentários detalhados sobre as possibilidades de financiamento futuro.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005167/14
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Leixões rail line, Portugal

The Leixões Line is a rail link between the stations of Contumil, on the Minho Line, and Leixões, in the municipality of Matosinhos.

The passenger service was introduced almost four years ago, after work to upgrade the line, to electrify it and to add an extra track. Of the original project announced, however, only the branch line between São Gemil (Maia) and S. Mamede de Infesta has been completed.

As a result, the line does not provide an adequate service to several heavily populated areas, such as Pedrouços, Águas Santas or the Asprela area, which houses the university campus, or to the Hospital de São João, the Portuguese Oncology Institute and many industrial sites, and nor have all the stops and platforms required been built.

It has thus not been possible to realise the line's full potential by connecting it to other forms of public transport, such as the metro lines at the Hospital de São João and the Matosinhos terminal, the SCTP bus and tram network or other railway lines.

What funds can be used under the Multiannual Financial Framework (2014-2020) to build the stops and platforms required so that full use can be made of the Leixões line? What co-financing rates are applied to these funds?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(10 June 2014)

Discussions for the 2014-2020 period between the Commission and Portugal are still ongoing and therefore it is not yet possible to comment on detailed future funding possibilities.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005168/14
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(17 de abril de 2014)

Assunto: Mercado do Bolhão na cidade do Porto

Para além de ser um marco emblemático da cidade do Porto e de estar classificado como imóvel de interesse público desde fevereiro de 2006, o mercado do Bolhão é, ainda hoje em dia, o único mercado de produtos frescos na cidade e local de comércio tradicional. Apesar de haver projetos de recuperação pagos com dinheiros públicos, a sua recuperação vem sendo constantemente adiada. Estando este mercado histórico em muito más condições, podendo mesmo constituir um perigo para os comerciantes que ainda aí exercem a sua atividade, é fundamental que, rapidamente, se tomem medidas adequadas para a sua reabilitação, pondo fim ao processo de degradação destas instalações.

Na resposta a uma pergunta apresentada em outubro de 2011 à Comissão Europeia (E-009168/2011), o comissário Joahannes Hahn, informou que «no âmbito do Quadro de Referência Estratégico (QREN) para 2097-2013» poderiam ser financiadas «intervenções relacionadas com operações integradas em zonas urbanas de regeneração prioritária».

Perguntamos à Comissão:

1. No âmbito do QREN e do Quadro Financeiro Plurianual (QFP) 2007-2013, que fundos comunitários estão ainda disponíveis para a reabilitação urbana em zonas de regeneração prioritária?

2. Quanto dinheiro foi já gasto deste QREN para a reabilitação urbana?

3. No âmbito do QFP 2014-2020, quais são os programas e fundos que podem ser utilizados para apoiar a reabilitação do Mercado do Bolhão, mantendo os seus comerciantes, tendo em conta que existem projetos de reabilitação que contemplam o seu carácter patrimonial e funcional? Quais as taxas de cofinanciamento associadas?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(10 de junho de 2014)

1. e 2. Todos os fundos previstos para a renovação urbana em zonas de renovação prioritárias já foram autorizados para o período de 2007-2013.

Foram autorizados 2 791 milhões de euros do Fundo Europeu de Desenvolvimento Regional para projetos de renovação urbana (números de final de março de 2014), dos quais 651 milhões de euros foram pagos.

3. As discussões relativas ao período de 2014-2020 estão ainda em curso e, por conseguinte, os pormenores definitivos ainda não estão disponíveis.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005168/14
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Bolhão market, Porto

As well as being a symbol of the city of Porto that has been a listed building since February 2006, the Bolhão market is still a centre for traditional trading and the only market in the city selling fresh produce. There have been a number of publicly funded restoration plans, but restoration work has been postponed again and again. At present this historic market is in a severely dilapidated state and may even pose a danger to stallholders still trading there. Action needs to be taken as a matter of urgency to restore the market and prevent further deterioration.

In his answer to a question to the Commission tabled in October 2011 (E-009168/2011), Commissioner Johannes Hahn said that 'under the National Strategic Reference Frameworks (NSRF) 2007-2013' it might be possible to 'finance interventions related to integrated operations in urban regeneration priority zones'.

Can the Commission provide the following information:

1. What Community funds are still available for urban renewal in priority regeneration zones under the NSRF and the multiannual financial framework (MFF) 2007-2013?

2. How much money has already been spent on urban renewal under this NSRF?

3. Under the MFF 2014-2020, what programmes and funds can be used to support the regeneration of the Bolhão market and enable its stallholders to continue trading, bearing in mind that regeneration projects have been drawn up that take account of its status as part of the city's heritage and a working market? What are the corresponding co-financing rates?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(10 June 2014)

1 and 2. All the funding foreseen for urban renewal in priority regeneration zones has already been committed for the 2007-2013 period.

EUR 2 791 million has been committed from the European Regional Development Fund to urban renewal projects (end of March 2014 figures) of which EUR 651 million has been paid out.

3. Discussions are still on-going for the 2014-2020 period and consequently, final details are not yet available.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005169/14
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(17 de abril de 2014)

Assunto: Poluição do rio Tinto

Na sequência de uma visita ao concelho de Gondomar e de um encontro com o Movimento em Defesa do Rio Tinto, foi-nos feito um ponto de situação sobre o estado deste rio que passa por três conselhos do distrito do Porto e que é considerado o rio mais poluído do Norte, sendo quase um esgoto a céu aberto. O Movimento em Defesa do Rio Tinto é constituído por um grupo de mais de centena e meia de cidadãos que, em abril de 2006, se propôs salvar o rio Tinto, pugnando, junto das diversas entidades responsáveis, por ações de despoluição e reabilitação, defendendo o respeito pelo rio, a valorização da paisagem e a proteção de um recurso natural público, mobilizando centenas de pessoas e várias escolas, sensibilizando a população para a educação ambiental e para a defesa da água e do rio.

Conforme o Movimento em Defesa do Rio Tinto amplamente tem denunciado, o estado deste rio deve-se a atrasos na rede de saneamento do concelho, a ligações ilegais de saneamento, a construções que entubaram do rio e, em grande parte, à ETAR do Meiral, que se tornou um dos muitos graves problemas. Esta ETAR, em vez de constituir uma solução positiva no que se refere à despoluição deste recurso hídrico, assume-se, paradoxalmente, como uma agravante que aumenta a contaminação das águas. Acontece que este rio não tem dimensões para receber as águas da ETAR, pelo que a dimensão do curso de água deverá ser reajustado, devendo as descargas atender às características do meio hídrico. A ETAR, que sofreu uma remodelação e não está em pleno funcionamento, pois os tratamentos físico-químicos e biológicos ainda revelam problemas, não viu ainda renovada a sua licença, estando a descarregar para o rio ilegalmente, problema que suscitou uma queixa à Comissão Europeia (CHAP(2012)00330: ETAR em Rio Tinto).

Em face do exposto, perguntamos à Comissão:

1. Que fundos existem e podem ser mobilizados pelas autarquias para a defesa e despoluição deste curso de água e para apoiar os objetivos do Movimento de cidadãos em defesa do rio Tinto?

2. Qual é a taxa de cofinanciamento associada a esses fundos?

3. Tem conhecimento dos problemas denunciados, associados à ETAR do Meiral? Que diligências efetuou ou vai efetuar a Comissão na sequência da queixa supramencionada?

Resposta dada por Janez Potočnik em nome da Comissão
(23 de junho de 2014)

As questões descritas pelos Senhores Deputados podem ser solucionadas utilizando fundos nacionais, mas parecem estar igualmente abrangidas pelo âmbito dos fundos da UE concedidos através do Fundo de Coesão ou através do Fundo Europeu de Desenvolvimento Regional (FEDER). As condições ao abrigo das quais tais trabalhos podem ser financiados, incluindo as taxas de cofinanciamento aplicáveis, dependem do acordo de parceria e dos programas operacionais atualmente a ser debatido entre as autoridades portuguesas e a Comissão Europeia. Informações pormenorizadas, incluindo a lista dos pontos de contacto em cada Estado-Membro, está disponível em ([1]):

Essas atividades poderiam também ser financiadas através do instrumento financeiro LIFE ([2]), em especial se forem de caráter inovador ou de demonstração. O novo programa LIFE oferece possibilidades de financiamento de projetos integrados destinados a melhorar a execução das estratégias ou dos planos para o ambiente e para o clima, incluindo planos de gestão das bacias hidrográficas, em conjugação com outras fontes de financiamento, tais como fundos de coesão ou FEDER.

A Comissão recebeu uma denúncia relativa à estação de tratamento de águas residuais do Meiral em 2012. No entanto, os elementos fornecidos pelo autor da denúncia nesse momento, não revelaram uma infração da legislação da UE e o queixoso foi informado, em 24 de fevereiro de 2012, que o processo CHAP (2012)00330 tinha sido encerrado. Uma vez que o autor da denúncia não forneceu informações adicionais, a Comissão confirmou o encerramento do processo por carta de 13 de abril de 2012.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/thefunds/regional/index_en.cfm
([2]) JO C 104 E de 30.4.2004.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005169/14
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Pollution of the river Tinto

In the course of a recent visit to the municipality of Gondomar and a meeting with the River Tinto Protection Movement, we were informed about the condition of the Tinto, a river which flows through three municipalities in the Greater Metropolitan Area of Porto. It is regarded as the most polluted river in northern Portugal, in fact as something akin to an open sewer. The River Tinto Protection Movement was established in April 2006 and has more than 150 members. The group lobbies the relevant authorities to carry out clean-up operations and restoration work on the river, and campaigns for protection of the natural amenity formed by the river and its surrounding landscape. It organises events involving hundreds of people and local schools and raises public awareness of the importance of the environment and of protecting the river and water quality.

As the movement has clearly shown, the condition of the river has come about because of delays in making improvements to the municipality's sanitation network, illegal dumping of sewage in the river, the density of buildings near the river and, most significantly, the operation of the waste water treatment plant in Meiral. Paradoxically, rather than providing a solution to the problem, the plant has increased pollution levels in the river. The river would have to be widened and deepened to cope with the volume of waste water discharged. The plant, which is not currently fully operational after its redesign as its chemical and biological treatment systems are still causing problems, has not had its licence renewed and is discharging waste water into the river illegally, a matter about which the Commission has received a complaint (CHAP(2012)00330).

1. What sources of funding can the local authorities draw on in an effort to protect and clean up the river and help the River Tinto Protection Movement achieve its objectives.

2. What co-financing rate is applied to these funds?

3. Has the Commission been informed of the problems associated with the Meiral water treatment plant? What action has the Commission taken or will it take on the complaint referred to above?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(23 June 2014)

The issues described by the Honourable Member can be addressed using national funds but seem also to be in the scope of the EU funding provided through the Cohesion Fund or through the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF). The conditions under which such work can be funded, including the applicable co-financing rates, will depend on the Partnership Agreement and Operational Programmes currently being discussed between the Portuguese authorities and the European Commission. Detailed information, including a list of contact points in each Member State, is available online ([1]).

Such activities could also be funded through the LIFE financial instrument ([2]), particularly if they are of an innovative or demonstrative nature. The new LIFE programme offers possibilities for funding integrated projects that aim to improve the implementation of environmental or climate plans or strategies, including River Basin Management Plans, in conjunction with other funding sources, such as Cohesion Funds or ERDF.

The Commission received a complaint about the Meiral wastewater treatment plant in 2012. The elements provided by the complainant at that time, however, did not show an infringement of EU legislation and the complainant was informed, on 24 February 2012, that the file CHAP(2012)00330 would be closed. Since the complainant did not provide additional information, the Commission confirmed the closure of the case by letter on 13 April 2012.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/thefunds/regional/index_en.cfm
([2]) OJ C 104 E , 30.4.2004.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-005170/14
alla Commissione
Lara Comi (PPE)
(17 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Protezionismo della materia prima conciaria a danno delle aziende italiane ed europee

Premesso che:

— dal 1º gennaio 2014 è entrato in vigore il nuovo Sistema comunitario di preferenze generalizzate (SPG — regolamento (UE) n. 978/2012) che da oltre quarant'anni facilita le importazioni di beni originari da paesi in via di sviluppo abbassando i dazi;

— l'articolo 19 del menzionato regolamento stabilisce che le preferenze accordate per un determinato prodotto possono essere revocate qualora il paese beneficiario ponga in essere «pratiche commerciali sleali, gravi e sistematiche, tra cui quelle che hanno effetto sull'approvvigionamento di materie prime, che hanno ripercussioni negative sull'industria dell'Unione europea e che non sono state affrontate dal Paese beneficiario»;

— risulterebbe che in India dal 2000 il dazio è del 60 % su export di pelli grezze e semilavorate (il paese è beneficiario SPG per calzature, pelletterie ed abbigliamento in pelle); che in Etiopia dal 2012 il dazio è del 150 % su export di pelli grezze e semilavorate (il paese è beneficiario SPG+, cioè dazio zero per l'import nell'UE, per le pelli conciate e per tutti i manufatti in pelle; che in Pakistan dal 2005 il dazio è del 20 % su export di pelli grezze e semilavorate wet blue, stesso trattamento accordato all'Etiopia;

— gli accordi bilaterali e multilaterali (WTO) con gli stessi protezionisti hanno prodotto risultati insoddisfacenti e il protezionismo extra-UE continua a crescere (ad esempio la Russia ha recentemente annunciato il blocco dell'export di pelli grezze e wet blue per sei mesi);

— è necessario intervenire al più presto per tutelare le aziende europee indebolite fortemente da queste pratiche.

Tutto quanto sopra premesso, può la Commissione:

1. verificare con ogni mezzo a disposizione le circostanze in premessa e comunicare quali misure intende adottare?

2. specificare dettagliatamente che cosa intende per «pratiche commerciali sleali, gravi e sistematiche» di cui all'articolo 19 del regolamento (UE) n. 978/2012 e quale sarebbe l'effettivo ambito di applicazione di questa norma?

Risposta di Karel De Gucht a nome della Commissione
(10 giugno 2014)

La Commissione è consapevole delle difficoltà che l'industria europea si trova ad affrontare nell'approvvigionamento di pelli gregge provenienti da paesi terzi quali l'India, il Pakistan e l'Etiopia a causa di dazi all'esportazione. In linea con la strategia dell'UE per le materie prime, la Commissione ha stabilito come priorità centrale nei suoi negoziati sugli accordi di libero scambio (ALS) e nei negoziati di adesione all'Organizzazione mondiale del commercio (OMC), la necessità di ottenere dai paesi partner un impegno deciso a eliminare o limitare considerevolmente l'imposizione di dazi all'esportazione. Questa sarebbe la soluzione a lungo termine più adeguata al fine di agevolare la disponibilità di offerta per l'industria europea. Le disposizioni pertinenti figurano negli ALS con Corea del Sud, America centrale, Perù-Colombia e Singapore e hanno inoltre un'importanza centrale nei negoziati ALS in corso con l'India.

Il sistema di preferenze generalizzate dell'UE (SPG) non rappresenta lo strumento adeguato per affrontare i dazi all'esportazione. L'SPG mira a sostenere l'integrazione nei mercati internazionali dei paesi in via di sviluppo, in particolare di quelli più poveri, garantendo loro un accesso preferenziale al mercato dell'UE. Secondo le norme dell'SPG, la revoca delle preferenze presupporrebbe il sussistere di pratiche commerciali gravi, sleali e sistematiche ai sensi della normativa dell'OMC, come quelle vietate o passibili di azione legale in conformità agli accordi OMC *(articolo 19d)*. Tuttavia, secondo la normativa dell'OMC, l'imposizione di dazi all'esportazione non è di per sé illegale.

La Commissione controlla costantemente la disponibilità di pelli gregge sul mercato dell'UE e promuove un dialogo interno tra i produttori di cuoio e l'industria conciaria dell'UE al fine di garantire prezzi prevedibili e disponibilità a lungo termine dell'offerta all'interno dell'UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-005170/14
to the Commission
Lara Comi (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Protectionism regarding raw materials for the leather industry, to the detriment of Italian and EU companies

On 1 January 2014 the new EU scheme of generalised tariff preferences (GSP — Regulation (EU) No 978/2012) entered into force. For over 40 years, this system has been facilitating the importation of goods from developing countries by lowering duties.

Article 19 of that regulation provides that the preferential arrangements for a given product may be withdrawn if the beneficiary country engages in 'serious and systematic unfair trading practices including those affecting the supply of raw materials, which have an adverse effect on the Union industry and which have not been addressed by the beneficiary country'.

It would appear that, in India, since 2000, there has been a 60% duty on the export of raw and partially processed hides (the country is a GSP beneficiary for footwear, leather goods and leather clothing); in Ethiopia, since 2012, there has been a 150% duty on the export of raw and partially processed hides (this country is a GSP+ beneficiary, i.e. zero duty for imports into the EU of tanned hides and all kinds of leather goods); in Pakistan, meanwhile, since 2005, there has been a 20% duty on the export of raw and partially processed wet blue hides, when that country receives the same treatment as Ethiopia.

Bilateral and multilateral (WTO) agreements with these protectionist countries have produced unsatisfactory results while protectionism outside the EU continues to grow (for example, Russia recently announced that it would suspend its exports of raw hides and wet blue products for six months).

Urgent action is now therefore required in order to protect European companies that have been greatly weakened by these practices.

Can the Commission therefore:

1. verify, by all possible means, the circumstances mentioned above and say what steps itintends to take;

2. specify in detail what is meant by 'serious and systematic unfair trading practices' in Article 19 of Regulation (EU) No 978/2012 and say what the actual scope of that rule is?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(10 June 2014)

The Commission is aware of difficulties European industry is facing in sourcing raw hides and skins from third countries including from India, Pakistan and Ethiopia due to export duties. In line with the EU Raw Materials Strategy, the Commission has set as a key priority in its Free Trade Agreements (FTA) negotiations and World Trade Organisation (WTO) accession negotiations to obtain a firm commitment from partner countries to eliminate or substantially limit the use of export duties. This would be the most adequate long-term solution to facilitate availability of supply for the European industry. Relevant provisions are contained in the FTAs with South Korea, Central America, Peru-Colombia and Singapore. They are also of high importance in the ongoing FTA negotiations with India.

The EU Generalised Scheme of Preferences (GSP) is not the correct instrument to tackle export duties. The GSP aims to support the integration into international markets of developing countries, in particular the poorest, by providing preferential access to the EU market. Under GSP rules, the withdrawal of preferences would require the existence of serious and systematic unfair trading practices within the meaning of WTO law such as those which are prohibited or actionable under the WTO Agreements *(Article 19d)*. However, the imposition of export duties is not *per se* illegal under WTO law.

The Commission is permanently monitoring the availability of raw hides and skins on the EU market and is promoting a domestic dialogue between EU leather producers and the EU tanning industry with the objective of ensuring predictable prices and long-term availability of supply within the EU.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005171/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(17. April 2014)

Betrifft: Dickdarmkarzinom und Vorsorge

Europaweit erkrankten 2008 mehr als 400 000 Menschen an einem Dickdarmkarzinom und mehr als 200 000 Menschen starben daran.

In Österreich erkranken ca. 2 000 Personen pro Jahr an Dickdarmkrebs, pro Jahr sterben 1 000 Menschen, die zwischen 45 und 65 Jahre alt sind, daran oder an den Folgen; die laufenden Kosten betragen pro Jahr circa 200 Mio. EUR, wobei keinerlei Sekundärkosten eingerechnet sind.

Gäbe es in der Tat ein Vorsorgeprogramm, könnten einerseits viele Menschenleben durch ein entsprechend frühes Einschreiten gerettet werden und andererseits viele medizinische Kosten wie auch Folgekosten im Sozialsystem gespart werden.

1. Welche Zahlen liegen der Kommission in dem Zusammenhangvor, dass hier nicht schon längst ein Präventivprogramm auf europäischer Ebene angestrebt wurde? Diese Frage versteht sich vor allem vor dem Hintergrund, dass den Mitgliedstaaten im Gesundheits- und Sozialbereich ein weiteres Ansteigen ihrer Staatshaushalte erspart werden sollte.

2. Gibt es aktuelle Zahlen darüber,

— wie viele Menschen an Dickdarmkarzinom in der EU erkranken?

— wie viele Menschen an Dickdarmkarzinom in den einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten erkranken? Gibt es hier sowohl ein Nord-Süd-Gefälle als auch ein West-Ost-Gefälle?

— wie viele Menschen jährlich in der EU an Dickdarmkarzinom sterben?

— welche Kosten mit einem Dickdarmkarzinom für den Einzelnen wie auch für den Staat verbunden sind?

— (unbeschadet des ohnehin schweren Schicksals der einzelnen Betroffenen) wie viel der Mitgliedstaat durch den Tod eines im aktiven Arbeitsleben stehenden Menschen an Steuern verliert?

Antwort von Tonio Borg im Namen der Kommission
(3. Juni 2014)

Am 2. Dezember 2003 nahm der Rat die Empfehlung 2003/878/EG zur Krebsfrüherkennung ([1]) an. Die Kommission unterstützt die Mitgliedstaaten bei der Durchführung von Vorsorgeprogrammen, indem sie Leitlinien zur Qualitätssicherung in Bezug auf die Wirksamkeit der Vorsorgeuntersuchungen auf Brust-, Gebärmutterhals- und Darmkrebs erstellt. Im Jahr 2011 veröffentlichte die Kommission die erste Ausgabe der „Europäischen Leitlinien für Qualitätssicherung in der Darmkrebsvorsorge und -erkennung“ ([2]).

18 Mitgliedstaaten verfügen über Programme für die Darmkrebsvorsorge, einschließlich regionaler oder Pilotinitiativen.

Im Jahr 2012 gab es den Angaben in der Datenbank des Regionalbüros „Europa“ der Weltgesundheitsorganisation zufolge 342 000 neue Fälle von Darmkrebs in der Europäischen Union (13 % der Krebsfälle insgesamt) und 150 000 Todesfälle (11,9 % der krebsbedingten Todesfälle in Europa insgesamt).

Etwa 65 % aller neuen Fälle treten in Ländern mit hohem Einkommen auf. Die Todesfälle aufgrund von Darmkrebs sind jedoch in der EU von 22 Fällen je 100 000 Einwohner im Jahr 1995 auf weniger als 19 Fälle im Jahr 2011 zurückgegangen. Nach den jüngsten Ergebnissen der EUROCARE (Überlebensrate von Krebspatienten in Europa) hat sich die Überlebensrate bei Darmkrebs innerhalb von 5 Jahren verbessert und belief sich im Zeitraum 2005-2007 auf 57,6 % im Gegensatz zu 52,1 % in den Jahren 1999-2001.

Schätzungen zufolge sind 10 % der Gesamtkosten von Krebserkrankungen in der EU auf Darmkrebs zurückzuführen; dies entspricht Gesundheitskosten in Höhe von 5,6 Mrd. EUR (43 %) ([3]). Die Produktivitätsverluste durch frühzeitige Todesfälle lassen sich mit Kosten in Höhe von 3,8 Mrd. EUR und verlorenen Arbeitstagen im Wert von 0,9 Mrd. EUR beziffern.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2003:327:0034:0038:DE:PDF
([2]) http://bookshop.europa.eu/is-bin/INTERSHOP.enfinity/WFS/EU-Bookshop-Site/en_GB/EUR/ViewPublication-Start?PublicationKey=ND7007117
([3]) „Economic burden of cancer across the European Union: a population-based cost analysis“ (Die wirtschaftliche Belastung durch Krebs in der Europäischen Union: eine bevölkerungsbezogene Kostenanalyse). The Lancet Oncology, Band 14, Ausgabe 12, Seiten 1165-1174, November 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005171/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Colorectal cancer and screening

In 2008, across Europe, more than 400 000 people were diagnosed with colorectal cancer, and over 200 000 people died of it.

In Austria, approximately 2 000 people are diagnosed with colorectal cancer every year, and every year 1 000 people between the ages of 45 and 65 die of it or of its consequences; the on-going costs of this are approximately EUR 200 million per year, not including any secondary costs.

If there were in fact a screening programme, many lives could be saved by intervention at an early stage, and also a large amount of medical costs and consequential costs in the social welfare system could be saved.

1. What figures does the Commission have available with regard to why a preventative programme was not pursued on a European level a long time ago? This question should be understood in particular in the context of saving the Members States further public-expenditure increases in the areas of health and social welfare.

2. Do up-to-date figures exist in relation to:

— how many people are diagnosed with colorectal cancer in the EU?

— how many people are diagnosed with colorectal cancer in the individual Member States? Is there a North/South divide as well as an East/West divide?

— how many people die of colorectal cancer in the EU every year?

— what costs are associated with colorectal cancer for the individual and for the State?

— (quite apart from the suffering of the individuals affected) how much in taxes a Member State loses as a consequence of a person dying during their working life?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(3 June 2014)

On 2 December 2003 the Council adopted Recommendation 2003/878/EC on cancer screening ([1]). The Commission is supporting Member States in implementing screening programmes by developing guidelines for quality assurance for the effectiveness of breast, cervical and colorectal cancer screening. In 2011, the Commission published the first edition of the 'European Guidelines for Quality Assurance in Colorectal Cancer Screening and Diagnosis' ([2]).

18 Member States have colorectal cancer screening programmes including regional or pilot initiatives.

In 2012, according to the database of the World Health Organisation Regional Office for Europe, there were 342 000 new cases of colorectal cancer in the European Union (13% of total number of cancer cases) and 150 000 deaths (11.9% of the total deaths in Europe due to cancer).

About 65% of all new cases occur in high-income countries. However, deaths from colorectal cancer have fallen in the EU from 22 cases per 100 000 people in 1995 to less than 19 cases in 2011. According to the recent results of the Eurocare (Survival of cancer patients in Europe) the survival rate in 5 years for colorectal cancer improved to 57.6% in the period 2005-2007 from 52.1% in 1999-2001.

It has been estimated that colorectal cancer represents 10% of the total cost of cancer in EU, with healthcare accounting for EUR 5.6 billion (43%) ([3]). Productivity losses because of early death cost EUR 3.8 billion and lost working days EUR 0.9 billion.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2003:327:0034:0038:EN:PDF
([2]) http://bookshop.europa.eu/is-bin/INTERSHOP.enfinity/WFS/EU-Bookshop-Site/en_GB/-/EUR/ViewPublication-Start?PublicationKey=ND7007117
([3]) Economic burden of cancer across the European Union: a population-based cost analysis. The Lancet Oncology, Volume 14, Issue 12, Pages 1165-1174, November 2013.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005172/14
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(17. April 2014)

Betrifft: Kontinuierlicher Anstieg der Arbeitslosigkeit in der EU

Die Arbeitslosigkeit ist nach wie vor ein ungelöstes Problem in der Europäischen Union. Österreich zum Beispiel hat mittlerweile einen absoluten Höchststand an Arbeitslosen erreicht. In mehr als drei Viertel der EU-Regionen ist die Jugendarbeitslosigkeit mindestens doppelt so hoch wie die Gesamterwerbslosenquote.

1. Wie erklärt die Kommission die nach wie vor kontinuierliche Verschlechterung der Arbeitsmarktsituation in der Europäischen Union?

2. Welche Maßnahmen plant die Kommission nun konkret, um den Jugendlichen auch wirklich effizient helfen zu können?

3. Welche konkreten Maßnahmen und Strategien hat die Kommission geplant, um der Arbeitslosigkeit der Generation 50+ entgegenwirken zu können?

Antwort von Herrn Andor im Namen der Kommission
(6. Juni 2014)

Die allgemeine Arbeitsmarktsituation in der EU hat sich kürzlich etwas stabilisiert, doch ist der Stand der Arbeitslosigkeit weiterhin unannehmbar hoch. Im Euroraum lag die Arbeitslosenquote im März 2014 bei 11,8 %, also unter derjenigen vom März 2013 (12,0 %). In der EU der 28 betrug die Arbeitslosigkeit im März 2014 10,5 % und damit weniger als im März 2013 (10,9 %) ([1]). Die Erholung geht jedoch nur langsam vonstatten, und die Widerstandskraft der einzelnen Länder in der Krise war sehr unterschiedlich ausgeprägt. Diese Unterschiede gründen auch in Strukturproblemen, wie einer Segmentierung des Arbeitsmarktes, im Bereich der aktiven arbeitsmarktpolitischen Maßnahmen bzw. in einigen Ländern anhaltenden lohnkostenbedingten Problemen.

Mit Annahme des Jugendbeschäftigungspakets ([2]) vom Dezember 2012 hat die Kommission ihren Fokus auf die Einführung der Jugendgarantie ([3]) gerichtet. Diese umfasst eine fachliche Hilfestellung für die Mitgliedstaaten, die Überwachung und Abschätzung der Folgen der bestehenden politischen Strategien, länderspezifische Empfehlungen, die Förderung des Austausches bewährter Verfahren und die Ausschöpfung der europäischen Fonds, insbesondere des Europäischen Sozialfonds und der Beschäftigungsinitiative für junge Menschen. Darüber hinaus wird die Kommission die Empfehlung des Rates zu einem Qualitätsrahmen für Praktika ([4]) vom März 2014 weiter verfolgen, die Europäische Ausbildungsallianz ([5]) noch ausbauen und weiterhin die Mobilität der Arbeitskräfte innerhalb der EU fördern sowie die allgemeine und berufliche Bildung unterstützen.

Für ältere Arbeitskräfte sind keine spezifischen Maßnahmen geplant, da dem Gemeinsamen Beschäftigungsbericht 2014 ([6]) zufolge in dieser Gruppe deutliche Beschäftigungszuwächse erzielt wurden (um 3,3 Prozentpunkte seit 2008 auf 48,8 % im Jahr 2012).

([1]) Aktuelle Eurostat-Daten von 2014.
([2]) KOM(2012)727/728/729 vom 5.12.2012.
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2013:120:0001:0006:DE:PDF
([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/DE/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32014H0327(01)&qid=1401802770522&from=EN
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/apprenticeships-alliance
([6]) http://register.consilium.europa.eu/doc/srv?l=DE&t=PDF&gc=true&sc=false&f=ST%207476%202014%20INIT

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005172/14
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Unemployment continues to rise in the EU

Unemployment remains an unsolved problem in the EU. In Austria, for instance, unemployment recently reached its highest ever level. In more than three quarters of EU regions, youth unemployment is at least twice as high as the overall unemployment rate.

1. How does the Commission explain the continued deterioration of the situation on the employment market in the European Union?

2. Which concrete measures is the Commission now planning in order to provide effective help to young people?

3. Which specific measures and strategies has the Commission planned so as to combat unemployment among the 50+ generation?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2014)

The overall labour market situation in the EU has somewhat stabilised recently, but remains unacceptably high. Unemployment in the euro area was 11.8% in March 2014, down from 12.0% in March 2013. In the EU28 unemployment rate was 10.5% in March 2014 down from 10.9% in March 2013 ([1]). The pace of recovery is slow, though, and there are substantial differences in how resilient countries have been during the crisis. Those also reflect structural issues such as labour market segmentation, active labour market policies or labour-cost related problems persisting in some countries.

Following the December 2012 Youth Employment Package (YEP) ([2]), the Commission's priority is the implementation of the Youth Guarantee (YG) ([3]). This involves, technical assistance to Member States; monitoring and analysing the impact of the policies in place; addressing country-specific recommendations; supporting the exchange of good practices and ensuring the best possible use of European Funds, notably the European Social Fund and the Youth Employment Initiative. The Commission will follow up the Council Recommendation on the Quality Framework for Traineeships of March 2014 ([4]), further develop the European Alliance for Apprenticeships ([5]), and continue support for intra-EU labour mobility education and training of young EU citizens.

No particular measures are foreseen for elder workers, as increases in employment have been substantial for this group (3.3 percentage points since 2008 to reach 48.8% in 2012) as mentioned in the Joint Employment Report 2014 ([6]).

([1]) Eurostat latest data 2014.
([2]) COM(2012) 727-728-729 of 5.12.2012.
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2013:120:0001:0006:EN:PDF
([4]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/lsa/141424.pdf
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/apprenticeships-alliance
([6]) http://register.consilium.europa.eu/doc/srv?l=EN&t=PDF&gc=true&sc=false&f=ST%207476%202014%20INIT

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005174/14
à Comissão
Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL) e Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL)
(17 de abril de 2014)

Assunto: Controlo da aplicação das orientações

Em 19 de julho, a Comissão publicou as orientações relativas à participação de entidades israelitas em programas europeus. Essas orientações entraram em vigor em janeiro de 2014.

Solicita-se à Comissão que responda ao seguinte:

1. Que medidas tenciona o Banco Europeu de Investimento tomar a fim de dar aplicação a essas orientações?

2. Serão as entidades israelitas que operam em territórios palestinianos ocupados elegíveis para beneficiar de empréstimos concedidos pelo Banco Europeu de Investimento?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(2 de julho de 2014)

1. As orientações relativas à elegibilidade das entidades israelitas ([1]) são aplicáveis ao Banco Europeu de Investimento (BEI), na medida em que foi encarregado da gestão de fundos orçamentais da UE, tal como estabelecido na secção B das orientações. As orientações excluem o apoio da UE, sob a forma de subvenções, prémios ou instrumentos financeiros na aceção do Regulamento Financeiro, às entidades israelitas estabelecidas ou que exercem atividades nos territórios palestinianos ocupados.

O BEI tem estado em contacto estreito com a Comissão e a Alta Representante relativamente às orientações e ao seu impacto sobre a atividade do BEI desde a data do seu anúncio em meados do ano passado. Tal foi feito com vista a garantir a coerência entre as atividades do BEI em Israel e as orientações, bem como a manter a coerência das atividades do BEI em Israel com as políticas da UE em geral, incluindo financiamentos do BEI abrangidos pela garantia do orçamento da UE.

2. De acordo com as informações fornecidas pelo BEI, no passado, este não financiou projetos que não estavam em conformidade com as orientações. As modalidades finais para a aplicação das Orientações ainda se encontram em fase de negociação entre a União Europeia e Israel, o que contribuirá para definir o potencial de elegibilidade das entidades israelitas para receberem financiamento através do BEI.

([1]) Orientações relativas à elegibilidade das entidades israelitas estabelecidas nos territórios ocupados por Israel desde junho de 1967 e das atividades que aí desenvolvem para subvenções, prémios e instrumentos financeiros financiados pela UE a partir de 2014 (JO C 205 de 19.7.2013, p. 9).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005174/14
to the Commission
Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL) and Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Monitoring of guidelines implementation

On 19 July 2013 the Commission published guidelines on the participation of Israeli entities in European programmes. The Guidelines came into effect in January 2014.

Can the Commission answer the following:

1. What steps will the European Investment Bank take to implement the guidelines?

2. Will Israeli entities with operations in occupied Palestinian territories be eligible to receive loans from the European Investment Bank?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(2 July 2014)

1. The guidelines on the eligibility of Israeli entities ([1]) (the Guidelines) apply to the European Investment Bank (EIB) to the extent it has been entrusted with the management of EU budget funds, as set out Section B of the Guidelines. The Guidelines exclude EU support in the form of grants, prizes or financial instruments, within the meaning of the Financial Regulation, to Israeli entities which are established or carry out activities in the occupied Palestinian territories.

The EIB has been in close contact with the Commission and the High Representative regarding the Guidelines and their impact on EIB activity since the time of their announcement in the middle of last year. This has been with a view to ensure consistency between EIB activities in Israel and the Guidelines, as well as the consistency of EIB activities in Israel, including EIB financing covered by the EU budget guarantee, with EU policies in general.

2. According to information provided by the EIB, in the past the Bank has not financed projects that would not be in accordance with the Guidelines. The final modalities for the application of the Guidelines are still being negotiated between the Union and Israel. This will further determine the potential eligibility of Israeli entities for funding through the EIB.

([1]) Guidelines on the eligibility of Israeli entities and their activities in the territories occupied by Israel since June 1967 for grants, prizes and financial instruments funded by the EU from 2014 onwards (OJ C 205, 19.7.2013, p. 9).

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005175/14
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL) e Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL)
(17 de abril de 2014)

Assunto: VP/AR — Reagrupamento familiar dentro do território de Israel

Quando a lei «Cidadania e entrada em Israel» (decreto provisório) foi estabelecida em 2003, a Comissão Europeia alegou que essa política instaurava um regime discriminatório em detrimento dos palestinianos no domínio altamente sensível dos direitos da família. A CE realçou igualmente que, ao abrigo do Acordo de Associação UE-Israel, o respeito de Israel pelos direitos humanos constitui um elemento essencial da sua relação com a União Europeia, e que a Delegação europeia estava a acompanhar a situação de perto.

Pese embora esse controlo, a medida — inicialmente estabelecida para vigorar um ano — continuou, porém, a ser renovada anualmente ao longo da última década. A proibição em matéria de reagrupamento familiar foi renovada pela 11.ª vez na semana passada.

Em consequência disso, os palestinianos com documentos de identificação da Cisjordânia ou de Gaza permanecem separados dos respetivos cônjuges que tenham documentos de identidade de Jerusalém ou cidadania israelita. Esta política gera angústia e sofrimento a milhares de pessoas, ao mesmo tempo que serve os objetivos demográficos de Israel de limitar a presença palestiniana no seu território, e, em particular, no território ilegalmente anexado de Jerusalém Oriental.

Face a estas considerações, solicita-se à Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante que responda ao seguinte:

1. Que medidas específicas adotou a UE para pressionar Israel a cumprir as suas obrigaçõesinternacionais e a pôr fim a esta lei discriminatória?

2. Que impacto positivo e concreto tiveram essas medidas na política levada a cabo porIsrael desde que a lei foi instaurada em 2003?

3. Que resposta dará a UE se a lei voltar a ser renovada?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(24 de junho de 2014)

A UE tem conhecimento da recente renovação, até abril de 2015, da lei israelita relativa à «Cidadania e entrada em Israel», referida pelas Senhoras Deputadas.

A questão do reagrupamento familiar é motivo de preocupação para a UE, que está atualmente a financiar um projeto nesse domínio, executado pelos Médicos pelos Direitos Humanos, e cujo tema é «Empoderar as mulheres afetadas pela Lei da Cidadania de 2003, através da prestação de serviços sociais», com o objetivo de promover e acelerar a concessão de direitos sociais aos palestinianos/as sem estatuto legal casados/as com cidadãos israelitas.

Além disso, no contexto da cooperação com Israel nos domínios dos direitos humanos, a UE tem exortado repetidamente esse país a atuar contra e/ou a abster-se de exercer qualquer forma de discriminação, em conformidade com as suas obrigações ao abrigo do direito internacional em matéria de direitos humanos e liberdades fundamentais, referidas pelas Senhoras Deputadas.

A UE continuará a acompanhar de perto os desenvolvimentos e apelará às autoridades israelitas, se e quando pertinente e na forma apropriada, para que conformem as suas práticas com as normas internacionais estabelecidas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005175/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL) and Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Family unification within Israeli territory

When Israel's Citizenship and Entry into Israel Law (Temporary Order) was introduced in 2003, the Commission claimed that the policy established, 'a discriminatory regime to the detriment of Palestinians in the highly sensitive area of family rights'. The Commission also stressed that, 'under the EU-Israel Association Agreement, Israeli respect for human rights constitutes an essential element of its relationship with the European Union', and that the delegation was closely monitoring the situation.

Despite such scrutiny, however, the measure — initially introduced for one year — has continued to be renewed annually for the past decade. The ban on family unification was renewed last week for the 11th time.

As a result, Palestinians with West Bank or Gaza IDs remain divided from their spouses who hold Jerusalem IDs or Israeli citizenship. This policy leads to anguish and distress for thousands while serving the demographic aims of Israel by limiting Palestinian presence within Israeli territory, and in particular within illegally annexed East Jerusalem.

In light of the above, could the Vice-President/High Representative indicate:

1. what specific steps the EU has taken to pressure Israel to comply with its international obligations and end this discriminatory law?

2. the positive and precise outcomes that these steps have had on Israeli policy since the law's introduction in 2003?

3. the EU's response should the law be renewed again?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(24 June 2014)

The EU is aware of the recent renewal of the Israel's Citizenship and Entry into Israel Law until April 2015, referred to by the Honourable Members.

The issue of family unification is of concern for the EU which is currently funding an ongoing project in this area, implemented by Physicians for Human Rights on 'Empowering Women Affected by the 2003 Citizenship Law through the Provision of Social Services' aiming at promoting and advancing the granting of social rights to Palestinian status-less individuals married to Israeli citizens.

Moreover, in the context of the cooperation with Israel in areas of human rights the EU has repeatedly called on Israel to address and/or to refrain from any form of discrimination in accordance with its obligation under international law on matters of human rights and fundamental freedoms referred to by the Honorable Member.

The EU will continue monitoring closely the developments and will call upon Israeli authorities, if and when relevant and in the appropriate format, to bring its practices in line with established international standards.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005176/14
to the Commission
Nicole Sinclaire (NI)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: St Kitts and Nevis

Further to the EU's reform of its sugar sector in 2005, the Commission allocated EUR 45.13 million to St Kitts and Nevis for the 2006-2013 period.

Could the Commission advise me as to what measures are being taken to help St Kitts and Nevis following that period?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2014)

Two Multiannual Indicative Programmes (MIPs) were adopted for Saint Kitts and Nevis as part of the European Union's support for Accompanying Measures for the Sugar Protocol (AMSP).

Under the second MIPs (2011-2013), the European Union and the Government of Saint Kitts and Nevis have concluded two Financing Agreements totalling EUR 25,688,000 in continued support for the country's sugar National Adaptation Strategy (2006-2017). Under these Financing Agreements, the European Union is supporting the implementation of the 2012-2017 Social Protection Strategy with emphasis on more efficient and effective pro-poor targeted social safety nets and special attention to youth. In addition, support is being extended to private sector development and investment facilitation in areas where the country has future economic growth opportunities like land administration and the energy sector. The programme is also supporting human resources development actions with the aim of improving the educational and professional qualifications, skills and employability of the labour force.

For the 2014-2020 period, Saint Kitts and Nevis is eligible to receive an allocation from the 11th EDF. Saint Kitts and Nevis is also eligible for funding under the 11th EDF regional cooperation in the Caribbean, and from thematic programmes. Saint Kitts and Nevis can also apply for funding under the Caribbean Investment Facility. 11th EDF programming for the period 2014-2020 has not yet been adopted.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005177/14
a la Comisión
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(17 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: Ecosistemas naturales de Aceh

Desde 2012 se ha producido una intensificación del debate en torno a la situación actual y futura del ecosistema de Leuser, especialmente en la provincia de Aceh, en Sumatra (Indonesia), donde se halla el 80 % de los 2,6 millones de hectáreas de la zona protegida, una de las extensiones más importantes de bosque húmedo tropical del Sudeste Asiático. Este debate tiene que ver en gran medida con los planes de las autoridades de Aceh de permitir el cambio de uso de las llanuras y de los bosques pantanosos con turba rica en carbono, lo que ha provocado el enfrentamiento entre el Gobierno local y el Gobierno nacional de Yakarta. El Gobierno central indonesio reconoce ahora que el Gobierno de Aceh se opone a la normativa nacional, lo que ha llevado a un enfrentamiento político mientras continúa la destrucción de este ecosistema «protegido».

Es necesario y urgente que se produzca una mediación, y la UE es el agente que se halla en mejor situación para iniciarla, dada su dilatada trayectoria en la región. Esto también queda patente en una petición global en curso de Avaaz, dirigida al embajador de la UE en Indonesia, que parece que conseguirá rápidamente un millón de firmas a favor de la actuación de la UE, lo que pone de relieve la importancia mundial del tema. Varios de los Estados miembros, entre los que se hallan Alemania, el Reino Unido, Suecia y Finlandia, tienen programas de desarrollo en marcha en la región, que en parte tienen como objetivo velar por la conservación del ecosistema de Leuser, pero la coordinación entre estos programas en cuanto a los objetivos y los enfoques no es la adecuada.

1. ¿Convocará la UE, a través de su delegación en Yakarta, una reunión urgente de los Estados miembros y sus socios, como Noruega y Suiza, para tratar la mejor manera de mediar en la disputa entre el Gobierno nacional y el local en Indonesia?

2. ¿Redoblará la Comisión sus esfuerzos por armonizar sus propias iniciativas y programas de apoyo al ecosistema de Leuser en la región, y los de los Estados miembros; adoptará medidas para garantizar una mayor coordinación y coherencia en la actuación entre todos los agentes de la UE en materia de desarrollo?

3. ¿Brindará la UE acceso al gobernador de Aceh a la asistencia técnica y los conocimientos especializados del European Forest Institute con carácter urgente, a fin de que se examine y revise el programa de desarrollo para que cumpla los compromisos internacionales relativos a la reducción de las emisiones de gases de efecto invernadero y la protección de los hábitats de especies amenazadas?

Respuesta del Sr. Piebalgs en nombre de la Comisión
(6 de junio de 2014)

La UE es consciente de las preocupaciones sobre el plan territorial de Aceh y las otras amenazas para el ecosistema de Leuser en las provincias indonesias de Aceh y Sumatra del Norte. La UE tiene un largo historial de colaboración positiva con Indonesia en la protección de los recursos naturales.

1. La Delegación de la UE mantiene su compromiso en estos asuntos y aprovecha cualquier oportunidad para recordarle a las autoridades indonesias y de Aceh sus opiniones sobre la vital importancia del ecosistema de Leuser para la biodiversidad mundial y como sumidero de carbono de importancia mundial. La Delegación de la UE en Yakarta ha mantenido numerosas conversaciones sobre esta cuestión con los Estados miembros de la UE y otros Gobiernos interesados para lanzar un mensaje internacional concertado sobre estas cuestiones. En un futuro próximo, la Delegación de la UE encabezará una misión de embajadores de los Estados miembros de la UE en Aceh para celebrar reuniones de alto nivel en las que se abordará la cuestión de Leuser.

2. La Delegación de la UE mantiene reuniones de coordinación periódicas con los consejeros de desarrollo de los Estados miembros de la UE y otros agentes de desarrollo, para garantizar la coherencia de los programas sobre el cambio climático y relacionados no solo en Aceh e Indonesia sino también en todo el territorio de la región de la ASEAN.

3. El plan de trabajo de 2014 de la REDD (Reducción de Emisiones por Deforestación y Degradación Forestal) de la UE, en el marco del Instituto Forestal Europeo, prevé el diseño y la aplicación de ayudas de la UE al proyecto de respuesta al cambio climático de Indonesia en Aceh y Jambi, centrándose específicamente en garantizar una planificación del uso del suelo más participativa, creando unidades de gestión forestal y desarrollando y aplicando con eficacia el sistema indonesio de garantía de la legalidad de la madera como parte del Acuerdo de Asociación Voluntaria sobre leyes, aplicación, gobernanza y comercio en materia forestal (FLEGT en sus siglas inglesas) entre la UE e Indonesia.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005177/14
to the Commission
Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Natural ecosystems in Aceh

Since 2012 there have been escalating debates about the status and the future of the Leuser Ecosystem, in particular in the Aceh Province of Sumatra, which hosts 80% of the 2.6 million-hectare protected area and which is one of the richest expanses of tropical rain forest in Southeast Asia. These debates are strongly linked to the Aceh authorities' plans to open up lowland and carbon-rich peat swamp forests for conversion, which have pitted the local government against the national government in Jakarta. The Aceh Government is fighting against national regulation, a fact that has now been acknowledged by the Central Indonesian Government, thereby leading to a political standoff, while the destruction of this 'protected' ecosystem continues to take place.

Efforts to mediate are urgently needed. The EU, owing to its longstanding work in the region, is the best placed actor to initiate such efforts. This fact has also been pointed out by a current Avaaz global petition targeting the EU Ambassador to Indonesia, with signatures in favour of EU action rapidly heading towards one million, something which highlights the global significance of the issue. Several Member States, including Germany, the United Kingdom, Sweden and Finland all have ongoing development programmes in the region, which in part aim to safeguard the conservation of the Leuser Ecosystem, but the objectives and approaches of these programmes are not adequately coordinated.

1. Will the EU, through its delegation in Jakarta, convene an urgent meeting of the Member States and allies such as Norway and Switzerland to discuss how they can best mediate the disagreement between the national and local government in Indonesia?

2. Will the Commission increase its efforts to align its own interventions and support programmes for the Leuser Ecosystem in the region with those of Member States and take action to ensure greater coordination and coherent action among all EU development actors?

3. Will the EU offer the Governor of Aceh access to the European Forest Institute's technical support and expertise as a matter of urgency to review and revise a development agenda which complies with international commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and protect the habitats of endangered species?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2014)

The EU is aware of concerns over the Aceh Spatial Plan and other reported threats to the Leuser ecosystem in Indonesia's Aceh and North Sumatra provinces. The EU has a long record of positive engagement with Indonesia on helping to protect the country's unique natural resources.

1. The EU Delegation remains engaged on these issues and takes every opportunity to remind the Indonesian and Acehnese authorities of its views on the vital importance of the Leuser ecosystem to global biodiversity and as a globally important carbon sink. The EU Delegation in Jakarta has had numerous discussions on this issue with EU Member States (MS) and other interested governments to encourage a concerted international message on these issues. In the near future the EU Delegation will be leading a mission of EU MS Ambassadors to Aceh for high-level meetings at which the Leuser issue will be raised.

2. The EU Delegation holds regular coordination meetings with Development Counsellors from the EU MS and other related development actors to ensure coherence on climate change and related programmes not only in Aceh and Indonesia but also throughout the ASEAN region

3. The 2014 work plan of the EU REDD (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation) facility, under the European Forest Institute, foresees the design and implementation of the EU's Support to Indonesia's Climate Change Response project in Aceh and Jambi with a specific focus on ensuring more participatory land-use planning, setting up forest management units and the development and effective implementation of the Indonesian Timber Legality Assurance System as part of the Voluntary Partnership Agreement on Forest Law, Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT) between the EU and Indonesia.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-005178/14
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(17 avril 2014)

Objet: Exploitation pétrolière au Congo

En 2007, plusieurs parcelles du Parc des Virunga au Congo ont été octroyées à Total (société française), à Eni (société italienne) et à Soco (société anglaise). En août 2010, Soco publie son étude d'impact environnemental préalable au lancement des phases d'exploration et d'exploitation. Le ministère congolais de l'environnement la refuse et suspend toutes les activités dans le parc. L'Unesco s'est en effet manifestée, la directrice s'étant rendue en personne à Kinshasa pour convaincre le gouvernement congolais de protéger son parc national. À l'issue de cette visite, une déclaration conjointe est publiée: le gouvernement congolais ne touchera pas au Parc des Virunga.

En dépit de cette déclaration, un permis d'exploration sera néanmoins accordé à Soco en octobre 2011, puis annulé, pour être à nouveau autorisé grâce à une autorisation sismique fin 2013. Entre-temps, Total et Eni ont promis de ne pas exploiter de pétrole dans la portion de leur concession correspondant au parc national.

Soco continue, elle, d'explorer le site à la recherche de richesses pétrolières. Pourtant, la loi congolaise interdit la présence d'industries extractives dans les parcs nationaux. L'exploitation du pétrole dans le Parc des Virunga pourrait aussi constituer une violation du code de conduite que l'OCDE recommande aux multinationales.

1. Quelle est la position de l'Union européenne sur cette question?

2. Sachant que Soco est une société européenne, ne peut-on pas avoir un moyen de pression afin que celle-ci cesse son activité illégale dans ce parc national?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante, au nom de la Commission
(13 juin 2014)

L'UE et ses États membres soutiennent la préservation de la biodiversité en RDC depuis des décennies (et le parc national des Virunga depuis 1988). La biodiversité restera un secteur prioritaire dans le cadre du programme du 11^e^ FED à venir.

L'UE confirme son interprétation selon laquelle l'exploration et l'exploitation pétrolière dans le parc national des Virunga sont contraires à la législation nationale congolaise et vont à l'encontre de plusieurs conventions internationales ratifiées par la RDC.

En accord avec le ministre de l'environnement de la RDC, l'UE s'est engagée à soutenir la réalisation d'une évaluation stratégique des incidences sur l'environnement, qui devrait fournir aux autorités les évaluations qu'elles nécessitent sur le plan de l'impact économique, sécuritaire, social et environnemental avant toute prise de décision quant à une éventuelle exploitation et exploration des ressources pétrolières. Le travail sur le terrain dans le cadre de cette étude commencera sous peu.

L'UE mène actuellement un programme de soutien au parc national des Virunga, qui a déjà obtenu des résultats concrets pour ce qui est de la conservation du parc et de ses zones limitrophes. Il s'agit notamment de la mise en place d'une centrale hydroélectrique à Mutwanga et la sécurisation des fonds provenant de sources tant publiques que privées pour des projets à Lubero et Rutshuru.

Les représentants de l'Union européenne ont demandé à la fois à SOCO et aux autorités congolaises de prendre toutes les mesures nécessaires pour veiller à ce que SOCO respecte la législation en vigueur en RDC dans la conduite des activités liées aux hydrocarbures qu'elle y mène. L'UE et d'autres partenaires au développement de la RDC suivent étroitement l'adoption d'une loi sur les hydrocarbures en gardant à l'esprit la nécessité de respecter les normes sociales et environnementales ainsi que la législation internationale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005178/14
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Exploitation of oil in Congo

In 2007, several parcels of land in Virunga National Park in Congo were granted to Total (a French company), Eni (an Italian company) and Soco (an English company). In August 2010, Soco published its environmental impact assessment prior to the launching of the exploration and exploitation phases. The Congolese Minister of Environment rejected the assessment and suspended all activity in the park. This was because Unesco had become involved, with the Director-General personally visiting Kinshasa in order to convince the Congolese Government to protect its national park. A joint declaration was published at the end of this visit: the Congolese Government will not touch Virunga National Park.

Despite this declaration, an exploration permit would nonetheless be granted to Soco in October 2011, then cancelled, only to be authorised again after authorisation to carry out seismic testing was granted at the end of 2013. Meanwhile, Total and Eni have promised not to exploit oil in the portion of the granted land that falls within the national park.

Soco, on the other hand, continues to explore the site in search of oil deposits, yet Congolese law prohibits the presence of extractive industries in national parks. The exploitation of oil in Virunga National Park could also constitute a breach of the code of conduct that OECD recommends to multinational corporations.

1. What stance does the European Union take on this issue?

2. In the knowledge that Soco is a European company, is there not a means of applying pressure with a view to it stopping its illegal activity in this national park?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(13 June 2014)

The EU and its Member States have supported biodiversity conservation in DRC for decades (and Virunga Park since 1988): biodiversity will remain a focal sector under the forthcoming 11th EDF programme.

The EU confirms its understanding that oil exploration and exploitation in the Virunga Park is illegal according to Congolese national law and several international conventions ratified by the DRC.

In agreement with the DRC Ministry of Environment, the EU has undertaken to support the realisation of a Strategic Environmental Assessment: this should furnish the assessments needed by the authorities in terms of economic, security, social and environmental impact before any decision on potential oil exploration/exploitation is taken. Fieldwork for this study will start shortly.

The EU has an ongoing programme in support of Virunga which has already achieved tangible results in conservation and also in areas bordering the Park itself. These include the launching of a hydropower station in Mutwanga and securing funds from both public and private sources for projects in Rutshuru and Lubero.

Representatives of the EU have requested both SOCO and the Congolese authorities to undertake all necessary actions to ensure that SOCO respects the law in conducting oil -related activities in DRC. The EU and other development partners of DRC are also closely monitoring the passage of a hydrocarbon law bearing in mind the need to respect social and environmental standards and international legality.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-005179/14
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(17 avril 2014)

Objet: Turquie et liberté d'expression

La Turquie a interdit, le 20 mars, l'accès au réseau social sur lequel des opposants avaient diffusé des enregistrements de conversations téléphoniques piratées mettant en cause le Premier ministre Recep Tayyip Erdoğan dans un vaste scandale de corruption. Contrainte, le 3 avril, par un arrêt de la Cour constitutionnelle, la Turquie a levé le blocage de Twitter.

Ce samedi 12 avril, le Premier ministre turc a encore fait une sortie remarquée en réattaquant Twitter. Cette fois-ci, il accuse Twitter d'évasion fiscale. La position du Premier ministre est donc claire. Ajoutons également que la position de la Turquie dans ce domaine va à l'encontre de l'article 19 de la Déclaration universelle des Droits de l'homme des Nations unies.

1. L'Union européenne compte-t-elle prendre des sanctions vis-à-vis de la Turquie?

2. Étant donné qu'elle est en cours d'adhésion à l'Union européenne, ne serait-ce pas utile de rappeler à la Turquie que l'article 10 de la Convention européenne des Droits de l'homme défend la liberté d'expression et empêche ce type de mesure?

Réponse donnée par M. Füle au nom de la Commission
(20 juin 2014)

Les questions soulevées par les Honorables Parlementaires soulignent la nécessité de renforcer la coopération avec la Turquie afin de s'assurer que l'UE et ses normes restent la référence pour l'instauration des réformes de ce pays. Le potentiel de la relation UE-Turquie ne saurait être pleinement exploité que dans le cadre d'un processus d'adhésion actif et crédible.

La Commission, à de nombreuses reprises, a appelé la Turquie, en tant que pays candidat engagé à remplir les critères d'adhésion de l'UE, à respecter pleinement la liberté d'expression, conformément à l'article 10 de la Convention européenne des Droits de l'homme tel qu'interprété par la jurisprudence de la Cour européenne des Droits de l'homme. Toute entrave à l'exercice de telles libertés est soumise à un strict contrôle judiciaire en raison de l'importance primordiale des droits en question. Toute interférence individuelle dans l'application desdits droits, notamment, doit être proportionnée à l'objectif poursuivi.

La Commission continuera à suivre de près ces questions et les abordera avec les autorités turques à toute occasion appropriée.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005179/14
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Jean Louis Cottigny (S&D)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Turkey and freedom of expression

On 20 March, Turkey prohibited access to the social network on which opponents had broadcast recordings of leaked telephone conversations implicating the Prime Minister, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, in a huge corruption scandal. On 3 April, Turkey was forced to lift the block on Twitter by a ruling made by the Constitutional Court.

On Saturday, 12 April of this year, the Turkish Prime Minister once again attracted a great deal of attention by launching another attack on Twitter. This time he is accusing Twitter of tax evasion. The stance taken by the Prime Minister is therefore plain to see. We would also like to add that the stance taken by Turkey in this area is in breach of Article 19 of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

1. Does the European Union intend to impose sanctions on Turkey?

2. Given that it is in the process of acceding to the European Union, would it not be wise to remind Turkey that Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights defends freedom of expression and prevents this type of measure from being taken?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2014)

The issues highlighted by the Honourable Members underline the importance of enhancing engagement with Turkey to ensure that the EU and its standards remain the benchmark for reforms in this Country. The full potential of the EU-Turkey relationship is best fulfilled within the framework of an active and credible accession process.

The Commission has on numerous occasions called on Turkey, as a candidate country committed to the European Union accession criteria, to fully respect freedom of expression, as envisaged in Article 10 of the European Convention of Human Rights and interpreted by the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights. Any interference with the exercise of such freedoms requires strict supervision by the courts due to the cardinal importance of the rights in question. In particular, any individual interference in the application of such law must be proportionate to the aim pursued.

The Commission will continue following these issues closely and will raise them with the Turkish authorities on all appropriate occasions.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-005181/14
upućeno Komisiji
Dubravka Šuica (PPE)
(17. travnja 2014.)

Predmet: Sanacija Crnog Brda kod Biljana Donjih

Na lokaciji Crno Brdo kod Biljana Donjih, grad Benkovac, odložena je veća količina kamenog agregata dobivenog kao nusproizvod pri sanaciji metalne troske iz Tvornice elektroda i ferolegura Šibenik (TEF). Nadležne institucije i inspekcijske službe upoznate su s činjeničnim stanjem u nekoliko navrata kada im je ukazivano na problem koji utječe na kvalitetu života lokalnih stanovnika. Međutim do danas nije pronađeno odgovarajuće rješenje iako postoji realna opasnost i mogućnost da daljnje trunjenje troske i ubuduće otežava život građanima koji žive u krugu od 10 km od Crnog Brda.

Ta ogromna količina potencijalno opasnog otpada stoji u okolišu, a zbog vjetra i kiše predstavlja prijetnju i za okoliš i za podzemne vode jer su rezultati analize pokazali da voda sadrži štetne tvari. Kiša stvara crnu rijeku tekućine koja ulazi u podzemne vodotoke, a zagađivanje prijeti bunarima i bazenima za navodnjavanje, no nije isključeno ni zagađivanje nekog od izvora zadarskog vodovoda ili Vranskog jezera. Okolni mještani ne skupljaju više vodu u bunarima zbog brige za vlastito i zdravlje svojih obitelji.

Osobno su mi se kao članici Odbora za okoliš, javno zdravlje i sigurnost hrane Europskog parlamenta građani tog područja višekratno obratili za pomoć, a lokalne vlasti Zadarske županije također su u više navrata upozoravale nadležne državne institucije na postupak sanacije ovog lokaliteta, no odgovor je izostao. Budući da je pristup vodi osnovno ljudsko pravo, o čemu se zadnje vrijeme ozbiljno raspravlja u Europskom parlamentu na temelju prijedloga Europske građanske inicijative „Right2water", zanima me može li Komisija pomoći hrvatskim državnim i zadarskim lokalnim vlastima da riješe problem Crnog Brda kako bi se građanima koji su neposredno ugroženi omogućio normalan život te kako bi se i dalje mogli neometano baviti ekološkom poljoprivredom?

Odgovor g. Potočnika u ime Komisije
(4. srpnja 2014.)

U Europskoj uniji na snazi je sveobuhvatni skup pravila kako bi se osiguralo sigurno odlaganje otpada. Komisija je nedavno saznala za situaciju na lokaciji Crno Brdo kod Biljana Donjih te zajedno s hrvatskim tijelima nadležnima za ispravnu provedbu zakonodavstva EU-a istražuje taj predmet.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005181/14
to the Commission
Dubravka Šuica (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Reclamation of the 'Crno Brdo' site at Donje Biljane

A large amount of mineral aggregate, created as a by-product during the recovery of metal from slag, has been dumped at the 'Crno Brdo' site at Donje Biljane, near the town of Benkovac. The competent authorities and control services have been made aware of the state of affairs on several occasions when the impact on the quality of life of local residents was pointed out to them. However, no appropriate solution has yet been found, even though there is a genuine risk that more slag will be dumped there in the future, making life difficult for people living within 10 kilometres of Crno Brdo.

There are huge quantities of potentially dangerous waste in the area. The effects of rain and wind mean that this waste poses a threat to the environment and to underground water. Furthermore, analyses have shown the presence of harmful substances in the water. Rainfall is resulting in a black river of liquid that enters underground waterways, while wells and irrigation pools are in danger of being polluted. Furthermore, the risk of pollutants contaminating one of the sources of drinking water for the city of Zadar or Lake Vrana cannot be ruled out. Locals no longer collect water from wells as they are afraid for their own health and that of their families.

As a member of Parliament's Committee on Environment, Public Health and Food Safety, I have been personally contacted on a number of occasions by residents of this area seeking help. The local authorities in Zadar County have warned the competent national authorities many times about the recovery process at this site, but no response has been forthcoming. Given that access to water is a basic human right and that this has recently been the subject of serious discussions in Parliament in the context of the 'Right2water' European Citizens' Initiative, could the Commission help the national and Zadar county authorities to resolve the problems at the Crno Brdo site so that endangered residents can enjoy a normal life and continue to practice organic farming unhindered?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(4 July 2014)

A comprehensive set of rules is in place in the European Union to ensure the safe disposal of waste. The Commission has recently been made aware of the situation at Crno Brdo at Biljane Donje and is investigating the matter with the Croatian competent authorities who have to ensure the correct implementation of EU legislation.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005182/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(17 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Richiesta di chiarimenti circa l'applicazione del regolamento (UE) n. 461/2010 relativo alla distribuzione, alla riparazione e alla manutenzione degli autoveicoli

Il regolamento (UE) n. 461/2010 disciplina la distribuzione, la riparazione e la manutenzione degli autoveicoli, così come la fornitura dei pezzi di ricambio, nel tentativo di stimolare e favorire il principio della libera concorrenza nel settore. Nonostante ciò, lo spirito del regolamento (UE) n. 461/2010 è spesso messo in discussione in quanto vi sono casi in cui gli operatori indipendenti effettuano riparazioni degli autoveicoli mediante la sostituzione di interi sottosistemi (ciò costituirebbe un monopolio del costruttore del sottosistema).

A tale scopo, potrebbe essere importante procedere a una valutazione e a un miglior coordinamento degli aspetti della vendita, della manutenzione e della garanzia degli autoveicoli, in modo da favorire la libera concorrenza e offrire agli automobilisti una nuova e più ampia possibilità di scelta in termini di assistenza e ricambi.

Alla luce di quanto premesso, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. di fornire un quadro generale relativo all'applicazione del regolamento (UE) n. 461/2010;

2. di fornire un suo parere circa la possibile modifica del regolamento (UE) n. 461/2010, al fine di tutelare maggiormente il diritto dei consumatori di valutare alternative diverse e di rivolgersi quindi a quella che ritengono più conveniente o comunque più vicina alle loro esigenze nel settore della riparazione e manutenzione degli autoveicoli.

Risposta di Joaquín Almunia a nome della Commissione
(28 maggio 2014)

La Commissione comprende che l'interrogazione dell'onorevole deputato riguarda la tendenza dei fabbricanti di autoveicoli a modularizzare i loro prodotti, adottando una politica che prevede, invece della riparazione presso terzi, la restituzione al fabbricante per la sostituzione di interi sottosistemi.

Per quanto riguarda la prima domanda, la Commissione fa presente di aver pubblicato nell'agosto 2012, a seguito di un'ampia consultazione, un elenco delle domande più frequenti sull'applicazione delle norme antitrust dell'UE nel settore automobilistico ([1]), che forniscono una panoramica dei principali problemi incontrati dalle parti interessate.

Per quanto riguarda la seconda domanda, la Commissione ricorda all'onorevole deputato che il regolamento (UE) n. 461/2010 della Commissione è un regolamento di esenzione per categoria adottato a norma dell'articolo 101, paragrafo 3, del trattato e che, in quanto tale, si applica soltanto agli accordi tra imprese. Per contro, non vi è alcuna indicazione che le pratiche descritte dall'onorevole deputato non siano altro che atti unilaterali da parte dei fabbricanti dei veicoli in questione. Tali atti non rientrano nel campo di applicazione dell'articolo 101, paragrafo 1, del trattato, e non sono pertanto soggetti all'applicazione dei regolamenti di esenzione per categoria.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/competition/sectors/motor_vehicles/legislation/legislation.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005182/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Request for clarification on the application of Regulation (EU) No 461/2010 on the distribution, repair and maintenance of motor vehicles

Regulation (EU) No 461/2010, which governs the distribution, repair and maintenance of motor vehicles and the supply of spare parts, aims to stimulate and promote the principle of free competition in the sector. However, the spirit of Regulation (EU) No 461/2010 is frequently called into question because there are cases in which independent operators perform repairs on motor vehicles by replacing whole subsystems (thereby creating a manufacturer's monopoly on the subsystem replaced).

In view of the above, it would be useful to analyse and improve the coordination of aspects associated with the sale and maintenance of motor vehicles and the provision of warranties to encourage free competition and offer motorists new and broader options in terms of spare parts and assistance.

In the light of the above, the Commission is asked the following questions:

1. Can it provide an overview of the application of Regulation (EU) No 461/2010?

2. Can it provide an opinion on possible amendments to Regulation (EU) No 461/2010 to provide greater protection for the right of consumers to investigate alternative options and select the option most advantageous or at any rate most appropriate to their requirements in the motor vehicle repair and maintenance sector?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(28 May 2014)

The Commission understands the Honourable Member's questions as relating to the tendency of vehicle manufacturers to modularise their products, and to have a return-to-base refurbishment policy for whole subsystems, rather than provide for their repair in third-party garages.

As regards the Honourable Member's first question, the Commission would observe that in August 2012, following extensive consultation, it published a set of Frequently Asked Questions ([1]) on the application of EU antitrust rules in the motor vehicle sector, which provide an overview of the main issues faced by stakeholders.

As to the second question, the Commission would remind the Honourable Member that Commission Regulation 461/2010 is a block exemption regulation adopted in application of Article 101(3) of the Treaty, and that as such it is only applicable to agreements between undertakings. In contrast, there is no indication that the practices described by the Honourable Member are anything other than unilateral acts on the part of the vehicle manufacturers in question. Such acts are not caught by Article 101(1) of the Treaty, and block exemption regulations therefore do not apply to them.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/competition/sectors/motor_vehicles/legislation/legislation.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005183/14
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(17 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Costituzione di un ente bilaterale a difesa dei consumatori in tutti i rapporti tra questi e gli autoriparatori: possibili finanziamenti e best practices

Un ente bilaterale denominato Rete OPAC, recentemente costituito tra la società Gi Car Service S.r.l. e l'associazione consumatori Konsumer Italia, ha come obiettivo la creazione di regole e controlli a difesa dei consumatori, in tutti i rapporti che questi possono avere con gli autoriparatori di tutte le categorie per la riparazione degli autoveicoli, la verifica delle procedure, della soddisfazione del cliente e i controlli di sicurezza. Lo scopo sociale dell'ente è la tutela in tutti i rapporti di interfaccia tra i consumatori e gli autoriparatori, al fine di promuovere la qualità dei servizi e delle prestazioni, la correttezza, la lealtà e la trasparenza nei rapporti contrattuali e la relativa informazione al consumatore. Inoltre, le parti concordano di sviluppare un sistema di attività sinergiche tra loro che possano elaborare le buone pratiche commerciali in ordine alle attività di offerta, vendita ed esecuzione del contratto di autoriparazione. Le parti garantiscono un canale di informazione e controllo sulle varie fasi della riparazione e risoluzione di eventuali controversie attraverso lo strumento della conciliazione paritetica considerata come una best practice dalle Istituzioni europee.

Considerando l'attenzione che l'Unione europea rivolge all'elaborazione di politiche dirette a tutelare in misura sempre maggiore i consumatori, considerando anche la risposta che l'ente vuole dare alla necessità di sicurezza della circolazione e alla diminuzione di morti e feriti nell'incidentalità stradale, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. se sono previsti finanziamenti o bandi a livello europeo per sostenere tale progetto;

2. se vi sono progetti simili o best practice in materia in altri Stati membri;

3. quali bandi o finanziamenti a livello europeo sono previsti per la realizzazione e lo sviluppo di enti bilaterali che promuovono la difesa dei consumatori nella programmazione 2014-2020.

Risposta di Neven Mimica a nome della Commissione
(26 giugno 2014)

Le attività che rientrano nella politica dei consumatori dell'UE sono finanziate principalmente mediante il programma per la tutela dei consumatori, attuato con il ricorso a programmi di lavoro annuali. Il programma di lavoro per il 2014 comprende attività che mettono in primo piano il valore pratico dell'UE e integrano le iniziative nazionali promosse dagli Stati membri ([1]).

La Commissione europea rivolge un'attenzione particolare al funzionamento delle organizzazioni dei consumatori e (co)finanzia un certo numero di attività in questo campo, comprese le sovvenzioni concesse alle organizzazioni dei consumatori a livello comunitario e un programma di sviluppo delle capacità a favore delle organizzazioni di consumatori a livello locale, regionale o nazionale.

L'ente bilaterale cui si fa riferimento (Rete OPAC) non sembra soddisfare i criteri di ammissibilità per beneficiare delle sovvenzioni secondo le modalità di cui all'articolo 5 del programma per la tutela dei consumatori 2014-20 ([2]).

Per quanto riguarda la seconda interrogazione, la Commissione non è a conoscenza di iniziative in altri Stati membri che riuniscano associazioni dei consumatori e parti interessate nel campo dell'autoriparazione, quale quella cui si fa riferimento nell'interrogazione.

Oltre alle sovvenzioni la Commissione stanzia fondi per servizi di appalto a sostegno di progetti specifici riguardanti la politica dei consumatori, come descritto nel programma di lavoro. Bandi di gara e proposte per l'assegnazione di sovvenzioni e contratti sono pubblicati sul sito dell'Agenzia esecutiva per i consumatori, la salute e la sicurezza alimentare ([3]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/strategy-programme/financial-programme/docs/c_2014_961_annex_en.pdf
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2014:084:0042:0056:IT:PDF%20
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/consumers/index.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005183/14
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Creation of a bilateral body to protect consumers in dealings with car repairers: possible funding and best practice

A bilateral body, the OPAC Network, was recently set up by Gi Car Services S.r.l and Konsumer Italia (a consumer association) to impose rules and checks to protect consumers in dealings with all categories of car repairer in terms of vehicle repair, checks on procedures, customer satisfaction and safety checks. The objective of this body is to provide protection across the board in the interface between consumers and car repairers and promote quality of service, fair practice, honesty and transparency in contractual dealings and the provision of information to the consumer. The parties have also agreed to work in synergy with a view to the formulation of fair trade practice guidelines in terms of the offer, sale and execution of car repair contracts and aim to provide a joint conciliation tool (regarded as best practice by the European institutions) to channel information and monitor all stages of the repair process and, where necessary, resolve disputes.

In consideration of the European Union's focus on the formulation of policies designed to enhance consumer protection and the abovementioned body's wish to respond to the need to increase road safety and reduce the level of fatalities and injuries in road accidents, the Commission is asked the following questions:

1. Does funding exist or are there opportunities to participate in European tenders to support this project?

2. Do similar projects or best practice exist in other Member States?

3. What funding or opportunities to participate in European tenders exists in the 2014-2020 programming period to support the creation and development of bilateral consumer protection bodies?

Answer given by Mr Mimica on behalf of the Commission
(26 June 2014)

Actions in the field of EU consumer policy are mainly funded through the Consumer Programme, which is implemented by means of annual work programmes. The 2014 work programme includes actions which focus on EU added value and are complementary to the national actions pursued by Member States ([1]).

The European Commission pays particular attention to functioning of the consumer organisations and (co-)finances a number of relevant actions, including grants to EU-level consumer organisations and a capacity building programme for consumer organisations at local, regional or national level.

The bilateral body in reference (OPAC Network) does not appear to meet the eligibility criteria for beneficiaries of grants as described by Article 5 of the Consumer Programme 2014-20 ([2]).

In relation to the second question, the Commission is not aware of initiatives in other Member States bringing together consumers' associations and car repair stakeholders as the one referred to in the question.

In addition to grants, funds are allocated by the Commission for contracting services in support of specific consumer policy projects, as described by the work programme. Calls for tenders and proposals for the awarding of grants and contracts are published on the website of the Consumers, Health and Food Executive Agency ([3]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/strategy-programme/financial-programme/docs/c_2014_961_annex_en.pdf
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2014:084:0042:0056:EN:PDF%20
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/consumers/index.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005184/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(17 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Dubbi sull'affidabilità dei test di screening effettuati sui nascituri in Italia

I nuovi test di screening sul sangue materno per verificare le anomalie nel feto hanno rivelato risultati non veritieri e pericolosi. Il ginecologo e presidente della Fondazione Altamedica per lo studio delle patologie della madre e del feto ha dichiarato lo stato di allarme e la sua preoccupazione in merito a tali test. Quest'ultimo, infatti, effettuando un test di conferma mediante villocentesi o amniocentesi ha riscontrato che, su ben 6 di questi 8 feti definiti patologici, non venivano affatto confermate le patologie. Essendoci pertanto alcune pazienti che, approfittando del fatto che il risultato del test giunge prima dell'epoca prevista come limite temporale per l'interruzione volontaria di gravidanza, optavano direttamente per l'aborto senza ulteriori test diagnostici di conferma, il medico in questione ha dunque voluto allertare le madri su questo rischio concreto.

Può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se è al corrente dei fatti sopra descritti?

2. quali provvedimenti intende prendere per tutelare la vita dei nascituri e il diritto alla corretta informazione delle gestanti?

Risposta di Neven Mimica a nome della Commissione
(12 giugno 2014)

La Commissione non è a conoscenza di problemi legati all'uso di test di screening su sangue materno ma chiederà informazioni agli Stati membri in merito alla loro esperienza con simili test.

I test diagnostici sono disciplinati dalla direttiva 98/79/CE relativa ai dispositive medico-diagnostici *in vitro* ([1]) che stabilisce i requisiti di sicurezza e rendimento per tali test, nonché le procedure pertinenti per la loro certificazione prima che vengano immessi sul mercato dell'Unione.

Nel settembre 2012 la Commissione ha presentato una proposta di regolamento sui dispositivi medico-diagnostici *in vitro* ([2]) che — una volta adottata dal Consiglio e dal Parlamento — rimpiazzerà le disposizioni attuali. Il regolamento rafforza in modo significativo le condizioni per la commercializzazione di tali dispositivi nell'Unione. Attualmente, la grande maggioranza dei dispositivi diagnostici in vitro è autocertificata dal fabbricante prima dell'immissione sul mercato. La proposta comporterà l'obbligo per circa il 90 % di tali prodotti, compresi i test di screening su sangue materno, di sottostare a un controllo di conformità alle disposizioni effettuato da un organismo terzo indipendente («organismo notificato»). Inoltre la proposta specifica e rafforza in modo significativo i requisiti in merito alle prove cliniche che i fabbricanti devono fornire allorché chiedono la certificazione a un organismo notificato al fine di dimostrare la conformità del dispositivo. Inoltre, la proposta rafforza i requisiti in merito alla designazione, al monitoraggio e al funzionamento degli organismi notificati, alla trasparenza del sistema, alle disposizioni in materia di vigilanza e di sorveglianza del mercato.

Per quanto concerne le questioni etiche, compresa la protezione del nascituro, esse rientrano nelle responsabilità degli Stati membri e sono pertanto disciplinate a livello nazionale.

([1]) GU L 331 del 7.12.1998.
([2]) COM(2012) 541 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005184/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Concerns as to the reliability of screening tests carried out on unborn babies in Italy

New maternal blood screening tests to detect foetal abnormalities have proved unreliable and dangerous. A gynaecologist and Chairman of the *Fondazione Altamedica per lo studio delle patologie della madre e del feto* [Medical Foundation for the Study of Pathologies in the Mother and Foetus] has declared a state of alert and expressed concern regarding these tests. Follow-up tests in the form of chorionic villus sampling or amniocentesis have in fact revealed that, in six out of eight foetuses categorised as abnormal, the pathologies in question could not be confirmed. Given also that a number of patients have taken advantage of the fact that the results of these tests arrive before the legal time limit for the voluntary termination of pregnancy and have been opting directly for abortion without further diagnostic confirmation tests, the physician in question has decided to alert mothers to this concrete risk.

Can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Is it aware of the facts described above?

2. What measures does it intend to take to protect the life of the unborn child and the right of pregnant women to correct information?

Answer given by Mr Mimica on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2014)

The Commission is not aware of problems related to the use of maternal blood screening tests but will enquire with the Member States about their experience with such tests.

Diagnostic tests are regulated under Directive 98/79/EC on *in vitro* diagnostic medical devices ([1]) which sets out the safety and performance requirements for such tests, as well as the relevant procedures for their certification prior to their placing on the Union market.

In September 2012, the Commission presented a proposal for a regulation on *in vitro* diagnostic medical devices ([2]) which — once adopted by the Council and Parliament — will replace the current provisions. It significantly reinforces the conditions for marketing of these devices in the Union. Currently, the great majority of *in vitro* diagnostics are self-certified by the manufacturer prior to being placed on the market. The proposal will result in the obligation for around 90% of those products including maternal blood screening tests to be checked for their conformity with the requirements by an independent third party ('notified body'). Moreover, the proposal significantly details and reinforces the requirements for clinical evidence to be provided by manufacturers when applying for certification by a notified body in order to demonstrate the conformity of the device. In addition, the proposal strengthens the requirements for designation, monitoring and functioning of notified bodies, the transparency of the system, the provisions on vigilance and market surveillance.

As regards ethical issues including the protection of the unborn child, these are the responsibility of Member States and are therefore regulated at national level.

([1]) OJ L 331, 7.12.1998.
([2]) COM(2012) 541 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005185/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(17 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Grave falla in un sistema di criptaggio

Un gruppo di ricercatori finlandesi che lavorano per una società di sicurezza in California e due esperti della sicurezza di Google hanno scoperto una falla in un sistema di criptaggio (OpenSSL) e in particolare l'https su internet. Tale falla espone due terzi dei server di tutto il mondo al furto di dati, comprese informazioni sensibili degli utenti come conti bancari o carte di credito e rappresenta quindi la più grave minaccia alla sicurezza della rete degli ultimi anni, provocando forse la più grande fuga di dati nella storia del web secondo il New York Times.

Può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. È al corrente dei fatti sopra descritti?

2. Quali provvedimenti intende prendere per tutelare la privacy e la sicurezza?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(30 giugno 2014)

La Commissione è al corrente dei fatti descritti dall'Onorevole Deputato relativi alla falla nel sistema di criptaggio OpenSSL.

La Commissione affronta la questione in oggetto nelle sue proposte per una riforma UE in materia di protezione dei dati ([1]), fra l'altro rafforzando e chiarendo gli obblighi in materia di sicurezza dei dati dei responsabili e degli incaricati del trattamento. Inoltre, le imprese e le organizzazioni dovranno informare immediatamente i singoli individui in merito a eventuali violazioni di dati personali che potrebbero nuocere loro, e dovranno anche fare una segnalazione all'autorità garante della protezione dei dati. In caso di violazione dei diritti in materia di protezione dei dati i singoli individui potranno altresì ricorrere a rafforzati mezzi di ricorso amministrativi e giudiziari.

([1]) COM2012 (11), COM(2012) 10.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005185/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Serious flaw in an encryption system

A team of Finnish researchers employed by a security firm in California and two Google security experts have discovered a flaw in an encryption system (OpenSSL), specifically involving 'https' on the web. The flaw exposes two thirds of servers throughout the world to the theft of data, including sensitive user information such as bank accounts or credit cards. It therefore poses the most serious threat to Internet security in recent years, perhaps (according to the New York Times) capable of triggering the largest data leak in the history of the web.

Can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Is it aware of the facts described above?

2. What measures does it intend to take to safeguard privacy and security?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(30 June 2014)

The Commission is aware of the facts described by the Honourable Member as regards the flaw in the encryption system OpenSSL.

In its proposals for a EU data protection reform ([1]), the Commission addresses this issue *inter alia* by reinforcing and clarifying data security obligations of controllers and processors. In addition, businesses and organisations will need to inform individuals about personal data breaches that could adversely affect them without undue delay. They will also have to notify the relevant data protection supervisory authority. In addition, improved administrative and judicial remedies in cases of violation of data protection rights will be available to individuals.

([1]) COM(2012) 11, COM(2012) 10.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005186/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(17 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Animali dello zoo di Kharkiv in pericolo

Alexey Grigoriev, direttore zoo di Kharkiv (Ucraina), ha dichiarato che i 6.000 animali che si trovano in questa struttura stanno morendo di fame a causa del taglio dei rifornimenti da parte del governo. Come racconta il Daily Telegraph, lo zoo di Kharkiv non è l'unica struttura che ospita animali in pericolo in Ucraina. Completamente abbandonato rimane invece lo zoo privato dell'ex Presidente Yanukovich che ospita circa 2.000 esemplari, senza cibo e ora in balia, soprattutto quelli esotici, dei saccheggiatori.

Può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. È al corrente dei fatti sopra descritti?

2. Come intende intervenire per evitare questa strage?

Risposta di Stefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(19 giugno 2014)

La Commissione non ha competenze in merito a queste questioni per quanto riguarda l'Ucraina.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005186/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Animals in Kharkiv zoo in danger

Alexey Grigoriev, Director of Kharkiv Zoo (Ukraine), says the 6 000 animals in the zoo are starving to death because the government has cut off supplies. The *Daily Telegraph* reports that Kharkiv Zoo is not the only facility accommodating animals at risk in the Ukraine. The private zoo of former president Yanukovich, which houses some 2 000 specimens, now without food and at the mercy of looters (particularly in the case of exotic species), has been entirely abandoned.

Can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Is it aware of the facts described above?

2. What action does it intend to take to prevent this destruction?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2014)

The Commission has no competences on these matters as regards Ukraine.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005187/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(17 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Chiang Mai: la Corte Costituzionale invalida le elezioni legislative

La Corte costituzionale della Thailandia il 2 febbraio ha invalidato le elezioni legislative a causa del blocco dei seggi da parte dei manifestanti dell'opposizione. Tale decisione ha portato a una forte reazione da parte dei partigiani del primo ministro Yingluck Shinawatra, i quali hanno lanciato delle granate.

Può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. è al corrente dei fatti sopra descritti;

2. come intende agire per proteggere la vita delle persone di tale area prevenendo ulteriori attacchi?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(5 giugno 2014)

La Commissione segue con attenzione gli sviluppi in Thailandia e ha invitato più volte tutte le parti a dar prova di moderazione per evitare i problemi di sicurezza a cui fa riferimento l'interrogazione dell'onorevole deputato. Il 27 marzo 2014 il portavoce dell'AR/VP ha inoltre dichiarato quanto segue: L'Alta Rappresentante prende atto della sentenza pronunciata il 21 marzo 2014 dalla Corte costituzionale thailandese e invita le autorità competenti a definire un calendario chiaro per le nuove elezioni in linea con il quadro democratico e costituzionale della Thailandia. L'Alta Rappresentante invita tutte le parti ad avviare un dialogo per trovare una soluzione pacifica e duratura e garantire la partecipazione più ampia possibile al nuovo scrutinio. L'Alta Rappresentante ribadisce l'appello pressante a tutte le parti in causa perché si astengano da atti di violenza e agiscano nel rispetto dei principi democratici e dello Stato di diritto.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005187/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Chiang Mai: the Constitutional Court has declared the general elections invalid

On 2 February the Constitutional Court in Thailand ruled that the general elections were invalid due to a boycott by anti-Government demonstrators. This decision triggered a strong reaction from supporters of the Prime Minister, Yingluck Shinawatra, who hurled grenades.

Can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Is it aware of the facts described above?

2. What action does it intend to take to safeguard the lives of citizens in that area by preventing further attacks?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2014)

The Commission is following the evolving situation in Thailand closely and has repeatedly called on all sides for restraint to avoid the kind of security problem the Honourable Member refers to in her question. Furthermore, HR/VP's spokesperson issued a statement on 27 March 2014: 'The High Representative notes the ruling of Thailand's Constitutional Court of 21 March 2014 and calls upon the relevant authorities to set a clear timetable for new elections in line with Thailand's democratic and constitutional framework. She calls on all sides to commit to dialogue to find a peaceful, lasting solution and ensure that new elections involve the broadest possible participation. The High Representative reiterates her urgent call on all involved to refrain from violence and act in accordance with democratic principles and the rule of law.'

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005188/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(17 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Controlli sulla qualità e la conservazione degli alimenti nei ristoranti etnici

La provincia di Udine ha deciso di sottoporre a rigorosi controlli sanitari i take-away e i ristoranti etnici al fine di verificare che gli alimenti impiegati nella preparazione dei piatti «tipici» rispettino tutti i requisiti previsti dalle norme igienico-sanitarie poste a tutela dei consumatori. Troppo spesso, infatti, questi ristoratori incorrono in violazioni di natura igienico-sanitaria che mettono a rischio la salute dei cittadini. Preso atto che i prodotti utilizzati in questi particolari fast food non solo sono di dubbia provenienza ma vengono spesso mal conservati, la Commissione:

1. è al corrente delle dimensioni, dello sviluppo e degli eventuali problemi connessi al settore della ristorazione etnica in Europa?

2. Quali provvedimenti intende prendere per tutelare salute dei consumatori europei che sono sempre più esposti a questa particolare offerta di ristorazione?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(30 maggio 2014)

1. A livello di UE non vi sono dati dettagliati disponibili sulle dimensioni della ristorazione etnica. La Commissione è consapevole delle particolarità connesse a tale attività.

2. I principi e le norme di sicurezza alimentare che si applicano a tutti gli operatori del settore alimentare, inclusi tutti i locali e i ristoranti da asporto, sono definiti nella normativa europea nota come principi e requisiti generali della legislazione alimentare ([1]) e pacchetto igiene ([2]). Disposizioni più specifiche relative ai locali di vendita al dettaglio sono contenute nei «Requisiti generali in materia di igiene applicabili a tutti gli operatori del settore alimentare» ([3]). Esse si applicano a settori specifici quali i ristoranti etnici e la loro applicazione corretta è sufficiente per proteggere la salute dei consumatori europei. È compito delle autorità competenti nazionali, regionali e locali verificare e far rispettare l'applicazione corretta di tali regole.

([1]) Regolamento (CE) n. 178/2002 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 28 gennaio 2002, che stabilisce i principi e i requisiti generali della legislazione alimentare, istituisce l'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare e fissa procedure nel campo della sicurezza alimentare.

([2]) Regolamento (CE) n. 852/2004 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 29 aprile 2004, sull'igiene dei prodotti alimentari; regolamento (CE) n. 853/2004 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 29 aprile 2004, che stabilisce norme specifiche in materia di igiene per gli alimenti di origine animale; regolamento (CE) n. 854/2004 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 29 aprile 2004, che stabilisce norme specifiche per l'organizzazione di controlli ufficiali sui prodotti di origine animale destinati al consumo umano.

([3]) Allegato II del regolamento (CE) n. 852/2004.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005188/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Controls on the quality and storage of foodstuffs in ethnic restaurants

The Province of Udine has decided to impose rigorous health controls on ethnic takeaway outlets and restaurants to ensure that foodstuffs used in the preparation of 'typical' dishes meet in full the requirements of health and safety standards designed to protect consumers. Too often in fact such outlets are in breach of health and safety regulations and therefore pose a public health risk. Given that the products used in these particular fast food outlets are not only of dubious provenance, but frequently poorly stored, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Is it aware of the scale, development and issues associated with the ethnic restaurant trade in Europe?

2. What measures does it intend to take to protect the health of European consumers, frequently exposed to this particular type of food outlet?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2014)

1. No detailed data is available at EU level on the scale of the ethnic restaurants trade. The Commission is aware of particularities related to such trade.

2. The food safety rules and principles which apply to all food business operators, including all takeaway outlets and restaurants, are laid down by the European legislation known as the General Food Law ([1]) and the Hygiene Package ([2]). Most specific measures covering retail premises are laid down in the 'General hygiene requirements for all food business operators' ([3]). They apply to specific sectors such as ethnic restaurants and suffice to protect the health of the European consumers when correctly applied. It is the role of national, regional and local competent authorities to verify and enforce the correct application of these rules.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council, 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, 28.1.2002.

([2]) Regulation (EC) 852/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council, on the hygiene of foodstuffs, 29.4.2004, Regulation (EC) 853/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council, laying down specific hygiene rules for food of animal origin, 29.4.2004 and Regulation (EC) 854/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council, laying down specific rules for the organisation of official controls on products of animal origin intended for human consumption, 29.4.2004.

([3]) Annex II of Regulation (EC) No 852/2004.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005190/14
a la Comisión
Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL), Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL) y Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(17 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: Construcción de una línea de alta tensión entre Portugal y Galicia

Está previsto construir una línea de alta tensión entre Portugal y Galicia, actualmente en fase de proyecto. Las consecuencias y los peligros que acarrea la construcción de estos campos electromagnéticos son bien conocidos y ya están debidamente identificados por la OMS y también por la UE, en particular por lo que se refiere a la salud y seguridad de los trabajadores (Directiva 2004/40/CE, modificada por la Directiva 2012/11/UE, o la Recomendación del Consejo, de 12 de julio de 1999, que dice lo siguiente: «Es absolutamente necesaria la protección de los ciudadanos de la Comunidad contra los efectos nocivos para la salud que se sabe pueden resultar de la exposición a campos electromagnéticos»). Pero, aunque así no fuera, y por tratarse de temas de salud pública, debería aplicarse el principio de cautela. Se trata de un territorio cuya superficie, según el estudio, es de 109 355 hectáreas, y se encuentra en una zona con una densidad de población tan elevada que estaría justificado el soterramiento de las líneas para no poner en peligro la calidad de vida de los habitantes.

Sin embargo, este proyecto no solo pone en peligro la salud, sino también el medio ambiente y el territorio. Esta es una región, el Alto Miño, con un patrimonio natural, arquitectónico y cultural de gran importancia y esencial para las diferentes actividades económicas de mayor impacto en esta región, como el turismo rural, el ecoturismo y la agricultura. Y todo ello sin que, hasta el momento, se haya escuchado a sus habitantes. Por su parte, las autoridades municipales y locales afectadas ya han puesto de manifiesto su oposición. Además, el estudio de impacto ambiental (que aún no se ha publicado) no ofrece ninguna garantía de que no se lleve a cabo dicho proyecto, ya que fue encargado por la entidad interesada en la construcción de la línea, la empresa REN. Cabe señalar asimismo que este proyecto afecta a una zona del río Miño que se enmarca en la Red Natura, a una región vitícola con DOC en Galicia, así como a una zona de interés histórico-arqueológico en la que se encuentra una mina romana. Por lo tanto, es evidente la magnitud del impacto que tendrá este proyecto, ya que no solo se pondrá en peligro la salud de los habitantes, sino que supondrá un duro revés para estos mismos habitantes desde el punto de vista económico al repercutir en el valor de sus terrenos y afectar a zonas de producción con denominación de origen y, obviamente, al tener un impacto ambiental y cultural importante.

1. ¿Está previsto algún tipo de financiación directa o indirecta de la Unión Europea para este proyecto?

2. ¿Considera la Comisión que se han respetado los derechos de los habitantes afectados, a los que nunca se ha escuchado durante el proceso?

3. ¿Considera la Comisión que queda salvaguardada la salud pública? En caso afirmativo, ¿cómo se puede garantizar?

4. ¿Considera la Comisión que el interés público por la construcción de una infraestructura de este tipo puede estar por encima de los riesgos y daños para el medio ambiente, el territorio, la cultura y la subsistencia de los habitantes?

5. ¿Qué medidas piensa adoptar la Comisión en relación con este caso?

Respuesta del Sr. Borg en nombre de la Comisión
(17 de junio de 2014)

La interconexión Portugal-España entre Vila Fria-Vila do Conde-Recarei en Portugal y Beariz-Fontefría en España se ha considerado proyecto de interés común en el marco de las nuevas directrices para las infraestructuras energéticas transeuropeas. Para dichos proyectos puede solicitarse ayuda financiera en el marco del mecanismo «Conectar Europa». Los proyectos de interés común deben garantizar el cumplimiento de la legislación ambiental así como una participación y consulta pública adecuadas.

Según los Tratados son los Estados miembros los principales responsables de proteger a los ciudadanos de los posibles efectos nocivos de los campos electromagnéticos y no atribuye a la EU competencia para legislar en este ámbito. La Recomendación del Consejo 1999/519/CE ([1]) exige, sin embargo, a los Estados miembros fijar directrices de exposición para proteger a la población.

En virtud de la Directiva 2011/92/UE ([2]) los proyectos que impliquen la construcción de líneas aéreas de energía eléctrica con un voltaje igual o superior a 220 kV y una longitud superior a 15 km deben someterse a una evaluación de impacto ambiental. Los ciudadanos deben tener la oportunidad de formular observaciones sobre la información recogida durante la evaluación antes de que se tome una decisión en relación con el proyecto.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:1999:199:0059:0070:es:PDF
([2]) La Directiva 2011/92/UE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 13 de diciembre de 2011, relativa a la evaluación de las repercusiones de determinados proyectos públicos y privados sobre el medio ambiente (DO L 26 de 28.1.2012, pp. 1-21).

La Directiva 92/43/CEE ([3]) establece que los proyectos que puedan repercutir en un espacio Natura 2000 estarán sujetos a una adecuada evaluación de sus consecuencias a fin de tener en cuenta los objetivos de conservación de dicho lugar.

Según Sus Señorías el proyecto de las líneas de energía eléctrica en cuestión está sometido a una evaluación de impacto ambiental. Por lo tanto, es todavía prematuro sacar conclusiones sobre esta cuestión.

([3]) Directiva 92/43/CEE del Consejo, de 21 de mayo de 1992, relativa a la conservación de los hábitats naturales y de la fauna y flora silvestres (DO L 206 de 22.7.1992, p. 7).

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005190/14
à Comissão
Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL), Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL) e Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(17 de abril de 2014)

Assunto: Construção de uma linha de alta tensão entre Portugal e a Galiza

Está prevista a construção de uma linha de muito alta tensão entre Portugal e a Galiza, encontrando-se atualmente em fase de projeto. As consequências e perigos da construção destes campos eletromagnéticos são sobejamente conhecidos e estão já devidamente identificados pela OMS, e também pela UE, nomeadamente a propósito da saúde e segurança dos trabalhadores (Diretiva 2004/40/CE, alterada pela Diretiva 2012/11/UE, ou a Recomendação do Conselho de 12 de julho de 1999, onde se lê: «É imperativo proteger a população na Comunidade contra os comprovados efeitos adversos para a saúde suscetíveis de resultar da exposição a campos eletromagnéticos»). Mas ainda que assim não fosse, e porque estamos perante questões de saúde pública, deveria ser adotado o princípio da precaução. Trata-se de uma área territorial, que o estudo avalia vir a ter 109 355 ha, numa zona com densidade populacional tão intensa que justificaria o enterramento das linhas para não colocar em risco a qualidade de vida das populações.

Contudo, este projeto não só põe em causa a saúde, como o ambiente e o território. Trata-se de uma região, o Alto Minho, com um valor patrimonial natural, arquitetural e cultural de enorme importância e que é essencial para várias das atividades económicas com maior impacto nessa região, como o turismo rural, o ecoturismo e a agricultura. E tudo isto sem que, até ao momento, as populações tenham sido ouvidas. Por seu lado, as autoridades municipais e locais envolvidas manifestaram já a sua oposição. Por outro lado, o estudo de impacto ambiental (que ainda não se encontra publicado) não dá qualquer garantia de isenção uma vez que foi pago pela entidade interessada na construção da linha, a REN. Importa ainda referir que este projeto abrange uma faixa do rio Minho que está enquadrada na Rede Natura e uma região vinícola DOC na Galiza, bem como uma zona de interesse histórico-arqueológico onde se situa uma mina romana. É, pois, bem evidente a grandeza do impacto deste projeto, uma vez que não só colocará em risco a saúde das populações como constituirá um enorme revés económico para as mesmas, ao afetar o valor dos seus terrenos, ao afetar zonas de produção denominadas e, obviamente, pelo impacto ambiental e cultural que terá.

1. Está previsto algum tipo de financiamento direto ou indireto da União Europeia para este projeto?

2. Entende a Comissão que foram respeitados os direitos das populações envolvidas que nunca foram ouvidas durante o processo?

3. Entende a Comissão que está salvaguardada a saúde pública, e, na afirmativa, como pode tal ser garantido?

4. Entende a Comissão que o interesse público na construção de tal estrutura pode superar os riscos e danos ambientais, territoriais, culturais e de subsistência das populações?

5. Que medidas pretende a Comissão tomar em relação a este caso?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(17 de junho de 2014)

A interligação Portugal — Espanha entre Vila Fria — Vila do Conde — Recarei em Portugal e Beariz — Fontefría em Espanha foi identificada como um projeto de interesse comum ao abrigo das novas orientações para as infraestruturas energéticas transeuropeias. Estes projetos podem ser elegíveis para beneficiarem do apoio financeiro no âmbito do Mecanismo Interligar a Europa. Os projetos de interesse comum devem assegurar o cumprimento da legislação ambiental e a consulta e participação adequadas do público.

Os Tratados conferem aos Estados-Membros a principal responsabilidade pela proteção do público em geral dos potenciais efeitos nocivos dos campos eletromagnéticos e não confere à UE a competência para legislar nesta matéria. A Recomendação 1999/519/CE do Conselho ([1]) exige, porém, aos Estados-Membros que definam orientações em matéria de exposição para proteger o público.

Nos termos da Diretiva 2011/92/UE ([2]), os projetos de construção de linhas aéreas de transporte de eletricidade com uma tensão igual ou superior a 220 kV e um comprimento superior a 15 km devem ser submetidos a uma avaliação de impacto ambiental. É necessário dar aos cidadãos a oportunidade de comentar as informações recolhidas durante esta avaliação, antes de ser tomada uma decisão sobre o projeto.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:1999:199:0059:0070:PT:PDF
([2]) Diretiva 2011/92/UE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 13 de dezembro de 2011, relativa à avaliação dos efeitos de determinados projetos públicos e privados no ambiente (JO L 26 de 28.1.2012, p. 1).

A Diretiva 92/43/CEE ([3]) determina que os projetos suscetíveis de afetar um sítio Natura 2000 devem ser objeto de uma avaliação adequada das suas incidências, atendendo aos objetivos de conservação do sítio.

Segundo a Senhora Deputada, o projeto das linhas de distribuição de eletricidade em causa está a ser submetido a uma avaliação de impacto ambiental. Por conseguinte, é prematuro tirar conclusões sobre esta questão nesta fase.

([3]) Diretiva 92/43/CEE do Conselho, de 21 de maio de 1992, relativa à preservação dos habitats naturais e da fauna e da flora selvagens (JO L 206 de 22.7.1992, p. 7).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005190/14
to the Commission
Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL), Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL) and Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Construction of a high-voltage line between Portugal and Galicia

There are plans for the construction of a high-voltage line between Portugal and Galicia, which is currently at the design stage. The consequences and dangers of creating such electromagnetic fields are well known and have already been duly identified by the WHO, as well as by the EU, particularly as regards workers' health and safety (Directive 2004/40/EC, amended by Directive 2012/11/EU, or the Council Recommendation of 12 July 1999, which states that, 'It is imperative to protect members of the general public within the Community against established adverse health effects that may result as a consequence of exposure to electromagnetic fields.'). But even if this were not the case, the precautionary principle should be followed because we are talking about public health issues. The study estimates that the geographical area involved amounts to 109 355 hectares, in an area whose very high population density would justify burial of the cables so as not to endanger people's quality of life.

However, this project is a threat not only to health but also to the environment and regional heritage. The region of Alto Minho has a natural, architectural and cultural heritage of enormous importance, which is vital to several economic activities with a major impact in the region, including rural tourism, ecotourism and agriculture. Yet the local population has yet to be heard. The municipal and local authorities involved have already expressed their opposition. Also, the environmental impact assessment (which has yet to be published) provides no guarantees, since it was paid for by the body wanting to construct the line — the national energy company, REN. It is also important to point out that this project affects a stretch of the Minho river that is part of the Natura network and a DOC (Controlled Denomination of Origin) wine-growing region in Galicia, as well as an area of historic and archaeological interest in which there is a Roman mine. The extent of the impact of this project is very clear, since it would not only put people's health at risk but would also be a huge economic setback for them, affecting the value of their land, affecting denominated production areas and, obviously, having a significant environmental and cultural impact.

1. Is this project to receive any form of direct or indirect funding from the European Union?

2. Does the Commission think that the rights of the people involved, who have not been heard so far, have been respected?

3. Does the Commission think that public health is being safeguarded and, if so, how can it be guaranteed?

4. Does the Commission think that the public interest of constructing this high-voltage line is more important than the potential risks and damage to the environment, regional heritage and culture, and people's livelihoods?

5. What measures does the Commission plan to take as regards this case?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2014)

The Portugal — Spain interconnection between Vila Fria — Vila do Conde — Recarei in Portugal and Beariz — Fontefría in Spain has been identified as a Project of Common Interest under the new guidelines for trans-European energy infrastructure. Such projects may be eligible to apply for financial support under the Connecting Europe Facility. Projects of Common Interest must ensure compliance with environmental legislation and adequate public consultation and participation.

The Treaties give Member States primary responsibility to protect the general public from the potential harmful effects of electromagnetic fields and do not confer on the EU competence to legislate in this area. Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC ([1]), does however require Member States to set exposure guidelines to protect the public.

Under Directive 2011/92/EU ([2]) projects involving the construction of overhead electrical power lines with a voltage of 220 kV or more and a length of more than 15 km must be submitted to an environmental impact assessment. Citizens must be given an opportunity to comment on the information gathered during this assessment before a decision on the project is taken.

Directive 92/43/EEC ([3]) provides that projects likely to impact on a Natura 2000 site shall be subject to an appropriate assessment of its implications in view of the site's conservation objectives.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:1999:199:0059:0070:en:PDF
([2]) Directive 2011/92/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13.12.2011 on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment (OJ L 26, 28.1.2012, p. 1-21).
([3]) Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21.5.1992on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora (OJ L 206, 22.7.1992, p.7).

According to the Honourable Members the project of electrical power lines at stake is being submitted to an environmental impact assessment. Therefore it is premature to draw conclusions on this issue at this stage.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005191/14
à Comissão
Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL) e Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL)
(17 de abril de 2014)

Assunto: Limitações à atividade piscatória na Ilha da Culatra

No núcleo da Ilha da Culatra, (Faro, Portugal) existem 90 embarcações de pesca artesanal local e 6 de pesca costeira. É esta atividade, conjuntamente com a apanha e produção de bivalves, que garante a sobrevivência da comunidade, estando a larguíssima maioria dos pescadores limitada a exercer a sua atividade pesqueira numa área situada entre 1/4 de milha e 3 milhas a partir da costa de 6 milhas para cada lado da barra.

Contudo, foi criada e delimitada dentro desta área a Área de Produção Aquícola da Armona (APAA), que não só ocupa cerca de metade dessa área como interdita o exercício da pesca e a navegação das embarcações da comunidade dentro da mesma, criando graves problemas para os pescadores e para as suas famílias que aí trabalhavam na faina desde sempre, chegando mesmo ao ponto de pôr em causa a sua sobrevivência.

Acresce que um dos extremos da referida área, a ponte poente do projeto, situa-se de tal modo à entrada da barra do Lavajo e perto da linha da costa que inibe a entrada e saída das embarcações para o mar em segurança.

Apesar de diversos apelos, nomeadamente por parte da Associação de Moradores da Ilha da Culatra (AMIC), no sentido de se minimizarem os prejuízos para os pescadores e famílias e mitigar os prejuízos causados pela criação da APAA, nada foi feito até ao momento, não sendo visível também qualquer vantagem ou efeito positivo decorrente da implementação do projeto.

Face a tudo isto, não se compreende por que se mantêm as interdições à navegação e à pesca dentro dessa área, quando apenas uma pequena parcela da APAA está efetivamente a ser utilizada para o fim para que foi criada.

1. Está a Comissão a par deste projeto — APAA?

2. Considera a Comissão ser possível a atribuição de uma autorização especial de navegação e pesca dentro desta área para as embarcações de pesca local e costeira desta comunidade, nomeadamente na área que não está a ser utilizada?

3. Haverá alguma medida que possa ser implementada para proteger estes pescadores e respetivas famílias, permitindo que exerçam a sua atividade de forma a garantirem a sua subsistência?

Resposta dada pela Comissária Maria Damanaki em nome da Comissão
(19 de junho de 2014)

Nos termos da atual legislação da UE, os Estados-Membros não são obrigados a notificar à Comissão projetos como a Área de Produção Aquícola da Armona. A afetação de zonas às atividades de aquicultura, bem como a sua interação com outras atividades económicas como a pesca, é da competência dos Estados-Membros. Não incumbe à Comissão definir quais as atividades autorizadas numa dada zona, nem atribuir uma autorização especial de acesso a zonas demarcadas pelos Estados-Membros para efeitos de aquicultura ou outras finalidades. Neste contexto, os Estados-Membros devem respeitar a legislação em vigor a nível nacional e da UE.

A Diretiva relativa ao ordenamento do espaço marítimo, a ser brevemente adotada, irá assegurar uma abordagem coerente do desenvolvimento das atividades marítimas, ao estabelecer os requisitos mínimos para a elaboração dos planos de ordenamento. Todavia, os Estados-Membros continuarão a dispor da prerrogativa de adaptar o teor dos planos de ordenamento do espaço marítimo e das estratégias neste domínio às suas prioridades económicas, sociais e ambientais, bem como aos seus objetivos estratégicos e às suas tradições jurídicas nacionais.

No âmbito do novo Fundo Europeu dos Assuntos Marítimos e das Pescas, os grupos de ação local da pesca (GAL-Pesca) podem ser associados a este processo enquanto parceiros, tendo em vista a obtenção de soluções.

A Comissão sugere que o Senhor Deputado entre diretamente em contacto com as autoridades portuguesas responsáveis pela gestão das pescas e dos assuntos marítimos, a saber:

Eng. Miguel Sequeira, Diretor-Geral
DGRM — Direção-Geral de Recursos Naturais, Segurança e Serviços Marítimos
Avenida Brasília
P-1449-030 LISBOA
Tel: +351 21 3035700; Fax: +351 21 3035965
Sítio Web: http://www.dgrm.min-agricultura.pt/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005191/14
to the Commission
Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL) and Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Limits to fishing off Culatra Island

On Culatra Island (Faro, Portugal) there are 90 boats for local, small-scale fishing and six for coastal fishing. Together with shellfish collecting and production, fishing is the lifeline of this community. The vast majority of the fishing folk are confined to fishing in a sea area between a quarter and three miles off the coast and six miles on either side of the estuary.

However, the Aquaculture Production Area of Armona (APAA) was recently created and marked out within this area. Not only does it take up about half of the area, but the community has been banned from fishing and sailing their boats there. This has caused serious problems for the fishers and their families, who have been fishing there since time immemorial, and it even threatens their survival.

In addition, the western end of the APAA is positioned in such a way at the mouth of the Lavajo estuary and close to the coastline that it makes it difficult for boats to sail in or out to sea safely.

Despite several appeals, particularly by the Culatra Island Residents' Association (AMIC), to minimise the impact on the fishers and their families and mitigate the harm caused by the creation of the APAA, so far nothing has been done, and implementing the project has not brought about any visible benefit or positive effect either.

In view of all the above, it is difficult to understand why the ban on sailing and fishing in the area has not been lifted, since only a small part of the APAA is actually being used for the purpose for which it was created.

1. Is the Commission aware of the APAA project?

2. Does the Commission think it might be possible to grant a special authorisation for this community's local and coastal fishing boats to sail and fish within this area, particularly in the part that is not being used?

3. Might there be some measure that could be used to protect these fishers and their families so that they can carry on fishing and secure their livelihoods?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2014)

Under existing EU legislation, Member States are not required to notify the Commission of projects such as the Aquaculture Production Area of Armona. The allocation of areas to aquaculture activities and their interaction with other economic activities such as fisheries is a matter for the Member States. It is not within the competence of the Commission to define what activities are authorised in a given area, or to grant special authorisation for access to areas defined by the Member States for the purposes of aquaculture or other uses. Member States should respect any EU and national legislation in this regard.

The Maritime Spatial Planning Directive which is due to be adopted shortly will provide a coherent approach to the development of maritime activities by providing minimum requirements for the drafting of spatial plans. However, it is the Member States' prerogative to tailor the content of the spatial plans and strategies to their specific economic, social and environmental priorities, as well as their national policy objectives and legal traditions.

Within the framework of the new European Maritime and Fisheries Fund, Fisheries Local Action Groups (FLAGs) could be involved in this process as partners to find solutions.

The Commission would suggest that the Honourable Member makes direct contact with the Portuguese authorities in charge of managing fisheries and maritime affaires, namely:

Eng. Miguel Sequeira, Director Geral
DGRM — Direção-Geral de Recursos Naturais, Segurança e Serviços Marítimos
Avenida Brasília
P — 1449-030 Lisboa
Tel.: +351 21 3035700; Fax.: +351 21 3035965
Website: http://www.dgrm.min-agricultura.pt/

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005192/14
à Comissão
Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL) e Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL)
(17 de abril de 2014)

Assunto: Parque de Ciência e Inovação (PCI) nas margens da Ria de Aveiro (Portugal)

Na zona de Aveiro, pretende-se construir de raiz uma nova zona industrial — o Parque de Ciência e Inovação (PCI) — que ficará localizada nas margens da Ria de Aveiro, uma zona húmida das mais importantes da Europa, e que, segundo os promotores, será financiada em 80 % por fundos comunitários, apesar de ser público que a União Europeia não financia projetos que ocupem solos agrícolas.

Este assunto foi exposto por nós em perguntas anteriores (E-000362/2012 e E-012694/2013). Todavia, chegou-nos entretanto uma nova informação que remete para o abuso das autorizações concedidas para a alteração da utilização de solos situados na Reserva Agrícola Nacional (RAN). Esta situação/fraude tem como objetivo dotar uma empresa (PCI-SA — uma parceria público-privada criada para o efeito) que nada possui, de bens imóveis com um enorme potencial de valorização, através da compra ou da expropriação de mais de 30 hectares de terras agrícolas em produção. Acontece que esses solos, classificados pela RAN como terras de classe A1 (unidades de terra com aptidão elevada para o uso agrícola genérico), são precisamente onde se pretende construir o Parque de Ciência e Inovação — ou seja, solos que serão destruídos, caso nenhuma entidade trave a sua construção na localização prevista.

1. Conscientes de que a Comissão não responde perante violações à legislação da RAN, já que não constitui uma área da sua competência, não entende a Comissão que também existe aqui um incumprimento da Diretiva 2004/35/CE, relativa à responsabilidade ambiental em termos de prevenção e reparação de danos ambientais?

2. Em resposta à nossa mais recente pergunta sobre o tema, a Comissão comunicou-nos que iria ser informada pelas autoridades portuguesas, até final de janeiro último, sobre novos desenvolvimentos deste caso. Que esclarecimentos nos pode dar, agora que dispõe dessa informação?

3. Na mesma resposta, informou-nos também que estaria a avaliar queixas que alegavam uma aplicação incorreta da legislação ambiental da UE. A que conclusões chegou a Comissão?

4. Continua a considerar aceitável a escolha do local para o Parque de Ciência e Inovação e a considerar este projeto elegível para cofinanciamento?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(18 de junho de 2014)

1. A Diretiva 2004/35/CE ([1]) relativa à responsabilidade ambiental em termos de prevenção e reparação de danos ambientais visa prevenir uma ameaça eminente de danos significativos ao ambiente e reparar os danos causados aos recursos naturais (biodiversidade, água, solo), restituindo-os aos seu estado inicial. Entende-se por danos causados ao solo «qualquer contaminação do solo que crie um risco significativo de a saúde humana ser afetada adversamente devido à introdução, direta ou indireta, no solo ou à sua superfície, de substâncias, preparações, organismos ou microrganismos». De momento, não se verificou a ocorrência de danos ambientais ou de uma ameaça eminente desses danos. Caso se considere que existem danos, as pessoas afetadas ou as ONG autorizadas podem solicitar às autoridades competentes uma investigação e que sejam tomadas as medidas necessárias.

2. Segundo as informações fornecidas à Comissão pela autoridade de gestão do programa, o projeto «Parque da Ciência e Inovação — Creative Science Park» foi aprovado a 11 de dezembro de 2013. A autoridade de gestão transmitiu as respostas às perguntas colocadas pela Comissão. As respostas estão neste momento a ser avaliadas.

3. Foi aberta uma queixa e o processo está em curso.

4. Como é do conhecimento da Senhora Deputada, o princípio da gestão partilhada aplica-se à implementação da política de coesão. Neste contexto, a seleção dos projetos é da responsabilidade das autoridades nacionais competentes que gerem os programas, devendo a aprovação dos projetos estar conforme com as regulamentações nacionais e da UE e com os critérios de seleção estabelecidos.

([1]) Diretiva 2004/35/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 21 de abril de 2004, relativa à responsabilidade ambiental em termos de prevenção e reparação de danos ambientais; JO L 143 de 30.4.2004.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005192/14
to the Commission
Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL) and Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Science and Technology Park on the edge of the Ria de Aveiro (Portugal)

There are plans to build a new industrial park, the Science and Technology Park, in Aveiro, which is to be located on the edge of the Ria de Aveiro, one of Europe's most important wetlands, and which is, according to the promoters, to be 80% financed by Community funds, even though it is public knowledge that the European Union does not finance projects using agricultural land.

We have drawn the Commission's attention to this matter in previous questions (E-000362/2012 and E-012694/2013). However, we have now received new information that suggests abuse of the authorisations granted for change of use of land within the National Agricultural Reserve (RAN). The intention behind this situation/fraud is to hand over to a company (PCI-SA — a public-private partnership set up for the purpose) that owns nothing, property with huge potential for development, via the purchase or expropriation of more than 30 hectares of working agricultural land. It turns out that this land, classified for the RAN as class A1 land (parcels of land highly suitable for general agricultural use), is precisely where the Science and Technology Park is to be built — in other words, this land will be destroyed if no-one puts a stop to construction on the planned site.

1. We are aware that the Commission is not responsible for breaches of legislation governing the RAN, which is not within its area of competence, but does the Commission not think that there is also here a failure to comply with Directive 2004/35/EC on environmental liability with regard to the prevention and remedying of environmental damage?

2. In its answer to our most recent question on the subject, the Commission told us that the Portuguese authorities were going to inform it, by the end of January, of any new developments concerning this case. What clarifications can the Commission provide, now that it has this information?

3. In the same answer, the Commission also told us that it would be investigating complaints alleging incorrect application of EU environmental legislation. What conclusions did it reach?

4. Does the Commission still think the choice of site for the Science and Technology Park is acceptable and does it consider this project eligible for co-funding?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(18 June 2014)

1. Directive 2004/35/EC ([1]) on environmental liability with regard to the prevention and remedying of environmental damage aims at preventing an imminent threat of significant damage to the environment and at remedying the damaged natural resources (biodiversity, water, land) to their baseline condition. Damage to land is defined as 'any land contamination that creates a significant risk of human health being adversely affected as a result of the direct or indirect introduction, in, on or under land, of substances, preparations, organisms or micro-organisms'. At present, neither the occurrence of environmental damage nor an imminent threat of such damage is apparent. In case of perceived damage, affected persons and enabled NGOs may request the competent authorities to investigate and take the necessary action.

2. According to information sent to the Commission by the programme managing authority the project 'Parque de Ciência e Inovação — Creative Science Park' was approved on 11 December 2013. The managing authority has submitted answers to questions raised by the Commission. The answers are currently being assessed.

3. A complaint was opened and this procedure is currently on-going.

4. As the Honourable Member is aware the shared management principle applies to the implementation of cohesion policy. In this context the selection of projects is the responsibility of the competent national authorities managing the programmes and the approval of projects has to be in compliance with national and EU regulations and the established selection criteria.

([1]) Directive 2004/35/CE of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21.4.2004 on environmental liability with regard to the prevention and remedying of environmental damage; OJ L 143, 30.4.2004.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005193/14
à Comissão
Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL) e Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL)
(17 de abril de 2014)

Assunto: Abastecimento de água por condutas com amianto e falhas no abastecimento

A Comissão Europeia já reconheceu a existência de riscos diretos para a qualidade da água para consumo humano e para a saúde pública que são provocados por cortes frequentes no abastecimento de água (resposta à pergunta parlamentar E-002348/2008).

É nesta situação que, já há mais de uma década, vive a população de Vila da Marmeleira, no distrito de Santarém, em Portugal, onde há falhas frequentes no abastecimento da água, pois as condutas utilizadas têm já mais de 50 anos e foram concebidas para abastecer apenas alguns fontanários públicos, não a generalidade das casas de habitação. Além disso, estas condutas são em fibrocimento com amianto.

Questionado sobre este problema, em 2011, pelo Bloco de Esquerda no Parlamento nacional, o Ministério do Ambiente português respondeu que «apesar do amianto ser considerado um conhecido carcinogénico quando inalado, não foi estabelecido um valor guia para o amianto na água destinada ao consumo humano porque não existem estudos epidemiológicos que fundamentem a existência de risco para a saúde humana associado à ingestão do amianto pela via hídrica» (resposta à pergunta 3803/XI/2).

No entanto, segundo a CE, há estudos que indicam a existência de causalidade entre o cancro provocado pelo amianto, o mesotelioma, no revestimento interior da cavidade abdominal, o que coloca a hipótese de a existência de fibras de amianto na água ou nos alimentos poder penetrar no corpo através da parede dos intestinos e causar cancro (resposta à pergunta parlamentar E-002348/2008). Pelo que, por um princípio de precaução, consagrado em legislação europeia desde 1999, não devem ser utilizadas condutas de água que contenham amianto (Diretiva 1999/77/CE).

Por outro lado, a presença de fibras de amianto no abastecimento de água não significa apenas que o amianto será ingerido através de bebidas. A água é utilizada para a higiene pessoal, para lavar roupa, limpar a casa, etc. Quando a água seca, após essas atividades, liberta fibras que serão inaladas por seres humanos. Por conseguinte, a água que contém fibras de amianto pode provocar a inalação das referidas fibras. Esta situação é agravada quando existem falhas frequentes no abastecimento de água, pois estas provocam um aumento do número de fibras de amianto que penetram na água a partir das condutas, dado a entrada de ar na canalização provocar um risco agravado para o seu revestimento interior.

Que medidas urgentes pretende a Comissão tomar de forma a que, o mais rapidamente possível, sejam substituídas as antigas condutas de água com amianto que abastecem a população de Vila da Marmeleira e em outros casos semelhantes, de modo a afastar o perigo e assegurar um abastecimento sem falhas?

Resposta dada pelo Comissário Europeu para a Ciência e Investigação, Janez Potočnik, em nome da Comissão
(16 de junho de 2014)

A Comissão não tem conhecimento da situação específica quanto ao abastecimento de água em Vila da Marmeleira, Santarém, Portugal.

A Diretiva da UE relativa à água destinada ao consumo humano ([1]) prevê que os Estados-Membros devem tomar todas as medidas necessárias para garantir que a água potável seja salubre e limpa, para além de não conter quaisquer substâncias que constituam um perigo potencial para a saúde. O amianto não figura expressamente na lista de parâmetros da diretiva. No entanto, esta última estabelece que os Estados-Membros devem tomar medidas corretivas e adotar restrições. Além disso, os Estados-Membros devem garantir que nenhumas substâncias ou materiais utilizados na distribuição de água permaneçam em concentrações superiores às necessárias para os fins a que se destinam, nem reduzam o nível de proteção da saúde humana previsto na referida diretiva.

A restrição a nível da União relativa à utilização de amianto e de produtos que o contenham, inicialmente introduzida pela Diretiva 76/769/CEE ([2]) através da Diretiva 1999/77/CE ([3]), consta atualmente do Regulamento REACH ([4]). Todavia, este último não prevê qualquer requisito quanto à substituição de condutas em edifícios ou noutras construções imóveis (dado não serem considerados produtos nos termos do Regulamento REACH) que contenham amianto até 1 de janeiro de 2005, ou seja, a data-limite para efeitos da aplicação da Diretiva 1999/77/CE.

([1]) Directiva 98/83/CE do Conselho, de 3 de novembro de 1998, relativa à qualidade da água destinada ao consumo humano.
([2]) Diretiva 76/769/CEE do Conselho, de 27 de julho de 1976, relativa à aproximação das disposições legislativas, regulamentares e administrativas dos Estados-Membros respeitantes à limitação da colocação no mercado e da utilização de algumas substâncias e preparações perigosas (JO L 262 de 27.9.1976, p. 201).
([3]) Directiva 1999/77/CE da Comissão de 26 de Julho de 1999 que adapta, pela sexta vez, o anexo I da Directiva 76/769/CEE do Conselho, relativa à aproximação das disposições legislativas, regulamentares e administrativas dos Estados-Membros respeitantes à limitação da colocação no mercado e da utilização de algumas substâncias e preparações perigosas (amianto) (JO L 207 de 6.8.1999, p. 18).
([4]) Entrada 6 do anexo XVII do Regulamento (CE) n.° 1907/2006 do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 18 de dezembro de 2006, relativo ao registo, avaliação, autorização e restrição dos produtos químicos (REACH) (JO L 396 de 30.12.2006, p. 1).

A substituição das condutas incumbe aos Estados-Membros. A redução de fugas nas redes de distribuição de água potável foi identificada por Portugal como um problema para os seus planos de investimento ao abrigo dos fundos estruturais e de investimento da UE ([5]). Tais medidas podem ser elegíveis para efeitos de financiamento desde que as autoridades portuguesas incluam projetos específicos neste domínio no âmbito dos programas operacionais.

([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/what/future/pdf/partnership/pt_position_paper.pdf , páginas 15/40

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005193/14
to the Commission
Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL) and Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Water supply pipes containing asbestos and supply failures

The Commission has already acknowledged the fact that drinking water quality and public health are directly put at risk by frequent water supply cuts (answer to parliamentary Question E-002348/2008).

The inhabitants of Vila da Marmeleira in Santarém District, Portugal, have been experiencing such a situation of frequent water supply cuts for over 10 years now, because the pipes used are now over 50 years old and were designed to supply only public drinking fountains and not people's homes in general. Moreover, these pipes are made of asbestos cement.

When questioned on this problem in 2011 by the left-wing group in the Portuguese parliament, the Minister for the Environment answered that 'although asbestos is considered a known carcinogen when inhaled, no recommended level has been set for asbestos in drinking water because there have been no epidemiological studies demonstrating a risk to human health associated with the ingestion of asbestos in water' (answer to question 3803/XI/2).

According to the Commission, however, there have been studies showing causality with asbestos-induced cancer — mesothelioma — in the inner lining of the abdominal cavity, suggesting that asbestos fibres in water or food may penetrate the body through the bowel wall and cause cancer (answer to parliamentary Question E-002348/2008). Therefore, the precautionary principle, which has been enshrined in European legislation since 1999, requires that water pipes containing asbestos should not be used (Directive 1999/77/EC).

Furthermore, having asbestos fibres in the water supply does not only mean that asbestos will be ingested in drinks. Water is also used for personal hygiene, washing clothes, cleaning the house, etc. When the water dries after these activities, fibres are released and can be inhaled by human beings. Therefore, water containing asbestos fibres can cause these fibres to be inhaled. The situation is made worse if there are frequent cuts in the water supply, which increase the number of asbestos fibres entering the water from the pipes, since when air gets into the pipes it exacerbates the risk of damage to their inner lining.

What urgent measures does the Commission intend to adopt to ensure that the old, asbestos-containing water pipes that supply the people of Vila da Marmeleira — and other similar cases — are replaced as quickly as possible, so as to remove the danger and ensure an uninterrupted supply of water?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(16 June 2014)

The Commission is not aware of the water specific supply situation in Vila da Marmeleira, Santarém District, Portugal.

The EU Drinking Water Directive ([1]) stipulates that Member States shall take all actions needed to ensure that drinking water is wholesome and clean and is free from any substances which constitute a potential danger to health. Asbestos is not explicitly included in the parameter list of the directive. However, it stipulates that Member States shall take remedial actions and put restrictions in place. Furthermore, Member States shall ensure that no substances or materials used in the distribution remain in drinking water in concentrations higher than is necessary for the purpose of their use, and do not reduce the protection of human health provided for in this directive.

The Union restriction on asbestos and articles containing it, initially introduced into Directive 76/769/EEC ([2]) by means of Directive 1999/77/EC ([3]), is currently contained in the REACH Regulation ([4]). However, there is no requirement under REACH to substitute pipes in buildings or other immovable constructions (these are not considered articles under REACH) that contain asbestos by 1 January 2005, i.e. the deadline for implementation of Directive 1999/77/EC.

([1]) Council Directive 98/83/EC of 3.11.1998 on the quality of water intended for human consumption.
([2]) Council Directive of 27.7.1976 on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States relating to restrictions on the marketing and use of certain dangerous substances and preparations (OJ L 262, 27.9.1976, p.201).
([3]) Commission Directive 1999/77/EC of 26.7.1999 adapting to technical progress for the sixth time Annex I to Council Directive 76/769/EEC on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States relating to restrictions on the marketing and use of certain dangerous substances and preparations (asbestos), (OJ L 207, 6.8.1999, p. 18).
([4]) Entry 6 of Annex XVII to Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18.12.2006 concerning the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (OJ L 396, 30.12.2006, p. 1).

The replacement of water pipes falls under the responsibility of the Member States. The reduction of leakage in drinking water distribution networks has been identified by Portugal as an issue for their investment plans for EU Structural and Investment Funds ([5]). Such measures may be eligible for funding provided that specific projects are included in operational programmes by the Portuguese authorities.

([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/what/future/pdf/partnership/pt_position_paper.pdf page 15/40.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse P-005195/14
til Kommissionen
Morten Løkkegaard (ALDE)
(17. april 2014)

Om: Kapitalkontrol i Island

I svaret på min forespørgsel af 19. februar 2014 (E-001903/2014) giver Kommissionen udtryk for den opfattelse, at »Island fortsat gør fremskridt hvad angår ophævelse« af kapitalkontrollen, hvilket, eftersom der ikke er taget nogen skridt til at hæve denne kontrol, ikke er korrekt.

På baggrund af denne udtalelse ønsker jeg at stille følgende supplerende spørgsmål:

Kan Kommissionen, såfremt den står ved sin tidligere udtalelse om, at Island »fortsat gør fremskridt hvad angår ophævelse«, gøre rede for, præcist hvilke »fremskridt« den mener Island har gjort, og på hvilken måde Kommissionen mener, at dette udgør et skridt hen imod ophævelse af restriktionerne?

Kommissionen anmodes om i sit svar at tage højde for, at Island i marts 2013 gennemførte lovgivning, som gjorde kapitalkontrollen skrappere.

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Catherine Ashton
(26. maj 2014)

Den igangværende proces med at ophæve den eksisterende kapitalkontrol i Island er et kompliceret foretagende, og fremskridtene dokumenteres i regelmæssige rapporter fra den islandske Finans- og Økonomiminister, jf. det islandske parlaments (Althingi) lov nr. 16/2013.

Den første rapport blev offentliggjort den 17. september 2013 og kan findes på:
http://www.fjarmalaraduneyti.is/frettir/2013/09/17/nr/17190.

En engelsk oversættelse af rapporten blev offentliggjort den 17. marts 2014 og findes på:
http://eng.fjarmalaraduneyti.is/media/frettir/Progress-of-the-Plan-for-Removal-of-Capital-Controls.pdf.

Som det allerede blev understreget i svaret på forespørgselen af 19. februar 2014 (E-001903/2014), er Kommissionen endnu ikke, på baggrund af de forhåndenværende oplysninger i forbindelse med fremskridtene af gennemførelsen af den islandske regerings strategi for ophævelse af kapitalkontrol, i stand til at afgøre, hvornår og hvorvidt målene for strategien er opnået. I de kommende måneder fremlægger de islandske myndigheder yderligere oplysninger, som vil gøre det muligt at foretage en passende vurdering af både de opnåede fremskridt og de fortsatte behov for kapitalkontrol.

Eftersom det endelige mål er at ophæve restriktionerne, vil Europa-Kommissionen fortsat opfordre de islandske myndigheder til at forelægge regelmæssige opdateringer om fremskridtene med ophævelsen af kapitalkontrollen og om vurderingen af de makroøkonomiske og finansielle forhold, som retfærdiggør, at den midlertidige kontrol med kapitalbevægelserne fastholdes.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-005195/14
to the Commission
Morten Løkkegaard (ALDE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Capital controls in Iceland

It has come to my attention that, in its response to my Questions submitted on 19 February 2014 (E-001903/2014), the Commission has taken the view that Iceland is making 'on-going progress in lifting' the capital controls, which, given that there have been no steps taken to remove the controls, is incorrect.

In light of this statement, I would like to ask the following supplementary question:

In the event that the Commission stands by its earlier statement that Iceland is making 'on-going progress in lifting' the controls, could the Commission provide an account of exactly what 'progress' it believes Iceland has made, and how the Commission believes this constitutes a move towards lifting the restrictions?

Please provide an answer which takes into account the fact that in March 2013, Iceland implemented legislation which made the capital controls stricter.

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(26 May 2014)

The on-going process of removing the existing capital controls in Iceland remains a complex endeavour whose progress is documented by the regular reports published by the Minister of Finance and Economic Affairs as provided for in Act No 16/2013 of the Icelandic Parliament (Althingi).

The first of these reports was published on 17 September 2013 and is available at:
http://www.fjarmalaraduneyti.is/frettir/2013/09/17/nr/17190

An English translation of the report was published on 17 March 2014 and is available at:
http://eng.fjarmalaraduneyti.is/media/frettir/Progress-of-the-Plan-for-Removal-of-Capital-Controls.pdf

As already highlighted in its response to the Question submitted on 19 February 2014 (E- 01903/2014), on the basis of existing information with regard to the progress in implementing the Icelandic government' strategy on removing the capital controls, the Commission is not yet in a position to conclude when and whether the objectives of this strategy will be met. Further information to be submitted by the Icelandic authorities in the coming months will render possible an appropriate assessment of both the progress achieved and the continuous needs of capital controls.

As the removal of these restrictions is the final goal, the European Commission will continue to invite the Icelandic authorities to provide regular updates on the progress in removing the capital controls and on the assessment of the macroeconomic and financial conditions that justify that the controls temporarily remain in place.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-005196/14
an die Kommission
Helga Trüpel (Verts/ALE)
(17. April 2014)

Betrifft: Erklärungen der Kommission im Zusammenhang mit dem Urteil des Gerichtshofs zur Richtlinie über die Vorratsdatenspeicherung

Kann die Kommission eine Liste all ihrer bisherigen Erklärungen, einschließlich der im Parlament und im Rat abgegebenen Erklärungen, zu der Veröffentlichung des Urteils des Gerichtshofs zur Richtlinie über die Vorratsdatenspeicherung ([1]) vorlegen?

Antwort von Frau Malmström im Namen der Kommission
(25. Juni 2014)

Die Kommission hat ihre Erklärung für die Presse und die Medien an dem Tag herausgegeben, an dem das Urteil des Gerichtshofs der Europäischen Union in den verbundenen Rechtssachen C-293/12 und C-594/12 zu der Richtlinie über die Vorratsdatenspeicherung (2006/24/EG) ([2]) ergangen ist.

Im Anschluss an das Urteil hat sich die Kommission ferner mündlich geäußert

i) in der Sitzung des Ausschusses für bürgerliche Freiheiten, Justiz und Inneres vom 10. April 2014

ii) auf der Plenartagung des Europäischen Parlaments vom 16. April 2014.

([1]) http://curia.europa.eu/jcms/upload/docs/application/pdf/2014-04/cp140054de.pdf
([2]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_STATEMENT-14-113_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer P-005196/14
to the Commission
Helga Trüpel (Verts/ALE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Commission statements relating to the Court of Justice decision on the Data Retention Directive

Can the Commission provide a list of all its statements, including those made in Parliament and in the Council, relating to the publication of the Court of Justice decision on the Data Retention Directive ([1]) up to the present day?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(25 June 2014)

Regarding the press and media, the Commission has published its statement on the day of the European Court of Justice judgment on joined cases C-293/12 and C-594/12 on Data Retention Directive (2006/24/EC) ([2]).

Furthermore, after the judgment the Commission made other oral statements at:

i. The Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs meeting on 10 April 2014;

ii. The Plenary Session of the European Parliament on 16 April 2014.

([1]) http://curia.europa.eu/jcms/upload/docs/application/pdf/2014-04/cp140054en.pdf
([2]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_STATEMENT-14-113_en.htm

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005197/14
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), Maria Badia i Cutchet (S&D), Raimon Obiols (S&D), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE) y Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(17 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: Evaluación de la conformidad del Plan Hidrológico de Cuenca del río Ebro con la Directiva marco sobre el agua y las Directivas sobre los hábitats y las aves

En respuesta a las preguntas E-002404/2014 y E-002572/2014 en relación con el Plan Hidrológico del Ebro aprobado por el Gobierno español el pasado 28 de febrero, la Comisión Europea informa que está realizando una evaluación del contenido del citado plan para determinar su conformidad con la Directiva marco sobre el agua y las Directivas sobre los hábitats y las aves.

En vista de las serias implicaciones que dicho plan puede tener para el territorio y del impacto determinante del dictamen de la Comisión, ¿podría esta detallar sus previsiones sobre la fecha de publicación de los resultados de la evaluación?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(3 de junio de 2014)

La Comisión remite a Su Señoría a su respuesta a la pregunta escrita E-04023/2014 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/es/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005197/14
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE), Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE), Maria Badia i Cutchet (S&D), Raimon Obiols (S&D), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE) and Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Assessing the compliance of the Ebro river basin management plan with the Water Framework Directive and the Habitats and Birds directives

In its reply to written questions E-002404/2014 and E-002572/2014 on the Ebro river basin management plan approved by the Spanish Government on 28 February 2014, the Commission stated that it was assessing the contents of the plan to establish whether it complies with the Water Framework Directive and the Habitats and Birds directives.

Given the serious implications the plan can have for the area concerned and the decisive impact of the Commission's opinion, could the Commission state when it expects the results of its assessment to be published?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(3 June 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-04023/2014 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005198/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE)
(17 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Αξιοποίηση έξυπνων πόλεων (Smart Cities)

Διάφορα προθέματα (Digital, Wireless, Ubiquitous, Green κ.λπ.) χρησιμοποιούνται διεθνώς για να προσδιορίσουν πόλεις με χαρακτηριστικά (όπως υποδομές πληροφορικής και επικοινωνιών) που αυξάνουν την «ευφυΐα» μια πόλης σε τοπικό επίπεδο: των ανθρώπων, της επιχειρηματικότητας, της οικονομίας και άλλων παραγόντων. Πρόσφατες έρευνες (Korea IT Times, 2012) αποτιμούν τις έξυπνες πόλεις (Smart cities) ως μια νέα διεθνή αγορά του μεγέθους πλέον των 240 δις δολάρια, με σημαντικές προοπτικές επιχειρηματικότητας και περιφερειακής ανάπτυξης. Στο ίδιο χρονικό διάστημα η ΕΕ έχει αναπτύξει σημαντικές πρωτοβουλίες στην περιοχή των ευφυών πόλεων ([1]). Η DG Enterprise & Industry αναγνωρίζει την ευφυΐα και αειφορία των Ευρωπαϊκών πόλεων ως μια από τις σημαντικότερες προκλήσεις και χρηματοδοτεί με 365 ευρώ εκατομμύρια την ανάπτυξη καινοτόμων δικτύων ευφυών πόλεων και κοινοτήτων. Αν και σημαντικός αριθμός έργων έχει χρηματοδοτηθεί με πόρους της ΕΕ και έχει δημιουργηθεί πλήθος πόλεων που αυτοπροσδιορίζονται ως «ευφυείς», τα αποτελέσματα των πρωτοβουλιών αυτών μπορούν να χαρακτηρισθούν «πενιχρά» μπροστά σε ανάλογες επιδόσεις όπως ενδεικτικά της Νότιας Κορέας, όπου έχει μετατρέψει τις ευφυείς πόλεις σε «εξαγώγιμο εθνικό προϊόν».

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Πώς ορίζει την έξυπνη/ευφυή πόλη (Smart City); Έχει θεσπίσει ελάχιστα πρότυπα ή benchmarks αρχιτεκτονικής μιας αποδεκτής για την Ευρώπη έξυπνης πόλης ώστε μια πόλη να γνωρίζει τι ιδιότητες πρέπει να αναπτύξει για την ευφυΐα της; Με ποιον/ποιους τρόπους παρακολουθεί την επίδοση πρακτικών ευφυών πόλεων; Πώς εντάσσεται το θέμα των smart cities στον Ορίζοντα 2020;

2. Υπάρχει ή προβλέπεται να δημιουργηθεί κάποιο ρυθμιστικό πλαίσιο σε επίπεδο ΕΕ (για την αστική αειφορία, τις έξυπνες πόλεις κ.λπ.); Εξετάζονται σχετικές νομοθετικές πρωτοβουλίες;

3. Σε αρκετές αυτοαποκαλούμενες έξυπνες πόλεις που έχουν υλοποιηθεί με χρηματοδότηση της ΕΕ παρατηρούνται τεράστιες υπερβάσεις δαπανών για την κατασκευή στοιχειωδών υποδομών, ενώ σε άλλες περιπτώσεις οι «έξυπνες» πόλεις καταρρέουν κάτω από το βάρος του κόστους συντήρησης των υποδομών. Διαθέτει η ΕΕ συγκριτικά στοιχεία για το κόστος κατασκευής των ελάχιστων υποδομών μιας ευφυούς πόλης; Πώς εξασφαλίζει η ΕΕ τη βιωσιμότητα τέτοιου είδους επενδύσεων;

Απάντηση της κ. Kroes εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(10 Ιουνίου 2014)

Η Επιτροπή ορίζει ως έξυπνη πόλη (Smart-City) την ολοκληρωμένη διερεύνηση και εκμετάλλευση λύσεων των τεχνολογιών πληροφοριών και επικοινωνιών (ΤΠΕ) προσανατολισμένων στις σημερινές ανάγκες και τις μελλοντικές ευκαιρίες για τις πόλεις και τις κοινότητες των ενδιαφερόμενων μερών τους. Με άλλα λόγια, ο ορισμός αυτός περιλαμβάνει κάτι περισσότερο από την απλή «ψηφιακή» πόλη. Η Επιτροπή συνεργάζεται με πόλεις και κλάδους παραγωγής ούτως ώστε να δημιουργήσει ένα πλαίσιο που θα επιτρέπει τη συνεχή αξιολόγηση των επιδόσεων των σχεδίων έξυπνης πόλης συνολικώς και των τεχνολογικών λύσεων ειδικώς. Η υποστήριξη και οι συνεργασίες μεταξύ κλάδων παραγωγής + πόλεων επιτυγχάνεται *τόσο μέσω των έξυπνων πόλεων και των κοινοτήτων ευρωπαϊκών συμπράξεων καινοτομίας (EIP) (μέσω εθελοντικών δεσμεύσεων) όσο και μέσω της πρόσκλησης για την υποβολή προτάσεων για τον* «Ορίζοντα 2020», συμπεριλαμβανομένων των έργων-φάρων και των δράσεων στήριξης.

Καμία ειδική ρύθμιση για την έξυπνη πόλη δεν προβλέπεται στο σημείο αυτό.

Στο βαθμό που ως «*ελάχιστες απαραίτητες υποδομές για την έξυπνη πόλη*», νοούνται σε μεγάλο βαθμό οι υποδομές επικοινωνιακών δικτύων, η στήριξη αυτή θα εξακολουθήσει να διατίθεται μέσω των ευρωπαϊκών διαρθρωτικών και επενδυτικών ταμείων και να υλοποιείται από τα μέσα της περιφερειακής πολιτικής.

([1]) π.χ. www.smart-cities.eu

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005198/14
to the Commission
Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Development of smart cities

A number of designations (digital, wireless, ubiquitous, green, etc.) have now gained international acceptance with reference to 'smart cities' enhanced at local level (e.g. through information and communications' infrastructures) in terms of quality of life, the business environment and economic and other factors. Recent research (Korea IT Times, 2012) has revealed that smart cities are developing into a new international market worth over USD 240 billion, with substantial prospects in terms of business expansion and regional development. At the same time, the EU has taken major initiatives to promote smart cities ([1]). The Enterprise and Industry DG has identified the development of smart and sustainable European cities as a major challenge and earmarked EUR 365 million for the development of innovative smart city and municipality networks. However, although numerous projects have received EU funding and a large number of self-styled 'smart' cities have been created, the actual results can only be described as meagre when compared with those obtained by countries such as South Korea, for example, where smart cities have become an exportable national product.

In view of this:

1. How does the Commission define a smart city? Has it established minimum architectural standards or benchmarks for a smart city acceptable at European level so as to make it clear what criteria must be fulfilled to qualify for this designation? How is it monitoring smart city performances? How do smart cities fit into the Horizon 2020 programme?

2. Are any EU regulatory framework provisions in place or being envisaged (regarding urban sustainability, smart cities etc.)? Are legislative initiatives to this end being considered?

3. A considerable number of self-styled smart cities developed with EU funding have vastly exceeded their budgets for the creation of essential infrastructures while other smart cities are struggling under the financial burden of maintaining them. Does the Commission have comparative data regarding the cost of providing minimum essential 'smart city' infrastructures? What is the EU doing to ensure the sustainability of such investments?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(10 June 2014)

The Commission defines a Smart-City as the comprehensive exploration and exploitation of ICT solutions towards present needs and future opportunities for cities and their stakeholder communities. In other words, this definition encompasses more than the simple 'digital' city. The Commission is working with Cities and industry to produce a framework which will allow for the continuous performance assessment of Smart-City projects overall and technological solutions specifically. Support and collaborations between industry + cities is achieved through both the Smart Cities and Communities EIP (via voluntary commitments) and through the H2020 call for proposals, including Lighthouse projects and Support Actions.

No specific regulation for Smart-City is envisaged at this point.

To the extent that 'minimum essential "smart city" infrastructures' largely means Communication Network Infrastructures, this support will continue to be available via the European Structural and Investment Funds and delivered through the instruments of regional policy.

([1]) e.g. www.smart-cities.eu

(Eestikeelne versioon)

Kirjalikult vastatav küsimus E-005199/14
komisjonile
Milan Zver (PPE), László Tőkés (PPE), Romana Jordan (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE) ja Tunne Kelam (PPE)
(17. aprill 2014)

Teema: Kohtusüsteemide kasutamine poliitilistel eesmärkidel ELis

Janez Janša on olnud kahel korral Sloveenia peaminister ja 2008. aastal oli ta Euroopa Ülemkogu eesistuja. Juunis 2013 määras Ljubljana esimese astme kohus talle kaheaastase vanglakaristuse. Ta mõisteti süüdi, kuna oli nõustunud väidetava ebaseadusliku kasu toova sekkumise eest avalikul pakkumisel võtma vastu tasu, mille olemus ei ole teada. Ükski süüdistus siiski tõendamist ei leidnud ega saanudki leida, kuna süüdistused olid läbinisti valed. Kohtumenetlus oli lavastatud. Süüdistus, et õigusrikkumine pandi toime „teadmata ajal" „teadmata kohas", kasutades „teadmata suhtlusviisi", on niivõrd ebamäärane, et süüdistataval ei jää enda kaitsmiseks vähimatki võimalust. Sellega rikutakse selgelt Euroopa Liidu põhiõiguste hartas (artiklis 48) tunnustatud süütuse presumptsiooni põhimõtet ja kaitseõigust. Kakskümmend viis aastat tagasi võeti Janša vahi alla ja pandi vangi (kohtuotsus tunnistati hiljem kehtetuks) endise salapolitsei agendi algatusel, kes on 2013. aasta kohtuasja prokuröri abikaasa. Tundub, et tegu on Euroopa Nõukogu kehtestatud Euroopa standardite ja samuti hartas sätestatud põhimõtete (artikli 47) selge rikkumisega. Poliitilisele juhile süüdistuse esitamine erakorralise kiirendatud menetluse teel, mis välistab igasuguse eelneva sõltumatu kohtuliku kontrollimise, nagu seda tehti Janša puhul, võib olla vahend, mille abil püütakse hoida ära opositsioonijuhi kandideerimist valimistel (harta artikli 40 rikkumine), samal ajal kui tavapärasema ja sama tõhusa menetluse korral oleksid tema demokraatlikud õigused olnud tagatud. Sellistel juhtudel on kiirendatud menetlus poliitiline vahend, mille abil moonutatakse radikaalselt nii liikmesriikide kui ka ELi demokraatiat.

Kuidas hindab komisjon süüdistatava õigusi Janša kohtuasjas?

Milliseid standardeid rakendatakse ELis kohtusüsteemide poliitilistel eesmärkidel kasutamise vastu?

Milline võib olla sellise kohtuotsuse mõju kodanike usaldusele kohtusüsteemide vastu, demokraatia standarditele ja inimõigustele, mida EL kogu maailmas edendab?

Komisjoni nimel vastanud Vivian Reding
(13. juuni 2014)

Parlamendiliikmete osutatud konkreetse kriminaalasja ja selle lahendamiseks kasutatud konkreetse kriminaalmenetluse liigi puhul soovib komisjon täpsustada, et vastavalt Euroopa Liidu aluslepingutele ([1]) puudub komisjonil pädevus sekkuda liikmesriikide tegevusse põhiõiguste valdkonnas. Euroopa Komisjon saab seda teha vaid juhul, kui probleem on seotud Euroopa Liidu õigusega. Euroopa Liidu põhiõiguste hartat ei kohaldata iga väidetava põhiõiguste rikkumise korral. Vastavalt harta artikli 51 lõikele 1 kohaldatakse hartat liikmesriikide suhtes üksnes siis, kui nad kohaldavad liidu õigust. Küsimuses esitatud teabest ei ilmne, et osutatud kriminaalasi on seotud Euroopa Liidu õiguse rakendamisega. Sel põhjusel ei ole komisjonil võimalik sekkuda.

Seoses Sloveenia kohtusüsteemi toimimisega üldisemalt soovib komisjon selgitada, et riikide kohtusüsteemide kvaliteedi, sõltumatuse ja tõhususe parandamine on ka majanduspoliitika koordineerimise Euroopa poolaasta üks peamisi prioriteete, nagu on märgitud komisjoni teatises „2013. aasta majanduskasvu analüüs" ([2]). Nagu ka kõik teised ELi liikmesriigid, osaleb Sloveenia Euroopa poolaastas (2014) ([3]).

([1]) Euroopa Liidu leping ja Euroopa Liidu toimimise leping
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/ags2013_en.pdf
([3]) Lisateave riigipõhiste soovituste kohta: http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/index_en.htm

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-005199/14
a Bizottság számára
Milan Zver (PPE), László Tőkés (PPE), Romana Jordan (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE) és Tunne Kelam (PPE)
(2014. április 17.)

Tárgy: Az igazságszolgáltatási rendszerek politikai célokra történő felhasználása az Unióban

Janez Janša kétszer volt Szlovénia miniszterelnöke, 2008-ban pedig az Európai Tanács elnöke. 2013 júniusában a Ljubljanai Elsőfokú Bíróság két év börtönbüntetésre ítélte. A büntető ítélet alapja az volt, hogy ismeretlen jutalmazásra tett ígéretet fogadott el egy közbeszerzési pályázatba történő állítólagos illegális, kedvező beavatkozásért. A vádak egyikét sem sikerült bizonyítani, de ez lehetetlen is lett volna, hiszen teljes mértékben igaztalanok voltak. A tárgyalás puszta színjáték volt. A vádindítvány, amely szerint valaki egy „ismeretlen pillanatban", „ismeretlen helyen" és „ismeretlen kommunikációs eszköz felhasználásával" követett el bűncselekményt, túlságosan pontatlan volt ahhoz, hogy a vádlottnak a legcsekélyebb lehetősége legyen védekezni. Ez egyértelműen sérti az ártatlanság vélelmének elvét és az Európai Unió Alapjogi Chartájának 48. cikkében foglalt védelemhez való jogot. 25 évvel ezelőtt a titkosrendőrség egyik korábbi ügynöke, aki a mostani 2013-as ügyben eljáró ügyész házastársa, letartóztatta Janez Janšát, akit ezután bebörtönöztek. (Az ítéletet később hatályon kívül helyezték.) Ez egyértelműen sérteni látszik az Európa Tanács által megállapított európai normákat és az Alapjogi Charta 47. cikkében foglalt elveket. Egy politikai vezető olyan gyorsított eljárás során történő bíróság elé állítása, amely kizárja a korábbi és független bírói vizsgálatot, amint az Janez Janša esetében történt, arra irányuló kísérlet lehet, hogy megakadályozzanak egy ellenzéki vezetőt abban, hogy indulhasson a választásokon (ezzel megsértve az Alapjogi Charta 40. cikkét), míg egy általánosan alkalmazott és ugyanilyen hatékony eljárás megőrizte volna a demokratikus jogait. Az ilyen esetekben a gyorsított eljárás politikai eszköz a demokrácia radikális eltorzítására mind a tagállamokban, mind az Unióban.

Hogyan értékeli a Bizottság a vádlott jogait a Janša-ügyben?

Milyen normák állnak rendelkezésre az igazságszolgáltatás politikai célokra történő felhasználása ellen az Unióban?

Milyen hatást gyakorolhat egy ilyen ítélet a polgárok igazságszolgáltatásba, a demokratikus normákba és az Unió által világszerte hirdetett emberi jogokba vetett bizalmára?

Viviane Reding válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2014. június 13.)

A tisztelt képviselők által említett konkrét büntetőügyet és az annak során alkalmazott konkrét büntetőjogi eljárást illetően a Bizottság tisztázni kívánja, hogy az Európai Unió alapját képező Szerződések ([1]) értelmében a Bizottság általános hatásköre nem terjed ki arra, hogy beavatkozzon az alapvető jogokkal kapcsolatos tagállami ügyekbe. Ezt csak akkor teheti meg, ha az adott ügy európai uniós jogot érint. Az Európai Unió Alapjogi Chartája nem vonatkozik az alapvető jogok állítólagos megsértésének minden helyzetére. A Charta 51. cikkének (1) bekezdése szerint a Chartának annyiban címzettjei a tagállamok, amennyiben az Európai Unió jogát hajtják végre. A kérdésben foglalt információk alapján úgy tűnik, hogy az említett ügy nem kapcsolódik az uniós jog végrehajtásához. Ezen oknál fogva a Bizottságnak nem áll módjában nyomon követni az ügyet.

A szlovén igazságszolgáltatási rendszer általános működését illetően a Bizottság hangsúlyozni kívánja, hogy a nemzeti igazságszolgáltatási rendszerek minőségének, függetlenségének és hatékonyságának javítása az európai szemeszter – az EU éves gazdaságpolitikai koordinációs ciklusa – fő prioritásai közé tartozik, a 2013. évi éves növekedési jelentésről szóló bizottsági közleményben ([2]) foglaltaknak megfelelően. A többi uniós tagállamhoz hasonlóan Szlovénia is részt vesz a 2014. évi európai szemeszterben ([3]).

([1]) Az Európai Unióról szóló szerződés és az Európai Unió működéséről szóló szerződés.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/ags2013_hu.pdf
([3]) További információk az országspecifikus ajánlásokról: http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/index_en.htm

(Slovenska različica)

Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-005199/14
za Komisijo
Milan Zver (PPE), László Tőkés (PPE), Romana Jordan (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE) in Tunne Kelam (PPE)
(17. april 2014)

Zadeva: Uporaba sodnih sistemov v politične namene v EU

Janez Janša je bil dvakrat predsednik slovenske vlade, leta 2008 pa tudi predsednik Evropskega sveta. Junija 2013 ga je prvostopenjsko sodišče v Ljubljani obsodilo na dve leti zaporne kazni, češ da je sprejel obljubo neznane nagrade za domnevno nezakonito posredovanje v korist ponudnika na javnem razpisu. Nobena od obtožb ni bila dokazana; to tudi ni bilo mogoče, saj so bile obtožbe povsem neresnične. Sodni postopek je bil prirejen. Obtožnica, ki ga je bremenila, da je kaznivo dejanje storil ob neznanem času, na neznanem kraju in na neznan komunikacijski način, je bila preveč nedoločna, tako da obtoženec ni imel niti najmanjše možnosti obrambe. To je nedvomna kršitev načela o domnevi nedolžnosti in pravice do obrambe, ki ju priznava Listina EU o temeljnih pravicah (člen 48). Janez Janša je bil pred petindvajsetimi leti aretiran in zaprt (sodba je bila pozneje razveljavljena), pri aretaciji pa je sodeloval nekdanji agent tajne policije in soprog tožilke v primeru iz leta 2013. To je očitna kršitev evropskih standardov, ki jih je določil Svet Evrope, in načel iz zgoraj omenjene listine (člen 47). Pregon političnega voditelja s posebnim, pospešenim postopkom, ki izključuje neodvisen vnaprejšnji sodni preizkus, bi bil lahko v primeru Janeza Janše poskus, da se vodji politične opozicije prepreči kandidaturo (kršitev člena 40 Listine), saj v običajnem in prav tako učinkovitem postopku demokratične pravice ne bi bile ogrožene. V takšnih okoliščinah je pospešeni postopek politično orodje za korenito izkrivljanje demokracije tako v državah članicah kot v EU.

Kako Komisija ocenjuje pravice obtoženca v primeru Janeza Janše?

Kateri standardi preprečujejo uporabo sodnih sistemov v politične namene v EU?

Kakšne posledice bi utegnila imeti ta sodba za zaupanje državljanov v sodne sisteme, demokratične standarde in človekove pravice, za katere se EU zavzema po svetu?

Odgovor Viviane Reding v imenu Komisije
(13. junij 2014)

V zvezi s konkretno kazensko zadevo, ki jo navajajo poslanci, in posebno vrsto uporabljenega kazenskega postopka želi Komisija pojasniti, da v skladu s pogodbama, na katerih temelji Evropska unija ([1]), nima splošnih pooblastil za posredovanje v državah članicah na področju temeljnih pravic. Posreduje lahko samo, ko gre za vprašanje prava Evropske unije. Listina Evropske unije o temeljnih pravicah se ne uporablja v vseh primerih domnevnih kršitev temeljnih pravic. Določbe Listine se v skladu s členom 51(1) za države članice uporabljajo samo, ko te izvajajo pravo Evropske unije. Glede na informacije iz vašega vprašanja ni videti, da bi se navedena kazenska zadeva nanašala na izvajanje prava Evropske unije. Zato Komisija ne more ukrepati.

Kar zadeva delovanje slovenskega pravosodja nasploh, pa bi Komisija želela pojasniti, da je izboljšanje kakovosti, neodvisnosti in učinkovitosti nacionalnih pravosodnih sistemov med glavnimi prednostnimi nalogami evropskega semestra – letnega cikla usklajevanja ekonomskih politik na ravni EU, kot je poudarila v sporočilu Letni pregled rasti 2013 ([2]). Tako kot vse druge države članice EU je v evropski semester za leto 2014 vključena tudi Slovenija ([3]).

([1]) Pogodba o Evropski uniji in Pogodba o delovanju Evropske unije.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/ags2013_sl.pdf
([3]) Več informacij o priporočilih za posamezne države je na voljo na: http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005199/14
to the Commission
Milan Zver (PPE), László Tőkés (PPE), Romana Jordan (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE) and Tunne Kelam (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Use of judicial systems for political reasons in the EU

Janez Janša twice served as Prime Minister of Slovenia and in 2008 chaired the European Council. In June 2013, the Court of First Instance in Ljubljana sentenced him to two years in prison. The conviction was on the grounds that he had accepted a promise of an unknown reward for an alleged illegal favourable intervention in a public tender. None of the accusations were proved, however, nor could they be, because they were wholly untrue. The trial was staged. The indictment of committing an offence at an 'unknown moment', at an 'unknown place', through an 'unknown method of communication', is far too unspecific to allow the defendant the slightest opportunity to defend himself. This constitutes a clear violation of the principle of presumption of innocence and the right to defence recognised in the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights (Article 48). Twenty-five years ago, Janša was arrested and sent to prison (the judgment was later repealed) by a former agent of the secret police, the spouse of the prosecutor in the 2013 case. This seems to be a clear infringement of the European standards set by the Council of Europe and, again, of the principles laid down in the Charter (Article 47). The prosecution of a political leader via a specific expedited procedure that rules out any prior independent judicial verification, as used in the Janša case, can be a way of attempting to prevent an opposition leader from running for office (breach of Article 40 of the Charter) while a more common and equally effective procedure would have preserved his democratic rights. In such cases, expedited procedures are a political tool used to radically distort democracy both in the Member States and in the EU.

How would the Commission assess the rights of the defendant in the Janša case?

What are the standards against the use of judicial systems for political reasons in the EU?

What influence might such a judgment have on the confidence of citizens in judicial systems, standards of democracy, and human rights as promoted by the EU around the world?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(13 June 2014)

As regards the specific criminal case referred to by the Honourable Members and the specific type of criminal procedure used, the Commission wishes to clarify that under the Treaties on which the European Union is based ([1]), the Commission has no general powers to intervene with the Member States in the area of fundamental rights. It can only do so if an issue of European Union law is involved. The Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union does not apply to every situation of an alleged violation of fundamental rights. According to its Article 51(1), the Charter applies to Member States only when they are implementing European Union law. On the basis of the information provided in the question, it does not appear that the referred criminal case is related to the implementation of European Union law. For this reason, it is not possible for the Commission to follow up.

As regards the functioning of the Slovenian justice system more generally, the Commission would like to explain that improving the quality, independence and efficiency of national justice systems are amongst the key priorities of the European Semester — the EU annual cycle of economic policy coordination, as expressed in the communication from the Commission on the Annual Growth Survey for 2013 ([2]). As all other EU Member States, Slovenia is a part of the 2014 European Semester. ([3])

([1]) Treaty on European Union and Treaty on the functioning of the European Union.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/ags2013_en.pdf
([3]) For more information on Country Specific Recommendations, see: http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005200/14
to the Commission
Chris Davies (ALDE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Daimler's law-breaking

The Commission has stated (E-008665/2013) that it opened an investigation into the failure of Daimler to comply with the requirements of the Mobile Air Conditioning Directive (2006/40/EC) and that the German authorities responded on 14 August 2013.

Will the Commission state what developments have taken place since that date and what action it is taking to ensure that Daimler respects EC law in common with the vast majority of other car manufacturers?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(23 June 2014)

Following the opening of an investigation in mid-2013, regarding the actions by one manufacturer, Daimler, and the German authorities as far as the implementation of Directive 2006/40/EC on mobile air-conditioning (MAC) is concerned, the Commission opened on 27 January 2014 an infringement procedure against Germany. In its letter of formal notice ([1]), the Commission concludes that Germany does not fully apply the MAC Directive as far as vehicles produced by one manufacturer are concerned (Daimler):

1. Vehicles not in conformity with EC law were placed on the EU market. However, the German approval authorities opted not to act and did not impose adequate remedial measures on the manufacturer concerned.

2. In May 2013, the German authorities accepted the request by this manufacturer to discontinue the use of type approvals granted to vehicles using the new refrigerant which were already being produced and put on the market. They accepted to grant extensions of old vehicle approvals to those vehicles, which in effect temporarily excluded the vehicles concerned from compliance with the directive. The Commission considers that the extensions were requested with the sole purpose of circumventing the application of the directive, thus depriving it of its intended effects.

The Commission remains committed to ensuring that the climate objectives of the directive are fulfilled and that the law is uniformly applied throughout the EU's internal market. Under EU infringement procedures, Germany had two months to respond to the letter of formal notice. Germany replied on 27 March 2014 and the answer is being analysed.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-14-50_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005201/14
to the Commission
Arlene McCarthy (S&D)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Choice of currency for card transactions

During a recent trip to Spain, one of my constituents found, on numerous occasions, that he was forced to pay for purchases in pound sterling on his UK credit card. In many cases it was the retailer, as opposed to the consumer, who decided the currency of the transaction. Furthermore, my constituent was told by retailers that the Spanish banks had written to them suggesting that they force consumers to pay in the currency of their card and that they would receive payments from banks for taking such action.

Is the Commission aware of these allegations concerning banks colluding with retailers to the detriment of EU consumers? If so, what action is the Commission willing to take?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2014)

The Commission was not aware of the alleged collusion between some Spanish banks and some local retailers. Article 49.2 of the Payment Services Directive 2007/64/EC states that if a payment in another currency than the local currency is offered by the retailer, the related charges have to be communicated to the payer. On this basis, the payer can then choose the currency he wishes to pay with.

If retailers in a euro Member State refuse a card payment in euro, this is a breach of the directive. Consumers confronted with this practice should file a complaint with the Competent Authority of the country of the retailer, which in Spain is Banco de España (www.bde.es).

In this case, the legal framework appears clear and individual cases should be enforced by the competent national authority.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-005202/14
komissiolle (Varapuheenjohtajalle/Korkealle edustajalle)
Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE)
(17. huhtikuuta 2014)

Aihe: VP/HR – EU:n strategia Kambodžan laittoman hallituksen suhteen

EU:n edustusto Kambodžassa toteaa verkkosivustollaan, että EU:n ja Kambodžan suhteet ovat tiiviit monilla aloilla. EU:n Kambodžan suhteen noudattama strategia on yleissävyltään varsin myönteinen, mutta samaa ei voida sanoa EU:n suhteista moniin muihin maihin, joissa vallassa on vastaavanlainen autoritaarinen ja epädemokraattisesti valittu hallinto.

Kesän 2013 vaalit eivät olleet kansalaisjärjestöjen ja Kambodžan opposition mukaan lainkaan vapaat ja oikeudenmukaiset. EU:n edustusto Kambodžassa antoi 23.9.2013 lausunnon, jossa se kehotti poliittisia puolueita toimimaan yhteistyössä tuodakseen esiin vaaleissa esiintyneet väärinkäytökset ja ponnistelemaan tehostaakseen vaaliprosessia, mutta se ei ole antanut minkäänlaisia lausuntoja siitä, olivatko vaalit vapaat ja oikeudenmukaiset. Varapuheenjohtajan/korkean edustajan Catherine Ashtonin tiedottajan 29.7.2013 antamaa lausuntoa mukaillen edustusto tyytyi ilmaisemaan tyytyväisyytensä korkean äänestysprosentin, nuorten aktiivisen osallistumisen ja väkivallan puuttumisen johdosta.

Edellä mainitussa lausunnossa pahoiteltiin, että EU:n aiempien vaalitarkkailutehtävien kaikkia suosituksia ei ollut otettu huomioon. Kansalaisjärjestöt ovat laajalti arvostelleet EU:n edustuston varovaista toimintatapaa ja vaalien vilpillisyyden jättämistä huomiotta. Lisäksi kehotus kaikkien osapuolten yhteistyöhön on kansalaisjärjestöjen mielestä epärealistinen hallinnon diktatorisen luonteen vuoksi.

1. Miksi EU:n edustusto ja varapuheenjohtaja/korkea edustaja ovat tyytyneet arvostelemaan vaaliprosessia näin varovaisella tavalla? Olivatko vaalit EU:n tarkkailijoiden mukaan vapaat ja oikeudenmukaiset?

2. Onko EU vaatinut tutkimusta vaalien aikana ja niiden jälkeen esiintyneistä sääntöjenvastaisuuksista (muun muassa työntekijöiden pidätykset ja opposition jäsenten suunnitellut oikeudenkäynnit)?

Korkean edustajan, varapuheenjohtaja Catherine Ashtonin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(13. kesäkuuta 2014)

Kambodžassa on järjestetty vaaleja vuodesta 1993 lähtien, ja vaaliprosessi on kehittynyt tasaisesti. Vuoden 2013 parlamenttivaalikampanjalle oli ominaista vaaliympäristön avoimuus sekä etenkin nuorten äänestäjien ennennäkemätön osallistumisaktiivisuus. EU ei lähettänyt vaaleihin tarkkailijoita, mutta kaksi EU:n vaaliasiantuntijaa seurasi vaalikampanjaa, itse vaaleja ja joitakin vaaleja seuranneita valitusmenettelyjä. He suosittelivat erityisesti, että lisättäisiin Kambodžan keskusvaalilautakunnan riippumattomuutta ja äänestäjäluettelojen tarkkuutta ja perustettaisiin riippumaton tiedotusvälineiden sääntelyelin.

EU:n edustusto on ollut säännöllisesti yhteydessä sekä oppositioon että hallitukseen varmistaakseen, että riidat sovitaan demokraattisesti ja rauhanomaisesti. EU on aina kannustanut kaikkia osapuolia jatkamaan vuoropuhelua ja keskustelemaan keskeisistä vaalijärjestelmän uudistuksista. EU katsoo, että viimeisimmissä vaaleissa havaittujen puutteiden yksilöinti ja korjaaminen olisi tärkeää tulevien vaalien järjestämisen kannalta. Se toivoo, että parhaillaan käynnissä olevat osapuolten väliset neuvottelut johtavat konkreettisiin uudistusehdotuksiin.

EU kehotti Brysselissä 13. maaliskuuta 2014 pidetyssä EU:n ja Kambodžan sekakomitean 8. kokouksessa hallitusta vapauttamaan 21 vankia, jotka pidätettiin tammikuussa tekstiilialan työntekijöiden mielenosoitusten yhteydessä, ja tutkimaan perusteellisesti väkivaltaisuudet, jotka johtivat siihen, että ainakin neljä ihmistä surmattiin ampumalla heitä kovilla luodeilla. EU osallistuu pidätettyjen oikeudenkäynteihin.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005202/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — EU policy on the illegitimate Government of Cambodia

According to the website of the EU Delegation to Cambodia, the EU and Cambodia enjoy a close relationship in a number of areas. The overall tone of EU-Cambodia policy is rather positive, although the same cannot be said of the EU's relationship with a number of other countries governed by similar authoritarian and non-democratically elected regimes.

The summer 2013 elections were, according to civil society organisations and the Cambodian opposition, far from free and fair. The EU Delegation to Cambodia issued a statement on 23 September 2013 saying that it 'calls on the political parties to work together to identify any flaws that occurred' during the elections and to work ahead to improve the electoral process, yet it has not made any statements as to whether or not the elections were free and fair. In line with the statement of 29 July 2013 by the spokesperson of Vice-President/High Representative Catherine Ashton following the elections in Cambodia, the delegation simply commended the high levels of participation, the mobilisation of young people and the absence of violence.

In the abovementioned statement, it is regretted that not all of the recommendations of past EU election observation missions were taken into account. Civil society organisations have widely criticised the EU Delegation's reserved approach and vague denial of rigged elections. Moreover, the recommendation that all parties work together is considered to be unrealistic by non-governmental organisations, due to the dictatorial nature of the regime.

1. Why were the EU Delegation and the Vice-President/High Representative so reserved in their criticism of the election process? According to EU observers, were the elections free and fair?

2. Has the EU pushed for an investigation into the irregularities that occurred during and after the elections (including the arrest of workers, the planned trials of opposition members, etc.)?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(13 June 2014)

Cambodia has been organising elections since 1993 with steady progress as regards the electoral processes. The 2013 legislative electoral campaign was characterised by an open environment and an unprecedented level of participation in particular by young voters. The EU did not send observers, but two EU electoral experts monitored the electoral campaign, the election itself and some of the following appeal procedures. They recommended in particular greater independence of the National Election Committee, greater accuracy of the voters' list and the establishment of an independent media regulatory body.

The EU Delegation has been in regular contacts with the opposition, as well as with the government, to ensure that disputes are settled in a democratic and peaceful spirit. The EU has always encouraged all parties to resume dialogue and to discuss key electoral reforms. The EU is of the opinion that identifying and addressing shortcomings during the last elections would be important for the conduct of future elections. It hopes that current discussions between parties will deliver concrete proposals for reform.

During the 8th EU-Cambodia Joint Committee which took place in Brussels on 13 March 2014, the EU has called on the government to release the 21 detainees arrested during the January demonstrations of textile workers, and to conduct a thorough investigation into the violence, which resulted in the killing of at least four persons with live ammunition. The EU will attend the trials of the detainees.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-005203/14
komissiolle
Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE)
(17. huhtikuuta 2014)

Aihe: Maksullisia puhelinnumeroita (erityisesti lentoyhtiöiden puhelinnumeroita) koskevat yhteiset säännöt

EU:n kansalaiset joutuvat usein soittamaan lentoyhtiöiden puhelinnumeroihin esimerkiksi peruuttaakseen lentonsa tai tehdäkseen niihin muutoksia.

Useimmat lentoyhtiöiden puhelinnumerot ovat hyvin kalliita, soittajat joutuvat maksamaan jonottamisesta ja puhelumaksut ovat aivan liian suuria soitettaessa ulkomailta, josta lentoja koskevat puhelut yleensä joudutaan soittamaan.

1. Onko komissio pyrkinyt muuttamaan lentoyhtiöihin EU:ssa soitettavien puhelujen hintoja kuluttajille kohtuullisemmiksi?

2. Mikä on tällaisia puheluja koskeva EU:n nykyinen lainsäädäntökehys, ja minne valitukset voi ohjata?

Neelie Kroesin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(10. kesäkuuta 2014)

Komissiossa pidetään tärkeänä kuluttajasuojan laajentamista tällä alalla, ja EU:n tason säädöksiin sisältyy tähän liittyviä käytäntöjä.

Kuluttajansuojan alalta, koskien erityisesti lentoliikenteen käyttäjiä, on mainittava komission ehdotus ([1]) uudeksi direktiiviksi matkapaketeista ja avustetuista matkajärjestelyistä. Ehdotuksen mukaan kuluttajat, jotka ovat ostaneet lennon sisältävän pakettiloman, ovat velvollisia maksamaan vain perusmaksun ottaessaan puhelimitse yhteyttä elinkeinonharjoittajaan lomaan liittyvässä asiassa. Tämän taustalla on uudessa kuluttajan oikeuksia koskevassa direktiivissä 2011/83/EU ([2]) oleva säännös, jota on ehdotettu sovellettavaksi pakettilomiin ja -kiertomatkoihin.

Sähköisen viestinnän alalla EU:n sääntelykehys ei sisällä erityisiä velvoitteita televiestintäyrityksille, koska numerotyypin valinta ja siihen liittyvät kytkentä- ja hintaehdot kuuluvat kaupallista palvelua tarjoavan yrityksen liiketoiminnalliseen päätöksentekoon. Sääntelykehykseen sisältyy kuitenkin tiettyjä kuluttajansuojan välineitä, jotka antavat jäsenvaltioille valtuudet määrittää erityisehtoja numeroiden käyttöön, mukaan lukien myös hinnoitteluperiaatteet, enimmäishinnat ja hintatietojen läpinäkyvyys kuluttajille. Koko Euroopan markkinoiden yhteen liittämistä koskeva ehdotus (Connected Continent) ([3]) laajentaisi myös loppukäyttäjien suojaa siten, että palveluntarjoaja olisi ennen puhelun yhdistämistä velvollinen antamaan hintatietoja kaikista tiettyjen hinnoitteluehtojen alaisista palveluista.

([1]) COM(2013) 512 final.
([2]) Euroopan parlamentin ja neuvoston direktiivi 2011/83/EU, annettu 25 päivänä lokakuuta 2011, kuluttajan oikeuksista, neuvoston direktiivin 93/13/ETY ja Euroopan parlamentin ja neuvoston direktiivin 1999/44/EY muuttamisesta sekä neuvoston direktiivin 85/577/ETY ja Euroopan parlamentin ja neuvoston direktiivin 97/7/EY kumoamisesta (EUVL L 304, 22.11.2011, s. 64–88).
([3]) COM(2013) 627.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005203/14
to the Commission
Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Common rules for paid telephone numbers (in particular those of airline operators)

EU citizens are frequently faced with the problem of having to call, airline operators, for instance, to cancel or make changes to flights.

Most airline operator numbers are very expensive, with callers being subjected to queuing fees and the costs often being too high when the numbers are dialled from abroad, which is usually the case for calls concerning flights.

1. Has the Commission made any attempts to render the prices of phone calls to airline operators more reasonable for consumers when calling within the EU?

2. What is the current EU legislative framework governing such calls, and to where can complaints be addressed?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(10 June 2014)

The Commission is aware of the importance of enhancing consumer protection in this area and a number of legislative instruments at EU level contain measures in this regard.

In the field of consumer protection and as regards specifically users of air transport, the Commission proposal ([1]) for a new directive on package travel and assisted travel arrangements should be mentioned. According to this proposal, consumers having purchased a package holiday, which often contains a flight element, are not bound to pay more than the basic rate when contacting the trader by telephone in relation to the holiday. This follows from a provision in the new Consumer Rights Directive 2011/83/EU ([2]) which is proposed to become applicable to package holidays and tours.

In the field of electronic communications, the EU regulatory framework does not contain specific obligations for telecoms companies as the decision on the type of number and its related conditions for access and prices is a business decision by the company providing the commercial service. However, the regulatory framework contains certain consumer safeguards empowering Member States to establish specific conditions attached to the rights of use of numbers including tariff principles and maximum prices and transparency on tariff information to subscribers. The Connected Continent proposal ([3]) would also enhance end-users protection in relation to information on applicable tariffs on any number or service subject to particular pricing conditions and the obligation for providers to provide this information prior to connecting the call.

([1]) COM(2013) 512final.
([2]) Directive 2011/83/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25.10.2011 on consumer rights, amending Council Directive 93/13/EEC and Directive 1999/44/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council and repealing Council Directive 85/577/EEC and Directive 97/7/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council, OJ L 304, 22.11.2011, p. 64-88.
([3]) COM(2013) 627.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-005205/14
komissiolle (Varapuheenjohtajalle/Korkealle edustajalle)
Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE)
(17. huhtikuuta 2014)

Aihe: VP/HR – EU:n välitystä ja vuoropuhelua koskevat periaatteet ja valmiudet

Neuvosto hyväksyi vuonna 2009 EU:n välitys- ja vuoropuheluvalmiuksien vahvistamista koskevan toimintaperiaatteen, jonka tavoitteena on koordinoidumpi ja keskitetympi toimintatapa ja aktiivisempi kansainvälinen rooli tällä alalla. Toimintaperiaatteen kautta välitys ja vuoropuhelu tunnustetaan virallisesti unionin toimintapoliittisiksi välineiksi. Samalla vasta perustettuun Euroopan ulkosuhdehallintoon (EUH) luotiin konfliktinehkäisyn, rauhanrakentamisen ja välitystoiminnan osasto (CPPM).

Välittäjänä toimiminen edellyttäisi laajempaa tukea kuin tällä hetkellä on saatavilla (Herrberg, 2012, ISIS Europe). Tilannetta on korjattu muun muassa Euroopan unionin erityisedustajille ja EUH:n edustustojen henkilöstölle tarjotulla koulutuksella sekä hankkeilla, jotka on rahoitettu nopean toiminnan järjestelmästä (2001-2006) ja vakautusvälineestä (vuodesta 2007 lähtien). Rauhanrakentamisen alalla toimivien kansalaisjärjestöjen voimakkaan lobbauksen seurauksena parlamentti päätti käynnistää 600 000 euron suuruisen pilottihankkeen CPPM-osaston valmiuksien vahvistamiseksi ja pysyvämmän välitysyksikön perustamiseksi. Vuonna 2010 Suomen ja Ruotsin hallitukset ehdottivat myös Euroopan rauhaninstituutin perustamista.

Samaan aikaan muut alueelliset järjestöt ovat myös perustaneet omia välitysrakenteitaan, ja voidaan väittää, että niillä on paremmat valmiudet hoitaa välitys- ja vuoropuhelutehtäviä kuin EU:lla. Näihin järjestöihin lukeutuvat Afrikan unioni, Arabiliitto, Amerikan valtioiden järjestö (OAS), Afrikan sarven alueen maiden yhteistyöjärjestö (IGAD), Länsi-Afrikan valtioiden talousyhteisö (ECOWAS), Kaakkois-Aasian valtioiden järjestö (ASEAN), Etyj, Karibian yhteisö (CARICOM), kollektiivisen turvallisuuden sopimusjärjestö (CSTO), vuorovaikutusta ja luottamusta herättäviä toimia Aasiassa edistävä konferenssi (CICA), Euroopan neuvosto, Nato, Tyynenmeren saarten foorumi (PIF) ja Islamilaisten maiden yhteistyöjärjestö (OIC).

1. Onko EU:lla tarvittavat valmiudet ja pystyykö se toimimaan riittävän joustavasti lähettääkseen välittäjiä kiireellisten tarpeiden ilmetessä (erityisesti verrattuna edellä mainittuihin muihin alueellisiin järjestöihin)? Miten tämä varmistetaan, ja onko siitä olemassa konkreettista näyttöä?

2. Onko vuoden 2009 välitys- ja vuoropuheluvalmiuksien vahvistamista koskeva toimintaperiaate EUH:n mielestä pantu asianmukaisesti täytäntöön? Jos ei ole, mitkä ovat suurimmat puutteet?

3. Ovatko EUH ja Suomen ja Ruotsin hallitukset edelleen yhteydessä Euroopan rauhaninstituutin perustamisen johdosta? Onko jäsenvaltioiden keskuudessa kiinnostusta tällaisen välineen perustamiseen?

4. Onko suunnitteilla välitystoiminnasta vastaavan Euroopan unionin erityisedustajan viran perustaminen, kuten Herrberg ehdottaa?

Korkean edustajan, varapuheenjohtaja Catherine Ashtonin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(11. kesäkuuta 2014)

1. Korkea edustaja perusti vuonna 2011 Euroopan ulkosuhdehallintoon (EUH) välitystoiminnan EU-tukiryhmän (MST), jonka yhtenä päätehtävänä on tukea EU:n välittäjien toimintaa. Tukimuotoja on tällä hetkellä kolme: 1) MST:n henkilöstön ja EUH:n muun asiantuntemuksen nopea mobilisointi, 2) palvelusopimus välitystoimintaa harjoittavien kansalaisjärjestön yhteenliittymän kanssa niiden asiantuntemuksen käyttöön saamiseksi lyhytkestoisissa toimeksiannoissa EU:n välitysvalmiuksien tueksi, ja 3) vakautusvälineestä rahoitettava ja MST:n ja Euroopan komission ulkopolitiikan välineiden hallinnon lanseeraama ”European Resources for Mediation Support” -niminen järjestely (ERMES), joka mahdollistaa erimuotoisen välitystuen tarjoamisen kolmansille osapuolille (mm. lyhytkestoinen tekninen apu rauhanprosesseille ja niiden toimijoille, koulutus- ja valmennustuki, tutkimukset välittäjien työn ohjaamiseksi, kolmansien osapuolten välitystoimintaan osallistumiseen liittyvien kokousten edistäminen kansainvälisellä, kansallisella ja paikallisella tasolla sekä seminaarien ja työpajojen järjestäminen välitystoiminnasta saatujen kokemusten vaihtamiseksi).

2. Välitys- ja vuoropuheluvalmiuksia koskeva EU:n toimintaperiaate vuodelta 2009 on tärkein asiakirja, jonka ohjaamana EU pyrkii tehostamaan välitysvalmiuksiaan ja siihen liittyviä tukitoimintoja. Myös MST:n tehtävät ovat pitkälti linjassa toimintaperiaatteen III osassa esitettyjen toimenpiteiden kanssa.

3. Jäsenvaltioiden edustajien kanssa säännöllisesti järjestettävien tapaamisten ansiosta EUH on saanut ajantasaista tietoa Euroopan rauhaninstituutin perustamista ajavien kahdeksan valtion toiminnasta.

4. Toistaiseksi ei ole suunnitteilla perustaa välitystoimintaan keskittyvän EU:n erityisedustajan toimea. Välitystoiminta kuuluu kuitenkin monen tällä hetkellä erityisedustajana toimivan henkilön toimenkuvaan.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005205/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Follow-up on EU mediation and dialogue principles and capacities

In 2009, the Council adopted the Concept on Strengthening EU Mediation and Dialogue Capacities with the aim of a more coordinated and focused approach and of playing a more active international role in this area. Through the Concept, mediation and dialogue became officially recognised as policy tools for the Union. Consequently, a Conflict Prevention, Peacebuilding and Mediation (CPPM) division was also established in the newly founded European External Action Service (EEAS).

Fulfilling the role of mediator would require more support than is presently available (Herrberg, 2012, ISIS Europe). This has been remedied by, *inter alia*, training for EU Special Representatives (EUSRs)and EEAS delegations as well as projects financed by the rapid-reaction mechanism (2001-2006) and the Instrument for Stability (from 2007 onwards). Considerable lobbying by the peace-building NGOs led to Parliament's decision for a pilot project of EUR 600 000 to enhance the capacity of the CPPM division, with a view to setting up a more permanent mediation cell. In 2010 the governments of Finland and Sweden also suggested setting up a European Institute for Peace.

At the same time, other regional organisations have also set up their mediation structures, and may arguably be more prepared to take up mediation and dialogue tasks than the EU. These organisations include the African Union, the League of Arab States, the OAS, IGAD, Ecowas, ASEAN, the OSCE, Caricom, CSTO, CICA, the Council of Europe, NATO, the PIF and the OIC.

1. Is the EU equipped and flexible enough to send mediators, in case an urgent need emerges (in particular compared to the other regional organisations mentioned)? How is this ensured, and what concrete evidence is there to this effect?

2. Does the EEAS consider the 2009 Concept on Mediation and Dialogue to be fully implemented? If not, what are the main shortcomings?

3. Is there any communication still taking place between the EEAS and the governments of Finland and Sweden with regard to setting up a European Institute for Peace? What is the interest for such an instrument among Member States?

4. Are there any plans in place to create a post for an EUSR for Mediation as suggested by Herrberg?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2014)

1. The HR created in 2011 in the EEAS a dedicated EU Mediation Support Team (MST) with one of its core tasks being the provision of operational support to EU mediation actors. There are currently three modalities for this: 1) rapid deployment of MST staff and other in-house expertise, 2) a service contract with a consortium of mediation NGOs to gain access to their expertise for short-term assignments to enhance EU mediation capacities, and 3) the 'European Resources for Mediation Support' (ERMES), a facility, funded by the Instrument for Stability, launched by the MST and the European Commission's Service for Foreign Policy Instruments, to enable the provision of various forms of mediation support to third parties (including, inter alia, provision of short-term technical assistance to peace processes and actors; training and coaching support; production of research papers to guide mediation actors; facilitation of meetings linked to third-party engagement in mediation, at international, national and local levels; and organisation of seminars and workshops with the aim of exchanging experience and lessons learnt on mediation).

2. The 2009 Concept on Mediation and Dialogue is the key framework document for EU efforts to enhance the EU mediation and mediation support capacities. The tasks of the MST also correspond to a large extent to the measures outlined in section III of the concept.

3. Through regular meetings with representatives of EU Member States, the EEAS has been regularly updated on the efforts of the eight founding states to set up a European Institute of Peace.

4. There are currently no plans to create a post for an EUSR on mediation. However, please note that many current EUSRs do have mediation as part of their mandates.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-005206/14
komissiolle
Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE)
(17. huhtikuuta 2014)

Aihe: Syyrialle myönnettyjen avustusvarojen huono hallinnointi avun koordinoinnista vastaavassa yksikössä

EU on myöntänyt 3 500 000 euroa Gaziantepissa Turkissa toimivan Syyrian opposition ylläpitämän avun koordinoinnista vastaavan yksikön (ACU) toimintaedellytysten kehittämiseen ja paikallishallinnon rakenteisiin. Tämä tuki on myönnetty osana humanitaarisen avun ja pelastuspalveluasioiden pääosaston (ECHO) toimia, ja sen avulla pyritään saavuttamaan humanitaariselle interventiolle asetetut tavoitteet ([1]).

BBC News Middle East raportoi 9. tammikuuta 2014 ACU:n entisen henkilöstön väitteistä, joiden mukaan Syyrialle myönnettyjä avustusvaroja hallinnoidaan kaoottisella tavalla. Entisen henkilöstön mukaan varojen riittämätön seuranta ACU:ssa on johtanut miljoonien eurojen katoamiseen.

Ensimmäisenä toimintavuotenaan ACU vastaanotti 47 miljoonaa Yhdysvaltojen dollaria lahjoituksina, ja vuoden 2012 loppuun mennessä 34 miljoonaa dollaria oli jo käytetty toimiin Syyriassa. Monissa tapauksissa varojen käytöstä ei laadittu asianmukaisia tositteita. Kaikki lahjoittajat olivat kuitenkin tietoisia siitä, että tehokasta järjestelmää ei ollut otettu käyttöön ja varojen käyttöä ei seurattu asianmukaisesti. Väitteiden mukaan yksikön organisaation toimintaa haittasivat sisäiset kiistat, henkilöstölle maksettiin kohtuuttoman suurta palkkaa ja henkilöstö oli epäpätevää.

1. Miten komissio on seurannut ACU:lle myöntämänsä rahoituksen käyttöä?

2. Onko komissio jo ratkaissut vastuuvelvollisuuteen liittyvät ongelmat?

3. Voiko ACU komission mielestä jatkossakin saada rahoitusta opposition jäsenenä? Jos voi, minkä vuoksi?

Korkean edustajan, varapuheenjohtaja Catherine Ashtonin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(18. kesäkuuta 2014)

1. ACU ei ole saanut suoraa rahoitusta komissiolta. Komissio antaa EU:n yhteistyövälineiden puitteissa humanitaarista, kehitys- ja vakautusapua konfliktin koettelemalle siviiliväestölle Syyriassa. Komission humanitaarisen avun rahoitus kanavoidaan YK:n järjestöjen ja akkreditoitujen humanitaaristen järjestöjen kautta. Vakautta ja rauhaa edistävä välineen puitteissa voidaan tarjota hiljattain muodostetuille Syyrian oppositiota edustaville elimille muuta kuin humanitaarista apua, jotta niiden kautta saataisiin luotettavaa tietoa väestön tarpeista ja helpotettaisiin avun toimittamista Syyriassa asuville siviileille. Vaikka tässä yhteydessä pohdittiin suoran rahoituksen antamista ACU:lle, komissio ei ole tähän mennessä antanut ACU:lle toimintavalmiuksien kehittämistä varten rahallista apua. Komissio on sen sijaan tukenut ACU:a esimerkiksi tarjoamalla koulutusta ja asiantuntemusta sellaisten täytäntöönpanokumppaneiden kautta, joilla on kokemusta avun toimittamisesta vaikeissa kriisitilanteissa. Komissio pitää tiivisti yhteyttä täytäntöönpanokumppaneihinsa, jotka huolehtivat toiminnan säännöllisestä valvonnasta.

2. Edellä esitetystä seuraa, että ACU ei ole vastuuvelvollinen komissiolle. Aiemmin mainittuun toimintavalmiuksien kehittämiseen on myös kuulunut ACU:n vastuuvelvollisuuden vahvistaminen avunantajia ja -saajia kohtaan.

3. Ks. vastaus kysymykseen 1. Komissio kuulee tarvittaessa ACU:a ja/tai muita oppositiota edustavia elimiä, jotta komissio ja sen täytäntöönpanokumppanit voivat tehostaa kipeästi kaivatun EU:n avun antamista Syyrian siviiliväestölle.

([1]) Katso humanitaarinen täytäntöönpanosuunnitelma (HIP): Syyrian kriisi, 24.7.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005206/14
to the Commission
Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Assistance Coordination Unit mismanagement of Syrian aid money

As part of the DG ECHO response and expected results of humanitarian interventions ([1]), an EU contribution of EUR 3 500 000 was provided for to support the capacity development and local administrative structures of the Assistance Coordination Unit (ACU) of the Syrian opposition based in Gaziantep, Turkey.

On 9 January 2014 BBC News Middle East reported on former ACU staff member claims that Syrian aid money is being chaotically managed. According to the former staff members, inadequate monitoring by the ACU has led to millions of euro going unaccounted.

During its first year of operation the ACU received USD 47 million in donations, and by the end of 2012 USD 34 million had already been spent inside Syria. In several cases no proper documentation existed on how the funds had been spent, while all the donors knew was that no proper system was in place and that the matter was not being monitored appropriately. Allegedly, the organisation has also suffered from internal disputes, while paying inflated salaries and having incompetent staff.

1. How has the Commission monitored its funding to the ACU?

2. Have the problems of accountability been resolved on behalf of the Commission?

3. Does the Commission believe that the ACU can continue to receive funding as a member of the opposition? If so, why?

Answer given by HR/VP Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(18 June 2014)

1. The ACU has not received direct funding from the Commission. The Commission is providing humanitarian, development and stabilisation assistance, under a range of EU cooperation instruments, to the civilian population affected by conflict within Syria. The Commission's humanitarian funding is channelled through UN agencies and accredited humanitarian organisations. Non-humanitarian support has been foreseen under the Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace for the recently formed Syrian opposition structures to enable them provide reliable information about the needs of the population and facilitate the delivery of assistance to the population inside Syria. Although the possibility of limited direct funding to the ACU had been envisaged in this context, the situation is that all capacity-building support that the Commission has so far provided to the ACU has been delivered in-kind (e.g. provision of trainers or expertise), through implementing partners with experience in providing assistance in complex crisis situations. The Commission remains in close contact with the implementing partners who ensure regular monitoring of activities.

2. In line with answer above, ACU has no obligation to be accountable to the Commission. The earlier mentioned capacity-building activities have also focused on allowing ACU to strengthen its capacity to be accountable to beneficiaries and donors.

3. See answer question 1. The Commission consults with the ACU and/or other opposition structures whenever useful in helping the Commission and its implementing partners to provide more effectively the much needed EU assistance to the civilian population in Syria.

([1]) See Humanitarian Implementation Plan (HIP): Syria Crisis, 24.7.2013.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005207/14
aan de Commissie (Vicevoorzitter/Hoge Vertegenwoordiger)
Esther de Lange (PPE) en Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE)
(17 april 2014)

Betreft: VP/HR — Wetsontwerp inzake personen- en familierecht in Irak

Op 25 februari 2104 hechtte de Iraakse ministerraad zijn goedkeuring aan een wetsontwerp voor een nieuw personen- en familierecht. Dit wetsontwerp zal ernstige consequenties hebben voor de rechten van vrouwen en meisjes. Volgens de nieuwe wet kunnen meisjes vanaf negen jaar in het huwelijk treden. Op het wetsontwerp is kritiek geuit door strijders voor de mensenrechten, religieuze leiders en rechters in Irak.

Welke stappen denkt de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger jegens de Iraakse regering te ondernemen om te bereiken dat het wetsontwerp wordt ingetrokken?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(11 juni 2014)

De EU is zich terdege bewust van de discussies over het ontwerp van de wet-Jaafari inzake personen- en familierecht, en volgt de kwestie van nabij. Volgens de recentste informatie lijkt het echter erg onwaarschijnlijk dat het wetsontwerp door de Raad van Vertegenwoordigers zal worden goedgekeurd. Het wetsontwerp lijkt immers het initiatief van een kleine groep te zijn en zal hierdoor niet op de noodzakelijke meerderheid in het parlement kunnen rekenen.

De EU brengt haar bezorgdheid over de mensenrechten steeds consequent ter sprake bij de Iraakse autoriteiten, zowel publiekelijk als via diplomatieke weg. Mensenrechten, met inbegrip van vrouwenrechten en genderkwesties, worden ook besproken in het subcomité voor Democratie en mensenrechten van de partnerschaps- en samenwerkingsovereenkomst tussen de EU en Irak (PSO). Tijdens de eerste samenkomst van dit subcomité, in november 2013, werden reeds specifieke punten van zorg inzake het Jaafari-wetsontwerp naar voren gebracht.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005207/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Esther de Lange (PPE) and Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Draft Personal Status Law in Iraq

On 25 February 2014 Iraq's Council of Ministers approved a new draft Personal Status Law. This draft law will have serious consequences for the rights of girls and women in Iraq. Under the provisions of the law girls are allowed to be married from the age of nine. The draft law has been criticised by Iraqi human rights activists, religious leaders and judges.

What action will the Vice-President/High Representative take vis-à-vis the Iraqi Government in order to ensure that this new draft law is withdrawn?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2014)

The EU is well aware of the reported debates around the proposed Jaafari draft law on Personal Status and follows the issue closely. However, according to the latest information, it looks highly unlikely that the bill will be approved by the Council of Representatives, since the initiative seems to be coming from a small group and will not get the necessary majority of votes in the parliament.

The EU consistently voices its concerns on human rights to the Iraqi authorities, both publicly and through diplomatic channels. Human rights, including Women's rights and gender issues are also discussed in the context of the sub-committee on Democracy and Human Rights of the EU-Iraq Partnership and Cooperation Agreement (PCA), the first meeting of which, in November 2013, raised specific concerns on the Jaafari draft law.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005208/14
alla Commissione
Carlo Fidanza (PPE)
(17 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Tessera del tifoso e articolo 9

Il 14 agosto 2009, una direttiva del ministro dell'Interno italiano ha istituito la Tessera del tifoso, uno strumento di fidelizzazione imposto alle società di calcio italiane, per permettere alle autorità competenti verifiche preventive e non, al fine di identificare i tifosi di una squadra calcistica o della Nazionale di calcio italiana, con particolare riguardo ai tifosi in trasferta.

Questo provvedimento ha portato molteplici svantaggi di ordine pratico ai tifosi e ha causato un progressivo svuotamento degli stadi, avendo reso difficoltoso l'accesso ai tifosi.

La Tessera non è sottoscrivibile dai condannati per reati da stadio (anche con sentenza non definitiva) entro i 5 anni successivi alla condanna e da coloro che sono o sono stati sottoposti a divieto di accedere alle manifestazioni sportive — Daspo (anche in passato, prima del 14 agosto 2009) (articolo 9 legge 4 aprile 2007 n. 41 recante misure urgenti per la prevenzione e la repressione di fenomeni di violenza connessi a competizioni calcistiche). Quest'ultimo punto ha creato una doppia sanzione per chi è stato sottoposto a Daspo. Infatti, oltre a non avere accesso agli impianti sportivi per tutta la durata della pena, una volta scontata la stessa non è comunque possibile accedere allo stadio in quanto ex-sottoposto a Daspo.

Considerando ciò in aperto contrasto col diritto di non essere giudicato o punito due volte per lo stesso reato, stabilito dall'articolo 50 della Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea,

si interroga la Commissione per sapere se:

1. è al corrente della situazione;

2. è a conoscenza dell'esistenza di analoghe norme negli altri Stati membri.

Risposta di Androulla Vassiliou a nome della Commissione
(13 giugno 2014)

La Commissione constata che l'attrattiva delle partite di calcio dipende dalla capacità degli organizzatori e delle autorità pubbliche di assicurare un contesto sicuro e accogliente. La Commissione è a conoscenza del fatto che esistono sistemi nazionali basati su una tessera d'identificazione del tifoso, ma non dispone di un quadro della situazione in tutta l'UE poiché la questione sollevata dall'Onorevole deputato è di compentenza nazionale. L'articolo 51 della Carta dei diritti fondamentali si applica agli Stati membri soltanto allorché questi danno attuazione alla legislazione dell'Unione. Pertanto, l'articolo 50 della Carta non si applicherebbe alla situazione descritta che risulta essere pienamente disciplinata dalla normativa italiana.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005208/14
to the Commission
Carlo Fidanza (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Supporter ID cards and Article 9

On 14 August 2009, the Italian Ministry of the Interior introduced a compulsory system of supporter ID cards linked to specific Italian football clubs to enable the authorities to identify Italian football club or national team supporters, particularly when in transit, for the purposes of preventive and other controls.

In practice, this has proved highly disadvantageous for supporters, hampering their access to stadiums and resulting in an increasing number of empty seats.

Those with a record of misbehaviour in stadiums (even if it did not finally lead to sentencing) are ineligible for the ID card for five years following the offence. The same applies to those who are or have been banned from sports events (under 'Daspo' provisions) both before and after 14 August 2009 (Article 9 of Law No 41 of 4 April 2007 regarding urgent measures to prevent and penalise football violence), resulting in a dual penalty for those for those concerned, who, having been banned from sports stadiums for a specified period, are subsequently denied access as former 'Daspo' offenders.

Given that this is clearly at odds with the right not to be tried or punished twice for the same offence laid down in Article 50 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union:

1. Is the Commission aware of this situation?

2. Is it aware of the existence of similar arrangements in other Member States?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(13 June 2014)

The Commission notes that the attractiveness of football matches depends on the ability of organisers and public authorities to ensure a safe and welcoming environment. The Commission is aware that national systems based on supporter ID cards exist, but does not have an overview of the situation across the EU, as the subject matter raised by the Honourable Member is of national competence. By virtue of Article 51 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights its provisions are addressed to Member States only when they are implementing Union law. Therefore, Article 50 of the Charter would not be applicable to the situation described which appears to be wholly regulated by Italian law.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005210/14
aan de Commissie
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(17 april 2014)

Betreft: Ontmanteling/recyclage vliegtuigen

In de periode 2005-2007 liep er een project met Europese LIFE-steun in verband met de end-of-life van vliegtuigen (ontmanteling/recyclage) onder de naam PAMELA (Process for Advanced Management of End of Life of Aircraft). Het leidde tot een methodiek die het mogelijk zou moeten maken om tot 85% van het gewicht van een afgedankt vliegtuig in onderdelen te recupereren.

Vliegtuigen bevatten heel wat hoogwaardige materialen en in de praktijk blijkt nog al te vaak dat grote delen van vliegtuigen verschroot worden, waardoor er veel materialen gemengd blijven en ten gevolge daarvan gedowncycled worden, terwijl de ambitie van de Europese commissie toch is om hoogwaardige materialen een hoogwaardige herbestemming te geven.

Wat deze end-of-life van vliegtuigen betreft is er geen enkele bindende regelgeving tot op heden, ze vallen immers buiten de regelgeving voor voertuigen (richtlijn „end of life vehicles" 2000/53/EG) en bij de totstandkoming van de herziening van de richtlijn over afval van elektrische en elektronische toestellen is er bewust voor gekozen om voertuigen uit te sluiten.

1. Is de Commissie van oordeel dat — gezien de grote aantallen vliegtuigen die de komende jaren uit bedrijf genomen zullen worden en gezien de suboptimale recyclage-activiteiten vandaag — een wetgevend initiatief voor end-of -life van vliegtuigen wenselijk is?

2. Wat ziet de Commissie als belangrijkste maatregelen om ontmanteling en recycling af te dwingen en om de overgang te maken naar maximale upcycling van onderdelen?

3. Beschikt de Commissie over onderzoeksmateriaal in verband met end-of-life van vliegtuigen recenter dan de gegevens uit het PAMELA-project? Zo ja, welk?

4. Wat staat er eventueel in steigers bij de Commissie in verband met end-of-life van vliegtuigen?

Antwoord van de heer Potočnik namens de Commissie
(4 juni 2014)

Uit het Pamela-project ([1]) blijkt dat het mogelijk is tot 85 % van de vliegtuigonderdelen te recycleren, een aanzienlijke vooruitgang ten opzichte van de eerdere 60 %. Deze activiteiten zijn verricht naar aanleiding van het grote aantal vliegtuigen die de komende jaren uit bedrijf zullen worden genomen en de economische en milieugevolgen daarvan.

De Europese Commissie is dit onderzoekswerk blijven steunen in het kader van het gezamenlijk technologie-initiatief „Clean Sky" van het Zevende kaderprogramma, waar „Eco-Design Integrated Technology Demonstrator" ([2]) de belangrijkste industrie-ondernemingen en onderzoeksorganisaties samenbrengt om in te gaan op groen ontwerp en groene productie, onderhoud, uitdienstneming en recyclage van vliegtuigen. Het initiatief beoogt materiële vooruitgang te boeken bij de vermindering van de milieubelasting van de productie, het onderhoud en de verwijdering van vliegtuigen en aanverwante producten. Verschillende andere projecten die zich richten op specifieke aspecten van recyclageprocessen en het recycleren van composieten worden ondersteund door activiteit 7.1.1. „De vergroening van het luchtvervoer" van het KP7-werkprogramma.

In deze fase heeft de Commissie geen plannen om wetgeving of niet-wetgevingsinitiatieven voor te stellen over het recycleren van vliegtuigen. Naar verluidt ontwikkelt de luchtvaartindustrie onder auspiciën van de Internationale Luchtvaartassociatie (IATA) richtsnoeren over het recycleren van vliegtuigen in het licht van het Pamela-project. IATA erkent dat de industrie de kwestie actief moet aanpakken. Verder heeft AFRA (Aircraft Fleet Recycling Association), de vereniging voor het recycleren van luchtvloten, aangegeven dat de processen om 90 % van een vliegtuig te recycleren vanaf 2016 kunnen worden gestart.

([1]) LIFE05 ENV/F/000059.
([2]) http://cleansky.eu/content/page/eco-design.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005210/14
to the Commission
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Aircraft dismantling and recycling

Between 2005 and 2007, a demonstration project known as Pamela-Life (Process for Advanced Management of End-of-Life of Aircraft) was launched with EU support, the purpose being the dismantling and recycling of end-of-life aircraft, finally making it possible to recycle components totalling up to 85% of the weight of the decommissioned aircraft.

In practice, however, large sections of aircraft containing valuable materials are all too frequently scrapped, leaving many components mixed together and consequently downgraded. The Commission, on the other hand, is seeking to recycle valuable materials for a suitably worthwhile purpose.

However, no mandatory provisions have yet been introduced regarding end-of-life aircraft, which fall outside the scope of the relevant provisions for other vehicles (Directive 2000/53/EC on end-of-life vehicles). At the same time, vehicles are deliberately excluded from the amended directive on waste electrical and electronic equipment.

1. Does the Commission consider that, in view of the large number of aircraft to be decommissioned in the coming years and the less-than-optimal current recycling practices, it is necessary to introduce a legislative initiative for end-of-life aircraft?

2. What does the Commission regard as the most important measures to ensure the dismantling and recycling of aircraft while ensuring the optimum upgrading of recycled components?

3. Does the Commission have any research findings more up to date than those of the Pamela project regarding end-of-life aircraft? If so, what are these findings?

4. What other end-of-life aircraft initiatives does the Commission have in the pipeline?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(4 June 2014)

The Pamela project ([1]) demonstrated the possibility of recycling up to 85% of plane components, a significant advance on the earlier rate of 60%. These activities were carried out in response to the high number of planes expected to be retired in the following years and its environmental and economic impact.

The European Commission has continued to support this research work under Framework Programme 7 in the Clean Sky Joint Technology Initiative, where Eco-Design Integrated Technology Demonstrator ([2]) brings together the main industrial companies and research organisations to address green design and production, maintenance, withdrawal, and recycling of aircraft. It aims to make substantial progress in reducing the environmental impact of the manufacture, maintenance and disposal of aircraft and related products. Several other projects addressing specific aspects of recycling processes and recycling of composites are being supported under FP7 Work Programme Activity 7.1.1 'The greening of air transport'.

The Commission does not have plans to propose legislation, or non-legislative initiatives, on the recycling of planes at this stage. The aviation industry under the auspices of the International Air Transport Association (IATA) is reportedly developing guidelines on the recycling of planes, in the wake of the Pamela project. IATA has acknowledged that industry must actively tackle the issue. Also, the Aircraft Fleet Recycling Association (AFRA) claims that processes to recycle 90% of an aircraft could be implemented from 2016.

([1]) LIFE05 ENV/F/000059.
([2]) http://cleansky.eu/content/page/eco-design

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005211/14
aan de Commissie
Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)
(17 april 2014)

Betreft: Standaardisering attributen elektrische producten

Vanaf 1 september 2014 worden producenten in lijn met de Verordening (EU) nr 666/2013 verplicht zich aan een aantal minimumnormen te houden over het verbruik, de kracht en levensduur van stofzuigers. Als parlementslid voor Groen onderschrijf ik deze richtlijn. Niet alle onderdelen van een stofzuiger hebben echter dezelfde levensduur. Voor veel toestellen zijn geen vervangstukken te vinden, waardoor consumenten verplicht worden een nieuw toestel te kopen als één onderdeel stuk gaat.

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van deze problematiek?

2. Acht de Commissie het mogelijk om regelgeving betreffende vervangstukken bij stofzuigers en meer algemeen bij andere elektrische toestellen uit te werken?

Antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie
(11 juni 2014)

1. Uit de voorbereidende studie voor de verordening inzake het ecologisch ontwerp van stofzuigers is gebleken dat een aanzienlijk aandeel van alle stofzuigers reeds moest worden hersteld tijdens de eerste zes jaar na hun ingebruikstelling ([1]). De belangrijkste onderdelen die aanleiding gaven tot herstellingen waren een gescheurde/afgebroken zuigslang, problemen met het zuigmechanisme, de motor, een gebroken behuizing en de kabel. Uit de studie bleek echter niet dat het onmogelijk zou zijn om deze onderdelen te vervangen.

2. Om het vroegtijdig falen van de slang en de motor aan te pakken, heeft de Commissie duurzaamheidsvoorschriften in de verordening opgenomen. Daarnaast schrijft de verordening voor dat fabrikanten aan beroepsbeoefenaren informatie dienen te verstrekken over de niet-destructieve demontage van stofzuigers in verband met onderhoudsdoeleinden, met name wat betreft de slang, het zuigmechanisme, de motor, de behuizing en de kabel. Uit voorbereidende studies inzake ecologisch ontwerp voor andere producten is geen aanzienlijk vroegtijdig falen van onderdelen gebleken. Indien uit een toekomstige voorbereidende studie blijkt dat dit een belangrijk probleem vormt, zal de Commissie nagaan wat de beste methode is om dit aan te pakken.

([1]) https://circabc.europa.eu/sd/a/bf75c8fa-4a82-413e-bba1-c0423a2de0c7/Vacuum%20cleaners.pdf, blz. 30

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005211/14
to the Commission
Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Standardisation of electrical components

From 1 September 2014, manufacturers will be required to comply with certain minimum standards regarding the consumption, performance and durability of vacuum cleaners in accordance with Commission Regulation (EU) No 666/2013. As a Green Party MEP, I subscribe to this directive. However not all vacuum cleaner components last for the same amount of time and it is often impossible to replace them, forcing consumers to purchase a new vacuum cleaner if a single component fails.

1. Is the Commission aware of this problem?

2. Does the Commission consider it possible to draw up provisions concerning replacement parts for vacuum cleaners and, more generally, other electrical devices?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2014)

1. The preparatory study for the ecodesign regulation on vacuum cleaners showed that a significant share of vacuum cleaners required repair already during the first six years of use ([1]). The main parts responsible for this were found to be: split/broken hose, suction, motor, broken casing and power cable. However, the study did not give an indication that it would not be possible to replace them.

2. The Commission addressed the early failure of the hose and the motor through durability requirements in the regulation. In addition, the regulation requires information to be made available to professionals for non-destructive disassembly for maintenance purposes, in particular in relation to the hose, suction inlet, motor, casing and cable. Ecodesign preparatory studies for other products have not found a significant early failure of components. In case a future preparatory study indicates that this issue is significant, the Commission will consider what the best way could be to address this.

([1]) https://circabc.europa.eu/sd/a/bf75c8fa-4a82-413e-bba1-c0423a2de0c7/Vacuum%20cleaners.pdf p.30.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005212/14
do Komisji
Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE)
(17 kwietnia 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Duńskie przepisy emerytalne

Na mocy duńskich przepisów emerytalnych prawo do świadczeń emerytalnych jest przyznawane na podstawie liczby lat, przez które dana osoba stale przebywała w Danii. Jeśli osoba nie mieszkała w Danii przez określoną liczbę lat wymaganych w Danii do otrzymania emerytury podstawowej, wówczas wypłacana jest jej jedynie emerytura w ograniczonej wysokości, tak zwana emerytura cząstkowa „brokpension".

Czy według Komisji opisane powyżej zasady naliczania emerytury są zgodne z prawem UE, a w szczególności z rozporządzeniem (EWG) nr 1408/71 w sprawie stosowania systemów zabezpieczenia społecznego do pracowników najemnych i ich rodzin przemieszczających się we Wspólnocie oraz z rozporządzeniem (WE) nr 883/2004 w sprawie koordynacji systemów zabezpieczenia społecznego?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza László Andora w imieniu Komisji
(4 czerwca 2014 r.)

Unijne przepisy w zakresie zabezpieczenia społecznego ([1]) zapewniają koordynację, a nie harmonizację systemów zabezpieczenia społecznego państw członkowskich. W związku z powyższym nie ogranicza to uprawnień państw członkowskich do organizowania własnych systemów zabezpieczenia społecznego. Jednak w ramach wykonywania tego uprawnienia państwa członkowskie muszą przestrzegać prawa UE, które ustanawia zasady mające na celu zagwarantowanie, że stosowanie prawodawstwa państw członkowskich przestrzega podstawowych zasad równego traktowania oraz niedyskryminacji.

Władze duńskie mają zatem swobodę w zakresie organizacji własnego systemu emerytalnego pod warunkiem, że będą one przestrzegać prawa UE, a w szczególności zasady równego traktowania i niedyskryminacji.

([1]) Rozporządzenie (WE) nr 883/2004 w sprawie koordynacji systemów zabezpieczenia społecznego oraz rozporządzenie (WE) nr 987/2009 dotyczące wykonywania rozporządzenia (WE) nr 883/2004 w sprawie koordynacji systemów zabezpieczenia społecznego.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005212/14
to the Commission
Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Danish pension rules

Under Danish pension rules, entitlement to pension payments is granted on the basis of the number of years that a person has permanently resided in Denmark. If a person has not lived in Denmark for the specified number of years that are required to obtain a basic Danish pension, then that person will receive only a partial pension known as the 'brøkpension'.

In the Commission's view, are these rules on calculating pension entitlements consistent with EC law, in particular with Regulation (EEC) No 1408/71 on the application of social security schemes to employed persons and their families moving within the Community and with Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 on the coordination of social security systems?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(4 June 2014)

EC law in the field of social security ([1]) provides for the coordination and not the harmonisation of the Member States' social security schemes. Hence, it does not limit the Member States' power to organise their own social security schemes. However, when exercising that power, the Member States must comply with EC law, which lays down rules to ensure that the application of the Member States' legislation respects the basic principles of equality of treatment and non-discrimination.

The Danish authorities are therefore free to organise their own pension system, provided they respect EC law, and in particular the principles of equality of treatment and non-discrimination.

([1]) Regulation (EC) n. 883/2004 on the coordination of social security systems and Regulation (EC) 987/2009 laying down the procedure for implementing Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 on the coordination of social security systems.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005213/14
do Komisji
Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE)
(17 kwietnia 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Interpretacja dyrektywy o delegowaniu pracowników – wynagrodzenie za nadgodziny

Dyrektywa 96/71/WE Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady z dnia 16 grudnia 1996 r. stanowi, że do pracowników delegowanych w ramach transgranicznego świadczenia usług znajdują zastosowanie minimalne warunki pracy i zatrudnienia obowiązujące w państwie przyjmującym pod warunkiem, że są one dla nich bardziej korzystne niż warunki w państwie pochodzenia.

Niestety warunek określony w art. 3 ust. 1 lit. c) „minimalne stawki płacy, wraz ze stawką za nadgodziny" powoduje problemy interpretacyjne wynikające z rożnych systemów rozliczeń za nadgodziny w państwach członkowskich. Różnice dotyczą nie tylko tygodniowego czasu pracy (np. 35 godzin we Francji i 40 w Polsce), ale także wysokości wynagrodzenia za te nadgodziny, które często liczone są procentowo (np. odpowiednio we Francji 10 %, 25 % i 50 %, co uzależnione jest od liczby godzin ponad wymiar, od wielkości przedsiębiorstwa, a 50 % i 100 % w Polsce, co zależy od rodzaju pracy w godzinach nadliczbowych czy też przekroczenia tygodniowej normy czasu pracy). Dodatkowo porównanie tylko udziału procentowego dla określenia bardziej korzystnych warunków może nie wystarczyć ze względu na spore różnice w stawkach minimalnych za wynagrodzenie.

W świetle powyższego przykładu trudno jest ocenić w sposób obiektywny, który z systemów będzie dla danego pracownika bardziej korzystny, trudno jest bowiem znaleźć wspólny punkt odniesienia dla porównań.

Zgodnie z którym systemem rekompensaty za nadgodziny nadliczbowe należałoby według Komisji Europejskiej rozliczyć czas pracy pracownika delegowanego? Czy według Komisji w tej sytuacji należałoby stosować prawo jednego kraju i jeśli tak, to którego, mając na uwadze, że zastosowanie różnych systemów do rozliczenia czasu pracy mogłoby spowodować nadmierną komplikację umów o pracę.

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza László Andora w imieniu Komisji
(5 czerwca 2014 r.)

Dyrektywa 96/71/WE ([1]) precyzuje stosowane ustawodawstwo krajowe, w ramach którego należy określić minimalne stawki płacy, w tym stawki za nadgodziny, w sytuacji delegowania. Artykuł 3 wyraźnie stanowi, że pojęcie minimalnej stawki płacy jest zdefiniowane przez prawo krajowe lub przez praktykę państwa członkowskiego, na którego terytorium pracownik odbywa delegacje, tj. przyjmującego państwa członkowskiego. Interpretacja ta znajduje potwierdzenie w orzecznictwie Trybunału Sprawiedliwości Unii Europejskiej ([2]).

Komisja jest zdania, że system zapewniający pracownikowi najwyższe wynagrodzenie za jednostkę czasu należy uznać za najkorzystniejszy dla niego lub dla niej, zgodnie z art. 3 ust. 7 tiret pierwsze dyrektywy.

Komisja nie uważa, by stosowanie jednego systemu do obliczania wynagrodzenia za pracę w godzinach nadliczbowych w państwie prowadzenia przedsiębiorstwa oraz innego systemu w przyjmującym państwie członkowskim stanowiło przeszkodę nie do pokonania dla przedsiębiorstw lub pracowników delegowanych.

Informacje na temat obowiązujących warunków pracy i zatrudnienia dotyczących pracowników delegowanych, w tym zasad związanych ze stawkami za nadgodziny w poszczególnych państwach członkowskich można znaleźć na stronie internetowej Komisji ([3]).

([1]) Dyrektywa 96/71/WE Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady z dnia 16 grudnia 1996 r. dotycząca delegowania pracowników w ramach świadczenia usług, Dz.U. L 18 z 21.1.1997.
([2]) Na przykład wyrok z dnia 7 listopada 2013 r. w sprawie C-522/12 Isbir przeciwko DB Services GmbH, pkt 36.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=726&langId=en

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005213/14
to the Commission
Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE)
(17 April 2014)

Subject: Interpretation of the Posted Workers Directive

Directive 96/71/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 1996 stipulates that the minimum working and employment conditions in force in the host country are applicable in respect of workers posted in the framework of the transnational provision of services, provided that these conditions are more favourable that those in the country of origin.

Unfortunately, the condition set out in Article 3(1)(c) 'the minimum rates of pay, including overtime rates' is creating problems of interpretation on account of the fact that differences exist among the Member States in terms of the way that overtime rates are calculated. The differences concern not only weekly working times (e.g. 35 hours in France and 40 hours in Poland), but also the level of payment for overtime, which is often calculated in percentage terms (e.g. 10%, 25% or 50% in France, depending on the number of additional hours worked and the size of the company, and 50% or 100% in Poland, depending on the type of work carried out during the additional hours and on whether the weekly working time has been exceeded). Furthermore, using only a comparison of the percentages to determine which conditions are most favourable may be insufficient, given that there are many differences in minimum rates for pay.

In light of this example, it is hard to objectively assess which system would be most favourable for a particular worker as it is difficult to find a common point of reference for comparisons.

In the Commission's view, under what system should the overtime compensation of posted workers be calculated? Does the Commission feel that the laws of one country should apply in this situation, and if so, which country? It should be borne in mind that applying different systems could result in excessively complicated employment contracts.

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2014)

Directive 96/71/EC ([1]) clarifies under which country's law minimum rates of pay, including overtime rates, should be defined in a situation of posting. Article 3 expressly states that the concept of minimum rates of pay is defined by the national law and/or practice of the Member State to whose territory the worker is posted, i.e. the host Member State. This interpretation is confirmed by case law of the Court of Justice of the European Union ([2]).

It is the Commission's opinion that the system that would provide an employee with the highest remuneration per time unit should be considered the most favourable for him or her, in line with Article 3(7), first subparagraph of the directive.

The Commission does not consider that applying one system for calculating overtime compensation in the state of establishment and another system in the host Member State constitutes an insurmountable obstacle for undertakings or posted workers.

Information on applicable terms and conditions of employment for posted workers, including rules on overtime rates in the different Member States can be found on the Commission website ([3]).

([1]) Directive 96/71/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16.12.1996 concerning the posting of workers in the framework of the provision of services, OJ L 18, 21.1.1997.
([2]) For instance judgment of 7 November 2013, Case C-522/12, Isbir v DB Services GmbH, para. 36.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=726&langId=en

(English version)

Question for written answer P-005214/14
to the Commission
Gerard Batten (EFD)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Markets in Financial Instruments Directive

1. Does the Commission believe that the requirements on cost disclosure by investment firms under Article 24(3)(d) of the Markets in Financial Instruments Directive (MiFID) can be met for all instruments, especially since the aggregated inputs may not all be discoverable and the cumulative effect on return of the investment may be unknown?

2. Does the Commission believe that the introduction of phrasing via the trialogue process and without debate, consultation, or impact analysis is the best method of introducing such important concepts into law, especially since they could confuse consumers without significant educational follow-up?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(2 June 2014)

One of the key elements in the negotiations through the ordinary legislative procedure on the review of the Markets in Financial Instruments Directive (MiFID II) ([1]), and on the proposal for a regulation on key information documents for Packaged Retail Investment Products (PRIPs) ([2]), has been the importance of costs for investors as well as the difficulties experienced by them in understanding the overall costs of their investments and/or the actual impact on returns. The Commission has expressed its support to the outcome of the negotiations in the European Parliament and the Council, in particular to the amendments aiming at improving information on costs and charges, including the ones related to the provision of information on the cumulative effect of costs and charges on the return of the investment to which the Honourable Member refers.

The MiFID II text empowers the Commission to adopt delegated acts specifying the details about content and format of information in relation to costs and charges. The modalities to provide clear and comprehensible information on the cumulative effect of costs on return and the methodology for the calculation of costs would be further detailed in these delegated acts.

([1]) Proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on markets in financial instruments repealing Directive 2004/39/EC, 2011/0298(COD), adopted by the European Parliament, first reading, on 15.4.2014.

([2]) Proposal for a regulation (EU) of the European Parliament and of the Council on key information documents for Packaged Retail and Insurance based Investment Products (PRIIPs), 2012/0169(COD), adopted by the European Parliament, first reading, on 15.4.2014.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005219/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(23 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Νέος νόμος για τη χρηματοδότηση των ελληνικών κομμάτων

Από τον ισολογισμό του κόμματος της Νέας Δημοκρατίας του έτους 2013 προκύπτει ότι το κόμμα αυτό — που έχει ως πρόεδρο τον νυν πρωθυπουργό της Ελλάδος κ. Σαμαρά — έλαβε το 2013 νέα δάνεια ύψους 14 εκατ. ευρώ, με αποτέλεσμα τα συνολικά του δάνεια να φθάσουν τα 160 εκ. ευρώ. Το 2014 είναι έτος εκλογών για το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, από τις οποίες θα κριθεί — μεταξύ άλλων — και η επόμενη σύνθεση της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Είναι αλήθεια ότι — όπως ανεγράφη στον ελληνικό Τύπο —, η τρόικα ζήτησε νέο νόμο για τη χρηματοδότηση των ελληνικών κομμάτων αμέσως μετά τις ευρωεκλογές, κάτι που έχει ως πρακτική συνέπεια τη μη εκταμίευση, από τις αρχές του έτους μέχρι σήμερα, οποιουδήποτε ποσού προς τα κόμματα της αντιπολίτευσης, χωρίς, ωστόσο, να επηρεάζονται τα δύο κυβερνητικά κόμματα, αφού οι σχετικές χρηματοδοτήσεις των κυβερνητικών κομμάτων κατάσχονται εκ των προτέρων από τις δανειοδότριες τράπεζες; Τα κόμματα αυτά όμως χρηματοδοτούνταν (τουλάχιστον η Νέα Δημοκρατία), μέχρι και το 2013 με δάνεια από τις κρατικοποιημένες σε μεγάλο βαθμό τράπεζες, τα οποία δεν πρόκειται ποτέ να επιστρέψουν. Τα δάνεια δίδονται παρά τη ρητή διαβεβαίωση της Επιτροπής ότι κάτι τέτοιο δεν επρόκειτο να συμβεί.

Θεωρεί η Επιτροπή ότι τηρούνται οι θεμελιώδεις δημοκρατικοί κανόνες στις ευρωεκλογές, όταν έντεχνα δημιουργείται καθεστώς προκλητικής και απόλυτης ανισότητας οικονομικών πόρων μεταξύ των πολιτικών δυνάμεων που συμμετέχουν, προς όφελος των κυβερνητικών κομμάτων;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(23 Ιουνίου 2014)

Για την καταπολέμηση της διαφθοράς στην Ελλάδα έχει αναληφθεί αποφασιστική δράση μέσω του προγράμματος οικονομικής προσαρμογής. Ένας από τους τρόπους αντιμετώπισης της διαφθοράς είναι η βελτίωση του νομικού πλαισίου. Στο πλαίσιο αυτό, πρέπει να ληφθούν υπόψη οι διάφορες αδυναμίες του ελληνικού συστήματος οι οποίες περιγράφονται στις εκθέσεις αξιολόγησης που εκπονήθηκαν από την ομάδα κρατών κατά της διαφθοράς (GRECO) ([1]). Η έκθεση GRECO επισημαίνει ένα πρόβλημα όσον αφορά τα δάνεια προς τα πολιτικά κόμματα και διατυπώνει σύσταση.

Μία από τις ενέργειες που έχουν συμφωνηθεί με τις ελληνικές αρχές στην 4η αναθεώρηση του προγράμματος είναι η θέσπιση νομοθεσίας για τη χρηματοδότηση των πολιτικών κομμάτων. Το μέτρο αυτό έχει συμπεριληφθεί στο τμήμα 2.5.2 του επικαιροποιημένου Μνημονίου Συνεννόησης για τους ειδικούς όρους της οικονομικής πολιτικής ([2]) και η συμμόρφωση με το μέτρο αυτό θα αξιολογηθεί στο πλαίσιο του προγράμματος.

([1]) http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/greco/default_en.asp
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/assistance_eu_ms/greek_loan_facility/index_el.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005219/14
to the Commission
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: New law on the funding of Greek political parties

New Democracy's balance sheets for 2013 shows that in 2013 this party — whose President is the current Prime Minister of Greece, Mr Samaras — received new loans of EUR 14 million; this means that it now has loans totalling EUR 160 million. 2014 is an election year for the European Parliament, and these elections will determine — among other things — the composition of the next Commission.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

Is there any truth in Greek press reports that the Troika is demanding a new law on the funding of Greek political parties immediately after the European elections? In practice, this will mean that the opposition parties will have received no funding since the beginning of the year; however, it will not affect the two government parties, since the funds for the governing parties are seized in advance by the lending banks These parties (at least New Democracy) were, however, being financed until 2013 with loans from the largely nationalised banks, loans which they will never repay. The loans were issued despite the specific assurances by the Commission that this would not happen.

Does the Commission consider that the fundamental rules of democracy are being respected in the European elections, since a regime of provocative and absolute inequality of economic resources between the political forces involved in the elections is skilfully being created for the benefit of the government parties?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(23 June 2014)

Determined action has been engaged to fight corruption in Greece through the economic adjustment programme. One of the ways to tackle corruption is to improve the legal framework. In doing so, one needs to take into account the various weaknesses of the Greek system described in the evaluation reports conducted by the Group of States against Corruption (GRECO) ([1]). The GRECO report points out an issue with loans to political parties, and makes a recommendation.

One of the actions agreed with the Greek authorities in the 4th review of the programme is the adoption of legislation on the funding of political parties. This measure has been included in Section 2.5.2 of the updated Memorandum of Understanding of specific economic policy conditionality ([2]) and compliance with this measure will be assessed in the programme context.

([1]) http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/greco/default_en.asp
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/assistance_eu_ms/greek_loan_facility/index_en.htm

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005220/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(23 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Συμβατότητα του διαγωνισμού ΤΑΙΠΕΔ για το Ελληνικό

Στο διαγωνισμό του Ελληνικού Ταμείου Αξιοποίησης Δημόσιας Περιουσίας (ΤΑΙΠΕΔ), για το οικόπεδο του τέως αεροδρομίου του Ελληνικού, για τη διενέργεια του οποίου η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή έχει προνομιακή πληροφόρηση, λόγω της παρουσίας παρατηρητών τους οποίους έχει ορίσει στο ΔΣ του ΤΑΙΠΕΔ, ο τελικός επενδυτής θα υλοποιήσει έργα υποδομής ύψους 1,25 δισ. ευρώ, τα οποία θεωρεί μάλιστα μέρος του τελικού τιμήματος, δηλαδή υποχρεώσεις του δημοσίου. Επίσης, προϋπόθεση για την καταβολή του τιμήματος είναι, με βάση την σχετική ανακοίνωση της ΛΑΜΔΑ, η παραχώρηση άδειας καζίνο στο ακίνητο.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Υπάγεται ο σχετικός διαγωνισμός που έγινε στο ευρωπαϊκό δίκαιο, και ειδικότερα στις σχετικές οδηγίες που αφορούν έργα υποδομής και συμβάσεις παραχώρησης; Αν όχι, με ποιο σκεπτικό εξαιρείται;

Σε κάθε περίπτωση, είναι αποδεκτό, με βάση τις γενικές αρχές του ευρωπαϊκού δικαίου, να γίνονται δεκτές προσφορές υπό αίρεση;

Η παραχώρηση άδειας καζίνο ήταν γνωστή στους αρχικούς όρους του διαγωνισμού με βάση τους οποίους διαμορφώθηκε το αρχικό επενδυτικό ενδιαφέρον;

Η παραχώρηση άδειας καζίνο ήταν γνωστή σε όσους προεπελέγησαν να συμμετάσχουν στον σχετικό διαγωνισμό;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(20 Ιουνίου 2014)

Η υλοποίηση της διαδικασίας ιδιωτικοποιήσεων αποτελεί αποκλειστική αρμοδιότητα των εθνικών αρχών, και εναπόκειται στις εθνικές αρχές να διασφαλίσουν τη συμμόρφωση με τη σχετική ενωσιακή και εθνική νομοθεσία.

Βάσει των διαθέσιμων πληροφοριών, η Επιτροπή δεν έχει υπόψη της τυχόν ανησυχίες σχετικά με την (ενδεχόμενη) εφαρμογή της νομοθεσίας της ΕΕ για τις δημόσιες συμβάσεις στην ιδιωτικοποίηση του οικοπέδου του Ελληνικού.

Η Επιτροπή δεν είναι ενήμερη σχετικά με τη συμπερίληψη και την παραχώρηση άδειας καζίνο στο πλαίσιο της διαδικασίας.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005220/14
to the Commission
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Compatibility with EC law of the HRADF call for tenders for the Ellinikon site

In the call for tenders held by the Hellenic Republic Asset Development Fund (HRADF) for the site of the former Hellinikon airport, which the Commission is very well informed about owing to the presence of the observers it has appointed to the Board of HRADF, the investor finally selected will carry out infrastructure projects worth EUR 1.25 billion, which it of course considers to be part of the final price, i.e. liabilities of the Greek State. Moreover, Lamda Development has also made the payment of the price conditional upon the granting of a casino licence for the property.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

Was this tender procedure held in accordance with EC law, in particular the directives concerning infrastructure projects and public procurement? If not, on what grounds was it exempted?

In any case, is it acceptable, in the light of the general principles of EC law, for conditional offers to be accepted?

Did the original terms of the tender procedure which originally generated investor interest include the granting of a casino licence?

Were the bidders who were shortlisted to take part in the call for tenders aware that a licence would be granted to run a casino?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2014)

The implementation of the privatisation process is the exclusive responsibility of the national authorities. And it is the responsibility of the national authorities to ensure the compliance with the relevant EU and National law.

Based on the available information, the Commission is not aware of any concerns relating to the application of EU public procurement law (if applicable) to the privatisation of Hellinikon site.

The Commission is not aware of the inclusion and granting of any casino license in the process.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005221/14
to the Commission
George Lyon (ALDE)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Coupling entitlement for Scotland

Last week, Agriculture Commissioner Dacian Cioloş announced that the Commission is set to block moves to allow Scotland to borrow some of the UK's coupling entitlement, that would have delivered a 13% coupling rate for Scottish agricultural support. Since the announcement, the Commission has met with the Scottish representative to rectify this situation.

1. Can the Commission release details of the meeting it had to discuss this issue with the Scottish and UK Government Ministers during the February Agricultural Council? Can the Commission confirm whether it gave formal agreement to the request from the Scottish Government to be able to borrow part of the UK entitlement to increase the regional Scottish coupling limit to 13% at that meeting?

2. Is there a possibility that the Commission will reverse its decision to rule out this possibility?

3. Are there any other ways that the request for an increased coupled rate for Scottish farmers could be met?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2014)

The competent national authorities have raised questions with the Commission on the correct implementation of certain provisions of Regulation (EU) No 1307/2013 ([1]) on direct payments. The Commission has provided advice, in particular on the correct implementation of Article 52 on voluntary coupled support in the light of Article 118 of Regulation (EU) No 1306/2013 ([2]). In this context, the Commission provides its opinion and advice to assist national authorities, who are responsible for the correct implementation of their obligations, on the understanding that in the event of a dispute involving Union law it is, under the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, ultimately for the European Court of Justice to provide a definitive interpretation of the applicable Union law.

Technical exchanges have provided further clarifications on possible options open to the competent national authorities under Articles 52 of Regulation (EU) No 1307/2013 and 118 of Regulation (EU) No 1306/2013. In particular, the UK has been advised that it has the option to take a centralised decision as regards coupled support, leaving it up to the regions to take their decisions as regards the other direct support schemes. The limit of 8% of the annual ceiling for coupled support would apply at the national level in this context. Commission services offer their continuing advice and cooperation to competent national authorities.

([1]) OJ L 347, 20.12.2013, p.608.
([2]) OJ L 347, 20.12.2013, p.549.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005222/14
to the Commission
Vicky Ford (ECR)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Crop contamination calls under Horizon 2020

Within calls related to contamination of crops and the food chain, the terms, 'mycotoxins', 'chemical hazards' and 'toxicology of chemical mixtures in food' are used. Several research institutes are carrying out research into acrylamide, which forms in food during high-temperature processing. It is not clear whether this research would be eligible for funding under sustainable food security (SFS) calls.

Can the Commission confirm that projects looking at crop contamination that are not based on the study of mycotoxins or the misapplication of chemicals are eligible under this call?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(10 June 2014)

The multifaceted Societal Challenge 2 in the third pillar of Horizon 2020 relies heavily upon the integration of interdisciplinary sciences and technologies to provide innovative solutions for food security, sustainable agriculture and marine sectors, and biobased products.

The Commission confirms that research on acrylamide was eligible for funding under the 2014 'Sustainable Food Security (SFS)' call, and specifically under topic SFS-12-2014 'Assessing the health risks of combined human exposure to multiple food-related toxic substances' ([1]). This call is now closed to submitted proposals which satisfied the criteria mentioned in the topic as well as the general requirements of Horizon 2020 calls, which include *inter alia* multidisciplinary cross-cutting approaches.

With regard to crop contamination outside the issue of contamination resulting from mycotoxins or the misapplication of chemicals, no calls are available for the moment that go beyond this approach. However, opportunities could arise in future calls as indicated in Council Decision 2013/743/EU establishing the Specific Programme implementing Horizon 2020 ([2]). In Annex I, Part III, Section 2.2.2: 'Healthy and Safe Food and Diets for All', it is mentioned that 'Chemical and microbial food and feed contamination, risks and exposures as well as allergens will be analysed, assessed, monitored, controlled and traced throughout the food, feed and drinking water supply chains from production and storage to processing, packaging, distribution, catering, and preparation at home'.

([1]) Horizon 2020 Work Programme 2014-2015 'Food security, sustainable agriculture and forestry, marine and maritime and inland water research and the bioeconomy': http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/wp/2014_2015/main/h2020-wp1415-food_en.pdf

([2]) Council Decision 2013/743/EU: http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/legal_basis/sp/h2020-sp_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005223/14
to the Commission
Vicky Ford (ECR)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Financial guidance for capital-intensive research institutes

During the negotiations for Horizon 2020, the Commission promised that it would provide additional financial guidance for capital-intensive research institutes, in order to help clarify which capital costs should be allocated as direct costs under Horizon 2020 grants.

Rothamsted in the East of England is the longest-standing agricultural research facility in the world and obviously has significant capital costs. It is important that organisations like this should have their costs covered when they are participating in an EU-funded programme.

Can the Commission please confirm in what way institutions of this nature can access such advice?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(28 May 2014)

Beneficiaries running 'large research infrastructure' can declare capitalised and operating costs of these infrastructures if they comply with the definition and conditions listed in Point D.4 of Article 6.2 of the Annotated Model Grant Agreement (in particular if the large research infrastructure has a total value of at least EUR 20 million ([1]) and if the value of the large research infrastructure represents at least 75% of the beneficiary's total fixed assets, at historical value). The Commission will assess *ex-ante* the methodology of the eligible beneficiaries that have requested to use the provisions for large infrastructure.

Further details are explained in the following documents accessible on the EU Research and Innovation Participant Portal ([2]):

— The guidance material for the large infrastructure costs is available as part of the Horizon 2020 Annotated Model Grant Agreements under Art. 6.2., option D.4 (page 70ff) ([3])

— The document describing the procedure for requesting the *ex-ante* assessment ([4])

([1]) Calculated as the sum of the historical asset values of the individual research infrastructures as they appear in the beneficiary's last closed balance sheet before the date on which the grant agreement is signed, or determined on the basis of the rental and leasing costs of the infrastructures.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/index.html
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/grants_manual/amga/h2020-amga_en.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/grants_manual/hi/large_infra/h2020-hi-large-infrastructures-ass_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005224/14
to the Commission
Vicky Ford (ECR)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Horizon 2020 grants for GM research

For the avoidance of any doubt, can the Commission please confirm that GM research is eligible for Horizon 2020 grants within the Food Security Societal Challenge?

Can the Commission confirm that it does not intend to exclude such research from any individual calls?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2014)

The multifaceted Societal Challenge 2 ([1]) in the third pillar of Horizon 2020 relies upon the integration of interdisciplinary sciences and technologies to provide innovative solutions for food security, sustainable agriculture and marine sectors, and biobased products.

In this respect the Commission confirms that GM research is eligible for Horizon 2020 funding under this challenge where all three major farming models are covered: sustainable conventional farming, organic farming, and GM biotechnological solutions. On the other hand bioeconomy research within the framework Programme does not concern itself directly with commercial GM cultivation or the promotion of GM crops in Europe. It is greatly concerned however with obtaining and using genetic information and biological knowledge through modern technologies that can optimise agricultural production. The overall objective at farm level is therefore to improve competitiveness by increasing yields, preserving soil fertility, protecting against disease and pests, and reducing overall environmental impact. In each case, studying and applying the generated genetic and biological information under the different farming models is crucial for understanding how this objective can be achieved.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/en/h2020-section/food-security-sustainable-agriculture-and-forestry-marine-maritime-and-inland-water

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005225/14
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin)
Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE) und Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE)
(23. April 2014)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Mangelhafter Mechanismus zum Schutz von Menschenrechtsverteidigern in Mexiko

Die Delegation der Europäischen Union und die Botschaften der Mitgliedstaaten in Mexiko haben im Jahr 2010 einen nationalen Plan zur Umsetzung von EU-Leitlinien zu Menschenrechtsverteidigern in dem Land angenommen. Seit diesem Jahr gibt es eine strategische Partnerschaft zwischen der Europäischen Union und Mexiko, zu der ein Menschenrechtsdialog auf hoher Ebene gehört. Im März fand im Brüssel der 4. Menschenrechtsdialog mit Erfolg statt. Eines der behandelten Themen war der Mechanismus zum Schutz von Menschenrechtsverteidigern und Journalisten.

Wegen der Gefahren, denen Menschenrechtsverteidiger und Journalisten in Mexiko ausgesetzt sind, wurde im Jahr 2012 ein Nationaler Mechanismus zu ihrem Schutz ins Leben gerufen. Zwar wurden Maßnahmen ergriffen, um die zufriedenstellende Umsetzung des Mechanismus zu gewährleisten, aber mexikanische und internationale Organisationen der Zivilgesellschaft haben mit Sorge festgestellt, dass der Mechanismus immer noch nicht effizient und wirksam funktioniert. Seit kurzem steckt der Mechanismus offenbar erneut in der Krise, da ein Drittel der Mitarbeiter die Einrichtung verlassen haben. Das Gremium, das die Zivilgesellschaft vertritt, hat ebenfalls entschieden, sich nicht weiter daran zu beteiligen, da die Bedingungen zur Behandlung von Fragen in Bezug auf den Schutz nicht mehr gegeben sind und weil der mexikanische Staat dem Mechanismus in besorgniserregender Weise zu wenig institutionelle und politische Unterstützung zukommen lässt. Dies hat zur Konsequenz, dass der Mechanismus nicht mehr die körperliche und psychologische Unversehrtheit aller Menschenrechtsverteidiger und Journalisten, die nach den jüngsten Entwicklungen in noch größerer Gefahr schweben, gewährleisten kann.

Angesichts der Beschlüsse des Parlaments vom Juni 2010 zur Unterstützung von Menschenrechtsverteidigern, der Leitlinien zu Menschenrechtsverteidigern, des strategischen Rahmens der EU für Menschenrechte und Demokratie und ihres Aktionsplans sowie im Sinne einer Weiterbehandlung des Menschenrechtsdialogs zwischen der EU und Mexiko wird die Kommission um die Beantwortung der folgenden Frage gebeten:

Wird der Europäische Auswärtige Dienst seine Besorgnis über die geschilderte Lage zum Ausdruck bringen oder andere Maßnahmen diesbezüglich ergreifen?

Antwort von Frau Ashton im Namen der Kommission
(18. Juni 2014)

Die EU und Mexiko sind sowohl auf bilateraler als auch auf multilateraler Ebene gemeinsame Verpflichtungen in Bezug auf den Schutz der Menschenrechte eingegangen, was sich in ihrer strategischen Partnerschaft von 2008 und ihrem gemeinsamen Durchführungsplan widerspiegelt. Durch letzteren wurde der verstärkte Menschenrechtsdialog eingeführt, der jährlich auf hoher Ebene (unter Beteiligung des Sonderbeauftragten der Europäischen Union für Menschenrechte und des mexikanischen Außenministers) stattfindet.

Aufklärungsarbeit und Vermittlungstätigkeiten zugunsten von Menschenrechtsverteidigern gehören für die EU seit langem zu den Prioritäten im Bereich Menschenrechte in Mexiko und finden daher im Rahmen der regulären Strukturen des Dialogs und der Zusammenarbeit statt.

Auf den beiden letzten Treffen des hochrangigen Menschenrechtsdialogs mit Mexiko hat die EU ihre Bedenken in Bezug auf das Funktionieren des mexikanischen Mechanismus zum Schutz von Menschenrechtsverteidigern geäußert. Außerdem hat die EU nach einem eingehenden Austausch sowohl mit der mexikanischen Regierung als auch mit der Zivilgesellschaft die jüngsten Zwischenfälle im Zusammenhang mit dem Mechanismus über die EU-Delegation aufmerksam verfolgt. Zudem hat die EU angeboten, Mexiko bei der wirksamen Anwendung des Mechanismus zu unterstützen.

Daneben gibt es derzeit eine Reihe EU-finanzierter Hilfsprojekte für Menschenrechtsverteidiger in Mexiko, unter anderem fünf Projekte im Rahmen der EIDHR, die speziell auf den Aufbau von Kapazitäten bei Menschenrechtsverteidigern und die Unterstützung von Schutzmaßnahmen für diese Gruppe ausgerichtet sind. Diese Projekte werden langfristig auch dem mexikanischen Schutzmechanismus zugutekommen. Die Unterstützung wird voraussichtlich im Rahmen der nächsten Aufforderung zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen, die in Kürze von der EU-Delegation veröffentlicht wird, fortgesetzt.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-005225/14
komissiolle (Varapuheenjohtajalle/Korkealle edustajalle)
Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE) ja Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE)
(23. huhtikuuta 2014)

Aihe: VP/HR – Ihmisoikeuksien puolustajien suojelemista koskevan mekanismin epäonnistuminen Meksikossa

EU:n edustusto ja jäsenvaltioiden suurlähetystöt Meksikossa hyväksyivät vuonna 2010 paikallisen suunnitelman panna täytäntöön EU:n suuntaviivat, jotka koskivat ihmisoikeuksien puolustajia Meksikossa. Kyseisestä vuodesta alkaen Meksikolla ja EU:lla on ollut voimassa strateginen kumppanuus, johon kuuluu korkean tason vuoropuhelu ihmisoikeuksista. Neljäs ihmisoikeusvuoropuhelu käytiin menestyksekkäästi Brysselissä maaliskuussa 2014. Tässä vuoropuhelussa yksi keskustelunaiheista oli ihmisoikeuksien puolustajien ja journalistien suojelemista koskeva mekanismi.

Ihmisoikeuksien puolustajiin ja journalisteihin kohdistuvia riskejä ajatellen Meksikossa perustettiin vuonna 2012 kansallinen mekanismi heidän suojelemisekseen. Vaikka monenlaisia toimia on toteutettu sen tyydyttävän toimivuuden takaamiseksi, meksikolaiset ja kansainväliset kansalaisjärjestöt ovat huolissaan siitä, että mekanismi ei vieläkään toimi tehokkaasti ja tuloksellisesti. Äskettäin uusi kriisi tuntuu vaikuttaneen mekanismiin, sillä sen kerrotaan menettäneen kolmanneksen työntekijöistään. Lisäksi kansalaisyhteiskuntaa edustava elin on päättänyt lähteä mekanismista sen vuoksi, että olosuhteet suojelua koskevien asioiden käsittelemiseksi ovat muuttuneet ja että Meksikon valtio on huolestuttavalla tavalla vetänyt institutionaalisen ja poliittisen tukensa mekanismilta. Näin ollen mekanismi ei voi taata kaikkien ihmisoikeuksien puolustajien ja journalistien fyysistä ja psyykkistä koskemattomuutta, ja he ovat joutuneet entistäkin vaarallisempaan tilanteeseen viimeaikaisten tapahtumien johdosta.

Ottaen huomioon parlamentin kesäkuussa 2010 tekemät päätökset ihmisoikeuksien puolustajien hyväksi samoin kuin ihmisoikeuksien puolustajia koskevat suuntaviivat, ihmisoikeuksia ja demokratiaa koskevan EU:n strategiakehyksen ja sen toimintasuunnitelman sekä viimeisimmän EU:n ja Meksikon välisen ihmisoikeusvuoropuhelun jatkotoimet: aikooko Euroopan ulkosuhdehallinto ilmaista huolestuneisuutensa tai ryhtyä muihin toimiin tämän tilanteen suhteen?

Korkean edustajan, varapuheenjohtaja Catherine Ashtonin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(18. kesäkuuta 2014)

EU ja Meksiko ovat kumpikin sitoutuneet suojelemaan ihmisoikeuksia sekä kahdenvälisellä että monenvälisellä tasolla. Tämä heijastuu EU:n ja Meksikon vuonna 2008 perustetussa strategisessa kumppanuudessa ja siihen kuuluvassa yhteisessä toimintasuunnitelmassa, jolla aloitettiin tehostettu ihmisoikeuskysymyksiä koskeva vuosittainen korkean tason vuoropuhelu ihmisoikeuksista vastaavan Euroopan unionin erityisedustajan ja Meksikon ihmisoikeusvaltiosihteerin välillä.

EU on jo pidempään keskittynyt levittämään tietoa ja keräämään tukea ihmisoikeuksien puolustajille Meksikossa säännöllisen vuoropuhelun ja yhteistyön kautta.

EU:n edustajat ovat esittäneet huolensa ihmisoikeuksien puolustajien suojelemista koskevan mekanismin toiminnasta kahden viimeisen Meksikon kanssa käydyn korkean tason ihmisoikeusvuoropuhelun yhteydessä. Lisäksi EU on seurannut edustustonsa kautta tiiviisti mekanismiin liittyviä viimeaikaisia tapahtumia käytyään yksityiskohtaisia keskusteluja sekä Meksikon hallituksen että kansalaisyhteiskunnan kanssa. EU on myös tarjonnut tukea mekanismin saattamiseksi toimintakykyiseksi.

EU rahoittaa tämän lisäksi useita eri projekteja, joilla tuetaan ihmisoikeuksien puolustajien toimintaa Meksikossa. Näihin kuuluu viisi demokratiaa ja ihmisoikeuksia koskevan eurooppalaisen rahoitusvälineen (EIDHR) hanketta, joiden tarkoitus on ihmisoikeuksien puolustajien toimintavalmiuksien kehittäminen ja niiden suojelemisen tukeminen. Hankkeista on pitkällä aikavälillä hyötyä Meksikon omalle suojelumekanismille. Tämä tuki jatkunee seuraavan ehdotuspyynnön jälkeen, jonka EU:n edustusto on käynnistämässä piakkoin.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005225/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE) and Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Failure of Protection Mechanism for human rights defenders in Mexico

In 2010, the EU Delegation and the Member States' embassies in Mexico adopted a local plan to implement EU guidelines on human rights defenders (HRDs) in the country. Since that year, Mexico and the EU have had a Strategic Partnership that includes high-level dialogue on human rights. A fourth Human Rights Dialogue was successfully held in March 2014 in Brussels. In this dialogue. one of the issues addressed was the Protection Mechanism for Human Rights Defenders and Journalists.

In Mexico, in view of the risks for HRDs and journalists, a National Mechanism was created in 2012 to protect them. Although several measures have been taken to guarantee its satisfactory implementation, Mexican and international civil society organisations are alerted to the fact that the Mechanism is still not functioning efficiently and effectively. Recently, a new crisis seems to have been affecting the Mechanism as it has allegedly lost one third of its staff. The body which represents civil society has also decided to withdraw its participation on account of the fact that the conditions to address issues surrounding protection no longer exist and that there was a worrying lack of institutional and political backing from the Mexican state for the Mechanism. Consequently, the Mechanism is not able to guarantee the physical and psychological integrity of all HRDs and journalists who have been placed in a situation of even greater danger following these latest events.

In view of Parliament's decisions in June 2010 in favour of HRDs, and also the guidelines on HRDs, the EU's Strategic Framework for human rights and democracy and its Action Plan, and as a way of following up from the last EU-Mexico Human Rights Dialogue:

Will the European External Action Service express its concern or take any other action with regard to this situation?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(18 June 2014)

The EU and Mexico share a mutual commitment to the protection of human rights both at bilateral and multilateral level which is reflected in their 2008 Strategic Partnership and its Joint Executive Plan which introduced the 'enhanced dialogue on human rights' taking place on yearly basis at high level (EUSR for Human Rights and Mexican Under-Secretary of State).

Awareness raising and advocacy in favour of Human Rights Defenders (HRDs) has long been one of the human rights prioirities for the EU in Mexico and is hence addressed through the regular channels of dialogue and cooperation.

During the two last sessions of the high-level Human Rights Dialogue with Mexico, the EU side raised its concerns related to the problems in the functioning of the National HRDs Protection Mechanism. In addition, the EU, through the EU Delegation, has been closely following the recent incidents surrounding the Mechanism, following in-depth exchanges both with the Mexican Government and with Civil Society. The EU side also offered its support in making the Mechanism operational.

Furthermore, there is currently a variety of EU-funded projects supporting HRDs in Mexico, including five EIDHR projects which aim specifically at building capacities of HRDs and at supporting their protection. They will, in the long term, be beneficial for the Mexico-owned Protection Mechanism. This support is likely to continue under the next call for proposals which is about to be launched by the EU Delegation.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005226/14
to the Commission
Phil Bennion (ALDE) and George Lyon (ALDE)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: The need for specific guidance on REACH

The regulation on the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH) creates a complex range of obligations for businesses across the EU. The current guidance to help them comply with these obligations is unwieldy and complex. This imposes significant, unnecessary costs — particularly on SMEs.

Given that this lack of clarity impacts so heavily on these businesses' growth and competitiveness prospects, will the Commission indicate the progress in delivering the REACH Review recommendations for more specific guidance on transparency, non-discrimination and fair cost-sharing, and for more user-focused guidance, with special attention to SMEs, and the estimated timetable for completion?

In addition, the hazard-based approach under the precautionary principle in this regulation creates uncertainty and can lead to an overestimation of the potential for harm. On this basis, has the Commission considered the benefits of adopting a more scientific, risk-based approach which bases restrictions on evidence and analysis of the likelihood of the potential harm actually occurring?

This approach would remove unnecessary restrictions and would allow the full potential of chemicals to be exploited.

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2014)

The Commission held a workshop with owners and EU representatives of SMEs in December 2013, in order to hear their concerns about the REACH Regulation. These companies were asked to provide inputs on improving data-sharing and cost sharing mechanisms under REACH. The Commission is now reviewing these inputs and is exploring legal avenues to limit abusive practices in the run-up to the 2018 registration deadline. It envisages presenting preliminary ideas at the competent authorities meeting (Caracal) in July. The workshop also found that improvements could be made towards clarity of the potential obligations of companies active in the sector and has asked ECHA and industry associations to prepare targeted guidance and communication materials to address these gaps.

The Commission would like to remind the Honourable Members that it has already proposed measures aiming to reduce the administrative burden of REACH. The recommendations tackle concrete issues identified in the Review of particular relevance for SMEs; among others, in relation to SME participation in Substance Information Exchange Fora (SIEFs), availability of guidance or awareness-raising. The Commission proposed to revise the Fee Regulation in order to lower the costs for SMEs.

The Commission would also refer to its reply to parliamentary Question E-001975/2014 ([1]) and recall that to date, it has not been necessary to take preventive risk management decisions in accordance with the precautionary principle under the REACH restriction procedure.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005227/14
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Scarlet fever

In the United Kingdom, more cases of scarlet fever have been reported since the start of the year than occurred during the whole of 2013. Public Health Wales (PHW) has received notification of 397 cases, compared to a total of 186 last year. This is already the highest number of cases reported in Wales in 20 years. The increase in scarlet fever, which tends to affect young children, has been seen across the UK, with England reaching its highest weekly level since records began in 1982. In March 2014, PHW said the rise could be linked to mild weather. The number of cases seen already this year is higher than the total number reported in any year since 1994.

What mechanisms are in place by the Commission to raise awareness of scarlet fever across the European Union?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2014)

At Union level, surveillance of communicable diseases is regulated by Decision 1082/2013/EU ([1]) on Serious cross border threats to health. Scarlet fever is not part of the list of diseases agreed to be reported at EU level as it does not match the criteria for selection of communicable diseases to be covered by epidemiological surveillance at Union level set out in Annex II of Decision 1082/2013/EU. For this reason, surveillance of scarlet fever, including awareness raising campaigns, remains under the responsibility of health authorities at national level.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:293:0001:0015:EN:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005228/14
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Oral cancer

Poor oral health and irregular dental checks can increase the risk of oral cancer, a new study has found. The International Agency for Research on Cancer report also found that excessive use of mouthwash — more than three times a day — can increase risk. Smoking, heavy drinking and 'low socioeconomic status' are established risk indicators of mouth and throat cancers. The study covered 1 962 cancer patients and a further 1 993 control subjects across nine countries in Europe. The study was led by the Leibniz Institute for Prevention Research and Epidemiology (BIPS) in Bremen, Germany, and backed by researchers from Glasgow University Dental School.

What mechanisms does the Commission have in place to raise awareness of oral health, and does the Commission have any plans to aid the funding of further research into this type of cancer?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2014)

The Commission is aware of the study published in the scientific journal Oral Oncology, referred to by the Honourable Member ([1]) ([2]).

The Commission promotes a number of initiatives to raise awareness and encourage healthy lifestyle choices, including on major risk factors, such as tobacco, alcohol related harm, unhealthy diet and lack of physical activity. These initiatives address both men and women.

Furthermore, specifically in the area of cancer, the European Code against Cancer ([3]) is a key prevention tool, based on scientific evidence. The 4th edition of the code — a key communication tool in cancer prevention — is expected for later this year.

Horizon 2020, the EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020) ([4]), offers opportunities to address research on oral cancer, including research on screening, early diagnosis, treatment and quality of life, through the 'Health, demographic change and wellbeing' societal challenge. Information on current funding opportunities can be obtained through the Research and Innovation Participant Portal ([5]).

([1]) http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24680035
([2]) http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-scotland-glasgow-west-26875793
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/major_chronic_diseases/diseases/cancer/index_en.htm#fragment2
([4]) COM(2011) 809, 30.11.2011.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/index.html

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-005229/14
upućeno Komisiji
Tonino Picula (S&D)
(23. travnja 2014.)

Predmet: Poboljšanje željezničke infrastrukture u Hrvatskoj

Zbog krize svjedočimo dramatičnom smanjenju investicija i drastičnom smanjenju intenziteta ili čak zatvaranju mnogih nacionalnih i međunarodnih željezničkih linija. Ni Hrvatska u tom trendu nije iznimka.

Jedan je od temeljnih ciljeva europske prometne politike ostvarenje pomaka od prometa osobnim automobilima prema prometu željeznicom. Plan je Komisije ostvariti ciljanih 94.000 kilometara željeznica te povećati teretni prijevoz u EU-u za dvije trećine od 2000. do 2020. Za ostvarenje tog cilja nužno je razviti željezničku mrežu koja će moći prevesti putnike i robu od početne do završne točke, kako u unutarnjem tako i u međunarodnom putovanju.

Razvijena prometna infrastruktura za Hrvatsku ima vitalno značenje zbog specifičnog zemljopisnog oblika, dok je Europskoj uniji, zbog geostrateškog položaja, Hrvatska izuzetno bitna za povezivanje srednje Europe sa zemljama europskog jugoistoka.

Prošli tjedan Komisija je po prvi put objavila top-listu zemalja po različitim kriterijima razvijenosti i sigurnosti prometne infrastrukture. Od 28 zemalja EU-a Hrvatska je četvrta najbolja po broju kilometara autocesta na milijun stanovnika, ali i peta najlošija po željezničkoj infrastrukturi.

Kojim konkretnim mjerama Komisija planira osigurati ostvarenje pomaka prema prometu željeznicama i ciljani broj kilometara željeznica? U kojoj mjeri se u te ciljeve uklapa Republika Hrvatska, imajući u vidu da se nije mogla koristiti sredstvima iz prošlog TNT-T programskog razdoblja od 2007. do 2013., kada je više od polovice sredstava bilo namijenjeno razvoju i obnovi željezničkog prometa? Jesu li planirane investicije na „Mediteranskom koridoru" koji obuhvaća Hrvatsku i proteže se od Pirenejskog poluotoka sve do granice Mađarske i Ukrajine?

Odgovor g. Kallasa u ime Komisije
(12. lipnja 2014.)

Kao dio Mediteranskog koridora osnovne mreže u transeuropskoj prometnoj mreži (TEN-T), Hrvatska će se moći koristiti Instrumentom za povezivanje Europe (CEF) ([1]) u okviru kojega se daje prednost prekograničnim i multimodalnim projektima, kao i uklanjanju uskih grla u koridorima osnovne mreže. CEF je uvelike usredotočen na ekološki najprihvatljivije načine prijevoza, njihovu interoperabilnost i intermodalnost te osobito na željeznički prijevoz. Službe Komisije usko surađuju s hrvatskim vlastima radi utvrđivanja popisa projekata koji bi imali prednost pri dodjeli sredstava u okviru Instrumenta za povezivanje Europe.

Osim toga, Hrvatska ima pravo na sredstva iz omotnice u kojoj je u okviru CEF-a za kohezijske zemlje rezervirano 11,3 milijardi EUR za potporu projektima uz stopu sufinanciranja do 85 %.

Štoviše, Hrvatska će se u cilju razvoja svoje željezničke mreže moći koristiti sredstvima iz europskih strukturnih i investicijskih fondova. Predviđena su ulaganja na željezničkim prugama u okviru TEN-T-a duž bivših paneuropskih koridora X i Vb te duž prigradskih željezničkih pruga do većih gradova. O sredstvima koja će se za ta ulaganja dodijeliti još se pregovara s hrvatskim vlastima.

([1]) Uredba (EU) br. 1316/2013 Europskog parlamenta i Vijeća od 11. prosinca 2013. o uspostavi Instrumenta za povezivanje Europe, izmjeni Uredbe (EU) br. 913/2010 i stavljaju izvan snage uredaba (EZ) br. 680/2007 i (EZ) br. 67/2010, SL L 348, 20.12.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005229/14
to the Commission
Tonino Picula (S&D)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Improving Croatia's rail infrastructure

The crisis has led to a dramatic reduction in investment and a drastic fall in use — or even the outright closure — of many national and international rail services. Croatia is no exception to this trend.

One of the basic aims of European transport policy is to encourage a move away from using cars to using trains. The Commission's plan is to achieve a target of 94 000 kilometres of rail lines and to increase freight transport in the EU by two-thirds between 2000 and 2020. In order to achieve this objective, it is vital to develop a rail network that is capable of transporting passengers and cargo from their starting point to their final destination, both nationally and internationally.

Developed transport infrastructure is of vital importance for Croatia, given its specific geographical characteristics. In view of its geostrategic position, Croatia is also of great importance for the EU in connecting central Europe with the countries of Southeast Europe.

Last week, the Commission published — for the first time — a chart of countries organised according to various criteria of development and security of transport infrastructure. Of the 28 Member States, Croatia is the fourth best in terms of the number of kilometres of motorway per million residents, but fifth worst in terms of rail infrastructure.

What specific steps does the Commission plan to take to ensure that the EU moves towards greater use of rail transport and achieves its target of 94 000 kilometres of rail lines? To what extent will Croatia be included in these objectives, given that it was unable to draw on funding during the previous TEN-T 2007-2013 programming period, when over half of the funds were earmarked for the development and modernisation of rail transport? Are any investments planned for the Mediterranean Corridor, which includes Croatia and which extends all the way from the Iberian Peninsula to the border of Hungary and Ukraine?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2014)

Being part of the Mediterranean Trans-European Transport Network (TEN-T) Core Network Corridor, Croatia will be able to benefit from the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) ([1]) which gives priority to cross-border and multimodal projects as well as the removal of bottlenecks on the core network corridors. The CEF has a strong focus on the most environmentally friendly transport modes, their interoperability and intermodality, in particular rail transport. The Commission services work closely together with the Croatian authorities to identify the list of projects that would be eligible with priority for CEF financing.

In addition Croatia is eligible to receive funding from the EUR 11.3 billion envelope reserved within the CEF for cohesion countries, for project support with a co-funding rate of up to 85%.

Moreover, Croatia will benefit from support under the European Structural and Investment Funds to develop their railway network. Investments are foreseen on TEN-T railway lines along the former pan-European corridors X and Vb and along commuter rail lines to bigger cities. The funds allocated for these investments are still being negotiated with the Croatian authorities.

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 1316/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11.12.2013 establishing the Connecting Europe Facility, amending Regulation (EU) No 913/2010 and repealing Regulations (EC) No 680/2007 and (EC) No 67/2010, OJ L 348, 20.12.2013.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-005230/14
upućeno Komisiji
Ruža Tomašić (ECR)
(23. travnja 2014.)

Predmet: Podatci priloženi uz prijenose financijskih sredstava

U svojoj zakonodavnoj rezoluciji o prijedlogu Uredbe Europskog parlamenta i Vijeća o podatcima koji su priloženi uz prijenose financijskih sredstava Parlament je utvrdio da se informacije o uplatitelju i/ili primatelju ne čuvaju dulje nego što je nužno, odnosno tijekom razdoblja od najviše pet godina.

Prema mišljenju Parlamenta, nakon isteka tog razdoblja osobni podatci moraju se izbrisati. Međutim, navedeno je i kako države članice mogu dopustiti ili zahtijevati daljnje zadržavanje u iznimnim situacijama koje su uredno opravdane i valjano utemeljene te samo ako je to nužno za sprječavanje, otkrivanje ili istraživanje pranja novca i financiranja terorizma.

S obzirom na to da zadržavanje informacija o uplatitelju i/ili primatelju na rok duži od pet godina znatno ugrožava pravo na zaštitu osobnih podataka i da postoji potreba za osiguravanjem pravne sigurnosti u tom području, željela bih znati smatra li Komisija ovako široku definiciju plodnim tlom za zloporabe i kršenja prava na privatnost građana od strane represivnog aparata država članica te što planira poduzeti kako bi se takva praksa spriječila.

Odgovor g. Barniera u ime Komisije
(17. lipnja 2014.)

Uz obveze za države članice koje proizlaze iz pravila EU-a o borbi protiv pranja novca i neovisno o njima države članice moraju poštovati i okvir EU-a za zaštitu osobnih podataka, točnije Direktivu 95/46/EZ ([1]).

Pri donošenju prijedloga Uredbe o podacima koji su priloženi uz prijenose financijskih sredstava Komisija se pobrinula da ne postoji sukob između dva skupa pravila. Mogućnost da države članice dopuste ili zahtijevaju zadržavanje u razdoblju dužem od prvih 5 godina ograničena je na iznimne slučajeve. To je dopušteno samo ako je nužno za sprečavanje, otkrivanje ili istraživanje pranja novca ili financiranja terorizma te u skladu s Direktivom 95/46/EZ, a posebno njezinim člankom 6. stavkom 1. točkom (e).

([1]) Direktiva 95/46/EZ Europskog parlamenta i Vijeća od 24. listopada 1995. o zaštiti pojedinaca u vezi s obradom osobnih podataka i o slobodnom protoku takvih podataka; SL L 281, str. 31.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005230/14
to the Commission
Ruža Tomašić (ECR)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Information accompanying transfers of funds

In its legislative resolution on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on information accompanying transfers of funds, Parliament asserted that information on the payer and the payee should not be kept for any longer than is strictly necessary, i.e. for a period no longer than five years.

In Parliament's opinion, once this period expires the personal data must be deleted. However, it is also stated that Member States may allow or require retention for a further period in exceptional situations, where justified and where reasons have been given, and only if necessary for the prevention, detection or investigation of money laundering or terrorist financing.

Given that the retention of data on payers and/or payees for a period longer than five years poses a significant threat to the protection of personal data, and given that there is a need to ensure legal certainty in this area, does the Commission not feel that such a broad definition could serve as fertile soil for abuses and for the violation of citizens' right to privacy by repressive state apparatus in Member States? What does the Commission intend to do in order to prevent this practice?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2014)

In addition to and independently from the obligations imposed on Member States by the EU Anti-Money Laundering rules, Member States are also bound to respect the EU framework for the protection of personal data, namely Directive 95/46/EC ([1]).

When adopting its proposal for a regulation on information accompanying transfers of funds, the Commission made sure that there was no conflict between the two sets of rules. The possibility for Member States to allow or require retention for a further period longer than the initial 5 years has been limited to exceptional situations. It is only permitted if necessary for the prevention, detection or investigation of money laundering or terrorist financing, and in compliance with Directive 95/46/EC and in particular Article 6 (1) (e) thereof.

([1]) Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24.10.1995 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data; OJ L 281, p.31.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005231/14
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(23 aprile 2014)

Oggetto: Commemorazioni per il centenario della Grande Guerra: il monte Grappa

La prima Guerra mondiale (1914-1918) è un tragico evento che ha coinvolto 30 paesi e ha cambiato la storia dell'Europa. Per commemorare il centenario della Grande Guerra, gli enti locali hanno predisposto iniziative ed interventi che prevedono anche la valorizzazione e il recupero dei siti più importanti che sono stati teatro del conflitto.

Considerando che il monte Grappa, al confine tra le province di Vicenza, Treviso e Belluno, è ben noto nella memoria collettiva mondiale per essere stato il teatro principale degli scontri decisivi legati alla prima Guerra mondiale; preso atto che in esso è sita la «Galleria Vittorio Emanuele III», attualmente accessibile solo per il 20 % poiché necessita di importanti interventi di restauro e messa in sicurezza per non andare definitivamente persa ed essere aperta al pubblico; considerando inoltre che il monte Grappa ospita uno degli ossari più imponenti della prima Guerra mondiale, il sacrario militare di Cima del Grappa, che contiene i resti di 22 910 soldati italiani, austriaci, slovacchi, croati, boemi e di altre nazionalità; può la Commissione riferire:

— se intende sostenere finanziariamente le opere di restauro dei siti della Grande Guerra del monte Grappa, divenuto simbolo delle atrocità sofferte dai popoli europei a causa della Grande Guerra?

— Se, in segno di rispetto per le migliaia di vite umane sacrificate in questi luoghi in nome della pace e della libertà, ha intenzione di patrocinare e contribuire economicamente alle iniziative organizzate dalle regioni Veneto, Trentino Alto Adige e Friuli Venezia Giulia?

— Se il presidente della Commissione parteciperà agli eventi organizzati per ricordare questi tragici eventi che hanno cambiato la storia dell'Europa?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(11 giugno 2014)

La Commissione sostiene le azioni commemorative, tra cui anche le iniziative legate al centenario della Grande Guerra, attraverso la componente «*Memoria*» del programma di finanziamento *L'Europa per i Cittadini*. Di recente è stato pubblicato un invito a presentare proposte per tale programma e il termine ultimo per la presentazione delle candidature è il 4 giugno 2014.

Ulteriori informazioni su questo invito a presentare proposte sono disponibili all'indirizzo:
http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/europe-for-citizens/funding/european-rememberance_en

Il Presidente della Commissione europea intende partecipare senza fallo a diversi eventi a livello europeo per commemorare lo scoppio della Prima Guerra Mondiale, ne è un esempio il recente dibattito in seno al PE e l'imminente incontro del Consiglio europeo a Ypres, nonché altri eventi del caso.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005231/14
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Commemorations of the centenary of the First World War: Monte Grappa

The First World War (1914-18) was a tragic event which involved 30 countries and altered the course of history of Europe. To commemorate its centenary, local authorities in Italy have organised events and initiatives which include the development and regeneration of key sites in the theatre of the conflict.

In view of the fact that Monte Grappa (the point at which the Provinces of Vicenza, Treviso and Belluno converge) is prominent in the world's collective memory as the principal theatre of decisive encounters in the First World War; considering that this is also the site of the 'Galleria Vittorio Emanuele III', only 20% of which is currently accessible due to the need for major restoration works to ensure that it is safe, prevent it from being permanently lost and allow it to be open to the public; considering also that Monte Grappa houses one of the most impressive ossuaries of the First World War, the Cima Grappa war memorial, which contains the remains of 22 910 Italian, Austrian, Slovak, Croatian and Bohemian soldiers, among others; can the Commission answer the following questions:

— Does it intend to provide financial support for restoration of the First World War sites on Monte Grappa, now a symbol of the atrocities suffered by the European people as a result of that War?

— Does it, as a token of respect for the thousands of lives sacrificed on these sites in the name of peace and freedom, intend to support and contribute economically to initiatives organised by the Veneto, Trentino Alto Adige and Friuli Venezia Giulia Regions?

— Does the Commission's President intend to participate in events organised to commemorate these tragic events which have altered the course of history of Europe?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2014)

The Commission supports commemorative actions, including initiatives related to the centenary of the Great War, through the Remembrance strand of the Europe for Citizens funding programme. A call for proposals for this funding programme has recently been published, with the deadline for applications set for 4 June 2014.

More information about this call for proposals is available at: http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/europe-for-citizens/funding/european-rememberance_en

The President of the European Commission will certainly participate in a variety of events at European level to commemorate the outbreak of World War I, including the recent debate in the EP and the forthcoming European Council dinner in Ypres, and others as appropriate.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005232/14
to the Commission
Anthea McIntyre (ECR)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Plant Protection Products Regulation

Access to innovative crop protection products would enhance the competitiveness of EU farming businesses and the EU's agri-chemicals sector. However, the current approvals process for such products is too complex and outcomes can be based on factors other than the scientific assessment of risk. How does the Commission plan to prepare its report to Parliament and the Council on the operation of the Plant Protection Products Regulation (Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009), this report being required by the end of 2014 in accordance with Article 82 of the regulation? In particular does the Commission plan to assess the impacts of the current regime and to introduce a process for evaluation that is based on scientific risk assessment alone? If not, why not?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(2 June 2014)

The Commission plans to perform a thorough analysis of the working of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 ([1]) and of its impact on human health, the environment as well as on the diversification and competitiveness of agriculture, in particular taking into account the legal provisions identified in Article 82.

The Commission would like to stress that because of the overall complexity of the issue, the publication of the thorough analysis will lead to a delay regarding the initial deadline of end of 2014.

The Commission will on the basis of this analysis, where and if necessary, propose amendments to the regulation.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 October 2009 concerning the placing of plant protection products on the market and repealing Council Directives 79/117/EEC and 91/414/EEC.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005233/14
to the Council
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: UK Government launches investigation into the Muslim Brotherhood

On 2 April 2014, the UK Government announced that it had tasked its security services with conducting an investigation into the activities of the Muslim Brotherhood. In a press statement, the UK Prime Minister, David Cameron, said:

'What I think is important about the Muslim Brotherhood is that we understand what this organisation is, what it stands for, what its beliefs are in terms of the path of extremism and violent extremism, what its connections are with other groups, what its presence is here in the United Kingdom.'

It is reported that the investigation was ordered following a conclusion that the UK Government had insufficient intelligence about the Muslim Brotherhood's activities in the UK and in Egypt. The investigation is to be led by the British Ambassador to Saudi Arabia, Sir John Jenkins, with an emphasis on the organisation's 'philosophy and values and alleged connections with extremism and violence'.

It has been reported by some media outlets that the results of the investigation could prompt the UK Government to add the organisation to its list of proscribed terrorist groups, imitating the recent decisions of Saudi Arabia and Egypt.

1. Has the Council, through its EU Counter-Terrorism Coordinator, Gilles de Kerchove, considered undertaking any substantial research or intelligence-gathering exercises along similar lines to the UK investigation in question?

2. Is the Council aware of any other Member State's intention to conduct such an investigation, and if so, has there been any discussion of coordinating this activity at EU level?

3. If the UK investigation finds evidence linking the Muslim Brotherhood with extremist and terrorist activity, will the Council consider adding the organisation to its list of proscribed terrorist groups?

Reply
(23 June 2014)

The Council is not engaged in any specific research or exercises as referred to by the Honourable Member, but is closely following developments in the region as well as more widely.

The Council is not aware of any similar investigations in other Member States.

In order to implement UNSCR 1373 (2001), the Council adopted Common Position 2001/931/CFSP on the application of specific measures to combat terrorism and Regulation (EC) No 2580/2001 on specific restrictive measures directed against certain persons and entities with a view to combating terrorism.

The Council may consider a proposal by any Member State to include a person, group or entity in the list of persons, groups or entities involved in terrorist acts where a competent authority has taken a decision to investigate or prosecute the person, group or entity for a terrorist act, an attempt to perpetrate, participate in or facilitate such an act, or has taken a decision to condemn such deeds.

The Council keeps the issue of current and potential listings of entities in Common Position 2001/931/CFSP under constant review.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005235/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Blood minerals in North Korea

Although the appalling state of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK, or North Korea) is notorious throughout the world, the recent UN Commission of Inquiry (COI) report highlighted one particularly egregious phenomenon: the existence of slave labour in prison camps, which are thought to house up to 200 000 inmates, among them thousands of children. The report states that in the prison camps 'all inmates are subjected to forced labour' for over 12 hours a day, regardless of their physical or emotional well-being, and that 'deadly work accidents frequently occur as a result of the combination of the prisoners' dire physical condition and the lack of safety measures'. The report further states that the actions of the state in the political prison camps, which include extermination, enslavement, torture, rape and religious and gender-based persecution, constitute crimes against humanity.

A less well-known aspect of the camps is that many of them host mines which produce coal, magnetite and other minerals. Given the overwhelming evidence that such mines are operated using slave labour, and that the inmates are subject to appalling conditions frequently resulting in severe injury or death, it comes as a surprise to many that importing such minerals from North Korea is technically not forbidden under the sanctions regime. It can be argued that EU policy is therefore tacitly supporting the trade of 'blood minerals', which should be treated in the same way as 'blood diamonds' in West Africa. Banning their trade would also cut off a valuable source of revenue for the government and its nuclear weapons programme.

1. Is the VP/HR aware of the allegations surrounding so-called 'blood minerals' in North Korea's slave labour camps?

2. Will she add her call for the import of such minerals to be explicitly banned by the EU, for example by amending Council Regulation (EC) No 329/2007?

3. What other measures has she taken, and can she take, to draw attention to the appalling situation of human rights in North Korea, and help to alleviate the conditions in the prison camps?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(18 June 2014)

1. The HR/VP is well aware of the report by the UN Commission of Inquiry on Human Rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), including the parts related to prison camps. In fact, the EU co-initiated the UN Human Rights Council resolution that, in March 2013, established the said Commission, to the report of which the Honourable Member has referred.

2. The EU has currently in place a regime of restrictive measures with respect to the DPRK that implements the sanctions imposed by the United Nations in response to the DPRK's weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missile programmes and includes additional restrictive measures reinforcing the UN measures. In February 2013, the EU imposed a ban on trade in gold, precious metals and diamonds with the Government of the DPRK, its public bodies and the Central Bank of the DPRK, or persons and entities acting on their behalf or at their direction. New EU restrictive measures are currently not under consideration. In its recommendations the UN Commission of Inquiry did not support sanctions targeted against the economy of the DPRK as a whole.

3. The EU has been clear in its condemnation of human rights abuses in the DPRK and expresses its concerns at every occasion with the DPRK representatives. The EU regularly draws the attention of the relevant UN bodies to this appalling state of affairs. The EU will work with all its partners to ensure an appropriate follow-up to the UN Commission of Inquiry's findings and recommendations.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-005236/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Emma McClarkin (ECR)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — G8-Tanzania Transparency Partnerships on Lands and Extractives

Two new G8-Tanzania Transparency Partnerships on Lands and Extractives were launched ahead of the G8 summit held in Northern Ireland in June 2013. As well as increasing transparency and accountability in the management and use of natural resources to ensure that benefits are widely shared amongst all Tanzanian citizens, they are also designed to strengthen the security of tenure rights of all landholders and improve transparency over large-scale land deals. The intention is that this will attract increased foreign and national private-sector investment.

However, I have been made aware by some of my constituents that pressure has been put on foreign investors who own land in Tanzania, including intimidation, meaning that they live in fear that they will lose their land.

Given that the Council and Commission are both represented in the G8 (now G7), can the High Representative tell me if she is aware of these pressures on foreign investors in Tanzania and whether she believes that this contravenes the partnerships created last year?

Can the High Representative raise these issues with the Tanzanian Government so as to ensure that foreign landowners do not have to live in fear that their land will be taken from them?

Question for written answer E-005238/14
to the Commission
Emma McClarkin (ECR)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: G8-Tanzania Transparency Partnerships on Lands and Extractives

Two new G8-Tanzania Transparency Partnerships on Lands and Extractives were launched ahead of the G8 Summit in Northern Ireland in June 2013. As well as increasing transparency and accountability in the management and use of natural resources to ensure benefits are widely shared amongst all Tanzanian citizens, they are also designed to strengthen the security of tenure rights of all land holders and improve transparency over large-scale land deals. The intention is that this will attract increased foreign and national private sector investment.

However, I have been made aware by some of my constituents that pressure has been put on foreign investors who own land in Tanzania, including intimidation, meaning that these foreign investors live in fear that they will lose their land.

Given that the Council and Commission are both represented in the G8 (now G7), can the Commission tell me if it is aware of these pressures on foreign investors in Tanzania and whether it believes that this contravenes the partnerships made last year?

Can the Commission raise these issues with the Tanzanian Government to ensure that foreign land owners do not have to live in fear that their land will be taken from them?

Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(4 June 2014)

Tanzania's legal framework for land is improving in terms of providing greater tenure security. However, capacity constraints in the country's land administration and weaknesses in the judicial system such as the length of proceedings or reported cases of corruption hinder efficient implementation. While individual cases of legal land disputes involving foreign investors have been reported, there is no evidence of a systemic pressure on foreign investors' land rights.

The growing competition over land affects the whole of society. The combination of population growth, economic development and the rising global demand for agricultural commodities has increased pressure on land for farming. There is a perception of increasing disputes over land: between the state and the communities; between communities and investors; within communities, particularly between farmers and pastoralists; and between individuals.

The Government, with the support of DFID/UK, is defining a programme to translate the Transparency Initiative on Lands into operational actions. The formulation of the programme is to be finalised in 2014. In addition, the government launched in April 2014 a new initiative to accelerate reforms, the 'Big Results Now on Business Environment' which includes measures to improve access to land and security of tenure. Meanwhile the EU Delegation engages with the European Business community which feeds into structured dialogue with the Government on fiscal and immigration issues. EU Member States' missions are following individual cases involving their citizens directly with the relevant authorities.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005239/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE)
(23 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Καταστροφή ξύλινων παραδοσιακών αλιευτικών σκαφών

Με αφορμή την ψηφοφορία για το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Θάλασσας και Αλιείας στην Ολομέλεια του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου (Απρίλιος 2014), η κοινή γνώμη έχει πάλι ερωτηματικά ως προς τη σκοπιμότητα και την αποτελεσματικότητα της πρακτικής της διάλυσης των αλιευτικών σκαφών, με στόχο τη μείωση της αλιευτικής ικανότητας του ευρωπαϊκού στόλου. Ιδιαίτερη ανησυχία δημιουργεί το γεγονός ότι πολλά σκάφη που αντιπροσωπεύουν την παράδοση και την πολιτισμική κληρονομιά ορισμένων κρατών μελών καταστρέφονται. Πρόκειται, κατά κύριο λόγο, για ξύλινα σκάφη άνω των 30 ετών, που παρόμοιά τους δεν πρόκειται να κατασκευαστούν ξανά.

Με βάση τα παραπάνω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Είναι δυνατόν τέτοιου είδους αλιευτικά σκάφη να αποσύρονται (και όχι να καταστρέφονται), με αφαίρεση, παραδείγματος χάριν, της αλιευτικής άδειας και των αλιευτικών εργαλείων;

Η απόφαση για καταστροφή ή απόσυρση των σκαφών εναπόκειται ή θα μπορούσε να περάσει, στα ίδια τα κράτη μέλη, τα οποία θα πρέπει προφανώς να εξασφαλίζουν ότι τα σκάφη αυτά θα διατηρούνται ως κειμήλια (διατήρηση της λαϊκής αλιευτικής τέχνης και παράδοσης, λαογραφία, χρήση για τουριστικούς σκοπούς, κ.λπ.) αλλά δεν θα χρησιμοποιούνται ως αλιευτικά;

Απάντηση της κ. Δαμανάκη εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(12 Ιουνίου 2014)

Το σχέδιο κανονισμού για το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Θάλασσας και Αλιείας (ΕΤΘΑ) προβλέπει ότι το ΕΤΘΑ μπορεί να στηρίξει την οριστική παύση των παραδοσιακών ξύλινων σκαφών χωρίς την οριστική διάλυσή τους, υπό τον όρο ότι τα εν λόγω σκάφη συντελούν στη διατήρηση της πολιτιστικής κληρονομιάς στην ξηρά. Σε όλες τις περιπτώσεις, πρέπει να αφαιρεθούν οριστικά οι αλιευτικές άδειες και εγκρίσεις.

Σύμφωνα με την αρχή της επιμερισμένης διαχείρισης, τα κράτη μέλη είναι αρμόδια να καθορίσουν ποια αλιευτικά σκάφη μπορούν να επωφεληθούν από τη στήριξη του ΕΤΘΑ για την οριστική παύση. Εναπόκειται επίσης στα κράτη μέλη να διευκρινίσουν το είδος των λειτουργιών που τα παραδοσιακά ξύλινα σκάφη τα οποία έχουν επωφεληθεί από τη στήριξη του ΕΤΘΑ για την οριστική παύση πρέπει να επιτελούν στην ξηρά για τη διατήρηση της πολιτιστικής κληρονομιάς.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005239/14
to the Commission
Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Destruction of traditional wooden fishing vessels

Following the plenary vote by the European Parliament on the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (April 2014), the public is again questioning the feasibility and effectiveness of the practice of scrapping fishing vessels in order to reduce the EU fleet's fishing capacity. There is particular concern that many vessels that embody the traditions and cultural heritage of some Member States are being destroyed. These are mainly wooden vessels over 30 years old, the like of which will probably not be built again.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

Could such fishing vessels be withdrawn from use (rather than destroyed), for example, by withholding the operator's fishing licence and gear?

Is the decision to withdraw or destroy these vessels a matter for Member States themselves? If not, could this decision-taking power be transferred to them? Obviously they would have to ensure that these vessels are preserved as relics from the past (as folk art, folklore and the embodiment of the traditions of fishing communities or as tourist attractions, etc.) but not used as fishing vessels?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2014)

The draft regulation for the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) foresees that the EMFF can support permanent cessation of traditional wooden vessels without scrapping these vessels permanently, provided that such vessels retain a land-based heritage function. In all cases, fishing licences and authorisations must permanently be withdrawn.

Under the principle of shared management, it is up to Member States to define which fishing vessels can benefit from EMFF support for permanent cessation. It is also up to Member States to decide which precise land-based heritage function traditional wooden vessels which have benefited from EMFF support for permanent cessation, should retain.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005240/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE)
(23 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Το τεράστιο κοινωνικό και οικονομικό κόστος των περιττών καισαρικών τομών

Σύμφωνα με στοιχεία διεθνών οργανισμών (ΠΟΕ, ΟΟΣΑ), τα τελευταία χρόνια παρατηρείται μεγάλη αύξηση των τοκετών που πραγματοποιούνται με καισαρική τομή, η οποία δεν μπορεί να δικαιολογηθεί από πραγματικές ιατρικές ανάγκες (π.χ. την ηλικία της μητέρας) ή απλώς από διαφορετικές ιατρικές πρακτικές που εφαρμόζονται σε κάθε χώρα.

Οι χώρες με τα χαμηλότερα ποσοστά καισαρικών τομών είναι η Ολλανδία (139 ανά 1 000 γεννήσεις) και η Φινλανδία (165 ανά 1 000 γεννήσεις), ενώ οι χώρες με τα υψηλότερα ποσοστά είναι η Ιταλία (381 ανά 1 000 γεννήσεις) και η Πορτογαλία (356 ανά 1 000 γεννήσεις). Για την Ελλάδα και την Κύπρο δυστυχώς δεν υπάρχουν διαθέσιμα στοιχεία, αν και, πρόσφατα, το Υπουργείο Υγείας της Κύπρου ανακοίνωσε ότι το ποσοστό καισαρικών τομών φτάνει στο 60% στις ιδιωτικές κλινικές και στο 45% στα δημόσια νοσοκομεία, ενώ παρόμοια στοιχεία έχουν αναφερθεί και για την Ελλάδα.

Μολονότι κανείς δεν μπορεί να αμφισβητήσει τη βελτίωση των σχετικών υγειονομικών δεικτών για μητέρες και βρέφη (ποσοστά επιβίωσης κ.λπ.) τα τελευταία χρόνια, η μεγάλη αύξηση των καισαρικών τομών ανησυχητική. Δεδομένου του τεράστιου σωματικού, ψυχολογικού, κοινωνικού και οικονομικού κόστους των περιττών καισαρικών τομών, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Διαθέτει αξιόπιστα συγκριτικά στοιχεία για τα ποσοστά καισαρικών τομών στις χώρες της ΕΕ; Διαθέτει στοιχεία για τις αιτίες των μεγάλων διαφορών που παρατηρούνται μεταξύ των κρατών μελών; Η αύξηση αυτή μπορεί να δικαιολογηθεί μόνο από την αύξηση της μέσης ηλικίας των μητέρων ή την αύξηση των πολύδυμων γεννήσεων, λόγω αυξημένης χρήσης της τεχνητής γονιμοποίησης;

Θεωρεί ότι υπάρχει πεδίο παρέμβασης της ΕΕ και συντονισμού των κρατών μελών στο συγκεκριμένο θέμα;

Χρηματοδοτεί, ή σκοπεύει να χρηματοδοτήσει σχετικά ερευνητικά, προγράμματα ενημέρωσης (σε επίπεδο ιατρικών συλλόγων, μελλόντων γονέων, ακόμη και σχολείων) ή διάδοσης βέλτιστων πρακτικών μεταξύ των ευρωπαίων πολιτών;

Απάντηση του κ. Borg εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(1 Ιουλίου 2014)

Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει τον κ. βουλευτή στην απάντηση που έδωσε στη γραπτή ερώτηση E-005596/2014 ([1]).

Επιπλέον, σύμφωνα με τη Συνθήκη για τη λειτουργία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης τα κράτη μέλη είναι αρμόδια για τη διαμόρφωσή της πολιτικής τους στον τομέα της υγείας, καθώς και την οργάνωση και την παροχή υγειονομικών υπηρεσιών και ιατρικής περίθαλψης. Στο πλαίσιο αυτό η Επιτροπή δεν έχει την πρόθεση να ενισχύσει τον συντονισμό των κρατών μελών όσον αφορά τους τοκετούς με καισαρική.

Όσον αφορά τα ερευνητικά κονδύλια της ΕΕ, το έργο OptiBIRTH ([2]) έχει σκοπό τη βελτίωση της παροχής υγειονομικών υπηρεσιών προς τις μητέρες, καθώς και τη βελτιστοποίηση των τοκετών, αυξάνοντας τους φυσικούς τοκετούς ύστερα από γέννες με καισαρική. Μια άλλη δράση είναι η δράση με τίτλο «Απόψεις, Ανησυχίες και Αντίκτυπος σχετικά με τον τοκετό: Δημιουργία ενός δυναμικού πλαισίου της ΕΕ για τη βελτίωση της μητρικής περίθαλψης» ([3]). Ο Ορίζοντας 2020 ([4]), ιδίως στο πλαίσιο της πτυχής του για τις κοινωνιακές προκλήσεις, μπορεί να παράσχει περισσότερες ευκαιρίες στήριξης της έρευνας στον εν λόγω τομέα.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/el/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) http://www.optibirth.eu/optibirth/
([3]) http://www.iresearch4birth.eu/iResearch4Birth/en/homepage.wp
([4]) COM(2011)808 τελικό, COM(2011)811 τελικό.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005240/14
to the Commission
Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: The enormous social and economic cost of unnecessary Caesarean sections

According to data from international organisations (WTO, OECD), there has been a very significant increase in deliveries conducted by Caesarean section in recent years, an increase which cannot be explained by genuine medical needs (e.g. the age of the mother) or simply by differences in medical practices in individual countries.

The countries with the lowest rates of Caesareans are the Netherlands (139 per 1 000 births) and Finland (165 per 1 000 births), while the countries with the highest rates are Italy (381 per 1 000 births) and Portugal (356 per 1 000 births). For Greece and Cyprus, unfortunately no figures are available, although recently the Ministry of Health of Cyprus announced that 60% of deliveries in private clinics and 45% in public hospitals are by Caesarean, while similar figures have been reported for Greece.

While no one can dispute the improvement in recent years of the relevant health indicators for mothers and infants (survival rates, etc.), the great increase in Caesareans is a matter for concern. Given the enormous physical, psychological, social and economic cost of unnecessary Caesareans, will the Commission say:

1. Does it have any reliable comparative data on rates of Caesareans in EU countries? Does it have any information on the reasons for the great differences between Member States? Can this increase be explained solely by the increase in the average age of mothers or the increase in the number of multiple births owing to the increased use of artificial insemination?

2. Does it consider that there is scope for EU intervention and the coordination of EU Member States in this field?

3. Does it fund — or will it fund in future — relevant research and public awareness programmes (for medical associations, prospective parents and even schools) or the dissemination of best practices among European citizens?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(1 July 2014)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its reply to Written Question E-005596/2014 ([1]).

In addition, according to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Member States are responsible for the definition of health policies and the organisation and delivery of all health services and medical care. As such, there is no intention to support coordination of Member States in the field of caesarean sections.

In terms of EU research funding, the project OptiBIRTH ([2]) aims to improve maternal health service delivery, and optimise childbirth, by increasing natural birth after caesarean section. Another action is 'Childbirth Cultures, Concerns, and Consequences: Creating a dynamic EU framework for optimal maternity care' ([3]). Horizon 2020 ([4]), in particular under the societal challenge strand, may provide further opportunities to support research in this area.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) http://www.optibirth.eu/optibirth/
([3]) http://www.iresearch4birth.eu/iResearch4Birth/en/homepage.wp
([4]) COM(2011) 808 final, COM(2011) 811 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005242/14
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: VP/HR — Election observation mission in Mauritania

In July 2014, Mauritanians are set to go to the polls in order to elect a new president. The incumbent, Mohamed Ould Abdel Aziz, assumed power after a 2008 coup, although he won an election in 2009 which was assessed as fair by the EU but bitterly contested by certain domestic opponents.

Five years on, allegations of corruption are widespread, and certain factions are threatening to boycott the elections if transparency measures are not implemented. There also continue to be lingering allegations of slavery in Mauritania, and the candidature of Biram Dah Abeid, the anti-slavery activist who has in the past faced harassment and jail, could also prove controversial.

1. Is the VP/HR aware of the sensitivities involved in the upcoming presidential elections in Mauritania?

2. Will she consider organising or calling for an EU election observation mission to be invited, as previously happened in the country?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2014)

We are monitoring the electoral process in Mauritania very closely as we are well aware of the many issues at stake, in particular for the country's democratic consolidation and stability. The first round of the presidential elections is scheduled for 21 June. President Abdel Aziz faces five other candidates whose applications have just been accepted by the Constitutional Council. They include Biram Abeid, an opposition campaigner for the rights of the Haratin and the abolition of slavery.

We regret that the talks between the government and the opposition ahead of the elections on extending opposition participation failed to produce an agreement.

The EU is sending three electoral experts on mission from 24 May to 20 July to continue the work started at the time of the parliamentary and local elections in November/December 2013. Technical assistance will also be provided to the Independent National Electoral Commission (CENI). The EU will not be sending an Election Observation Mission (EOM), however, notably because the request was made very late by the Mauritanian authorities.

The EU is aware of the issues at stake in this complex country and is working with both the authorities and civil society to address the challenges it faces and to contribute to inclusive growth, paying particular attention to the needs of the most vulnerable sections of society and improving the human rights situation.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-005243/14
à la Commission
Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE)
(23 avril 2014)

Objet: Accord de partenariat volontaire Cameroun-UE relatif à l'application des réglementations forestières, de la gouvernance et des échanges commerciaux (FLEGT) — cas de la concession à SG Sustainable Oils Cameroon (SGSOC)

Selon les informations fournies par de nombreux rapports, un projet de production d'huile de palme élaboré par la compagnie américaine Herakles Farms et sa filiale locale SG Sustainable Oils Cameroon (SGSOC) entraînera la conversion d'une vaste section de la forêt tropicale à des fins de production d'huile de palme, ce qui aura des répercussions sur des milliers de personnes dépendant de la forêt pour subsister et constitue une violation du droit national et international. Il a été démontré l'existence d'un abattage illégal dans la concession attribuée à SGSOC. Les arbres abattus seraient marqués d'une façon indiquant une exploitation commerciale et, en fin de compte, l'exportation aux marchés étrangers.

1. La Commission est-elle d'avis que l'affaire Herakles Farms/SGSOC porte atteinte à l'accord de partenariat volontaire FLEGT Cameroun-UE et est à l'encontre de l'esprit et du texte de cet accord?

2. Quelles mesures la Commission entend-elle prendre en ce qui concerne l'affaire Herakles Farms/SGSOC pour veiller à ce que la crédibilité de l'accord de partenariat volontaire signé avec le Cameroun ne soit pas amoindrie?

3. La Commission demandera-t-elle aux autorités camerounaises de lancer une enquête approfondie en vue d'établir s'il y a eu ou non infraction? Que fera la Commission si les autorités camerounaises ne répondent pas de manière positive à cette demande dans un délai raisonnable? Quelles mesures la Commission entend-elle prendre si l'enquête conclut qu'il y a bien eu infraction à l'accord de partenariat volontaire FLEGT?

4. À court terme, que prévoient la Commission et les États membres pour s'assurer que le bois récolté illégalement sur la concession de Herakles Farms/SGSOC n'est pas commercialisé et exporté dans l'Union européenne ou dans d'autres marchés internationaux?

5. La Commission est-elle satisfaite du rythme des réformes et des détails de la mise en œuvre de l'accord de partenariat volontaire FLEGT au Cameroun? La participation des organisations de la société civile dans cette phase du processus est-elle assurée de manière suffisante?

6. De manière plus générale, pouvez-vous indiquer quelles mesures concrètes ont été prises pour réduire le risque de conversion des forêts et vérifier la légalité du bois issu de la conversion forestière dans les pays couverts par un accord de partenariat volontaire?

Réponse donnée par M. Piebalgs au nom de la Commission
(12 juin 2014)

1. La Commission est vivement préoccupée par les allégations relatives à la récolte illégale de bois dans le cadre du projet de Herakles, susceptible de nuire aux efforts du Cameroun pour combattre l'exploitation forestière illégale, efforts soutenus par l'Union européenne.

2. Bien qu'il ne soit pas destiné à traiter la question de la conversion forestière, l'accord de partenariat volontaire (APV) met en place des mécanismes visant à renforcer la vérification de la légalité, à répondre à des préoccupations communes, en particulier en ce qui concerne le régime d'autorisation FLEGT, et à promouvoir la transparence et un contrôle indépendant dans le secteur forestier. Bien que le régime d'autorisation FLEGT ne soit pas encore opérationnel, l'Union européenne coopère étroitement avec le gouvernement du Cameroun sur la question de la légalité du bois issu de la conversion forestière, dans le respect du droit souverain du Cameroun d'attribuer des terres pour l'agriculture et d'autres aménagements.

3. L'Union européenne a saisi à plusieurs reprises le ministre chargé des forêts au sujet de l'affaire Herakles et demandé au gouvernement du Cameroun de procéder à une enquête. Lors de la réunion du comité mixte de suivi d'avril 2014, les parties sont convenues de la création d'un groupe de travail chargé d'examiner les rapports sur la légalité du bois issu de la conversion forestière dans le cadre de l'APV et de proposer des réponses.

4. Tant que l'APV n'est pas opérationnel, le bois issu de la conversion forestière au Cameroun et exporté vers l'Union européenne est soumis au règlement de l'Union dans le domaine du bois.

5. La Commission estime que l'établissement des systèmes propres à permettre la mise en œuvre de l'APV au Cameroun progresse, mais que d'importantes difficultés doivent être résolues avant que la délivrance des autorisations FLEGT ne puisse débuter.

6. Outre l'APV, l'Union européenne finance l'observation indépendante des forêts et des efforts au titre du mécanisme REDD+ ([1]), et elle soutient un grand nombre d'initiatives nationales et internationales visant à promouvoir une meilleure gouvernance foncière et à améliorer la transparence dans l'acquisition des terres.

([1]) Réduction des émissions liées à la déforestation et à la dégradation des forêts.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005243/14
to the Commission
Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Cameroon-EU bilateral agreement on forest law enforcement, governance and trade (FLEGT) — case of concession to SG Sustainable Oils Cameroon (SGSOC)

According to information obtained through numerous reports, a palm oil project developed by the US-owned company Herakles Farms and its local subsidiary SG Sustainable Oils Cameroon (SGSOC) will lead to the conversion of a vast area of rainforest for palm oil, impacting thousands of people dependent on the forest for their livelihoods, and violating national and international law. Evidence has been presented of illegal logging in the concession area allocated to SGSOC. Logs are reportedly being marked in a way that indicates they are intended for commercial sale and eventually for export to foreign markets.

1. Does the Commission think that the Herakles Farms/SGSOC case undermines the Cameroon-EU bilateral agreement on FLEGT and violates the spirit and the text of this bilateral agreement?

2. What action will the Commission take in regard to the Herakles Farms/SGSOC case to ensure that the credibility of the VPA signed with Cameroon will not be affected?

3. Will the Commission ask Cameroonian authorities to undertake a full investigation to identify infringements? What will the Commission do if the Cameroonian authorities do not react positively to this request in a reasonable time? What action will the Commission take if the investigation concludes that infringements to the FLEGT bilateral agreement have occurred?

4. In the short term, what do the Commission and Member States plan to do to ensure that timber that was illegally harvested in the Herakles Farms/SGSOC concession is not commercialised and exported to the EU or other international markets?

5. Is the Commission satisfied with the pace of reform and details of the implementation of the FLEGT partnership agreement in Cameroon? Is the participation and involvement of civil society organisations in this phase of the process sufficiently secured?

6. More generally, can you tell us what concrete measures have been taken to reduce the risk of forest conversion and verify the legality of conversion timber in VPA countries?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2014)

1. The Commission is deeply concerned by allegations about illegal timber harvesting in the context of the Herakles project which could potentially affect Cameroonian efforts to combat illegal logging, which are supported by the EU.

2. Although not designed to address forest conversion, the volontary partnership agreement (VPA) creates mechanisms to strengthen legality verification, to adress common concerns, particularly in relation to the FLEGT licensing scheme, and to promote transparency and independent monitoring in the forest sector. Despite the fact that the FLEGT licensing system is not yet operational, the EU is engaging closely with the Government of Cameroon on the issue of the legality of conversion timber, with due respect to the sovereign right of Cameroon to allocate land for agriculture and other developments.

3. The EU has repeatedly seized the Minister of Forestry on the Herakles case and requested the Government to make an investigation. At the April 2014 Joint Monitoring Committee the Parties agreed to the creation of a working group to review reports on the legality of conversion timber in the context of the VPA and propose answers.

4. Until the VPA becomes operational, timber coming from forest conversion in Cameroon and exported to the EU is subject to the EU timber regulation.

5. The Commission believes that progress is being made in building the systems for the implementation of the Cameroon VPA but significant challenges must be addressed before FLEGT licensing can start.

6. Beside the VPA, the EU finances independent forest observation and REDD+ ([1]) efforts and supports a variety of national and international initiatives to promote better land governance and to increase the transparency of land acquisition.

([1]) Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-005244/14
à la Commission
Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE)
(23 avril 2014)

Objet: Taxe aux frontières de la France

Le gouvernement français envisage actuellement la mise en place d'une taxe aux frontières de son territoire pour les camions étrangers. La ministre de l'écologie propose deux solutions: un droit de péage ou une vignette, qui concerneraient uniquement les camions entrant sur le territoire français.

La Commission peut-elle nous dire si la France a le droit d'appliquer un traitement particulier aux camions européens entrant sur son territoire en raison de la nationalité du transporteur ou de l'origine des camions?

Réponse donnée par M. Kallas au nom de la Commission
(4 juin 2014)

La Commission a été informée de l'Ecotaxe et a rendu un avis favorable à ce sujet le 16 octobre 2013 ([1]). La France n'a cependant notifié à la Commission aucun autre dispositif de péage comportant l'application d'une redevance d'infrastructure envisagé par son gouvernement. Or une notification doit être présentée en vertu de l'article 7 *nonies* de la directive 1999/62/CE telle que modifiée ([2]). La Commission n'est donc actuellement pas en mesure d'évaluer la légalité du système de péage envisagé. Toutefois, en tant que principe général du droit, le principe de non-discrimination exercée en raison de la nationalité ([3]) doit être respecté par les États membres lors de la mise en œuvre de systèmes de péage. Dans ce contexte, il est important de faire la distinction entre, d'une part, les droits d'usage ou les péages, qui devraient s'appliquer à tous les utilisateurs indépendamment de la nationalité et, d'autre part, les taxes, qui devraient être acquittées dans l'État membre d'immatriculation du véhicule ([4]).

([1]) C (2013) 6758 final.
([2]) Directive 1999/62/CE du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 17 juin 1999 relative à la taxation des poids lourds pour l'utilisation de certaines infrastructures (JO L 187 du 20.7.1999, p. 42).
([3]) Article 18 TFUE.
([4]) Directive 1999/62/CE, article 5.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005244/14
to the Commission
Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Tax on crossing French borders

The French Government is currently considering introducing a tax on foreign lorries crossing its borders. The Environment Ministry is proposing two options, a toll or a vignette, which would be required only by lorries entering French territory.

Does France have the right to impose specific treatment on European lorries entering its territory on the grounds of the nationality of the transport operator or the country of origin of the lorries?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(4 June 2014)

Whereas the Commission was notified of the Ecotax and issued a positive opinion on 16 October 2013 ([1]), it has not been notified by France of any other infrastructure charge tolling arrangement envisaged by the French Government. Such a notification is required according to Article 7h of Directive 1999/62/EC as amended ([2]). For that reason, the Commission is currently not in a position to provide an assessment of the legality of the envisaged tolling arrangement. However, as a general principle of law, non-discrimination based on nationality ([3]) must be respected by the Member State when implementing infrastructure charge tolling arrangements. It is important in this context to distinguish between user charges or tolls, which should be paid by all users independently of nationality, and between taxes, which should be paid in the Member State of registration of vehicles ([4]).

([1]) C(2013) 6758 final.
([2]) Directive 1999/62/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17.6.1999 on the charging of heavy goods vehicles for the use of certain infrastructures, OJ L 187, 20.7.1999, p. 42-50.
([3]) TFEU Article 18.
([4]) Article 5 of Directive 1999/62/EC.

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-005246/14
upućeno Komisiji
Ruža Tomašić (ECR)
(23. travnja 2014.)

Predmet: Poštovanje roka od 48 sati za pokretanje poduzeća u svim državama članicama

U svojoj rezoluciji o pogodnom okruženju za poduzeća, poslovne djelatnosti i novoosnovana poduzeća za stvaranje radnih mjesta Parlament je pozvao države članice na poštovanje njihovih obveza koje proizlaze iz Akta o malom poduzetništvu, a prema kojemu članice moraju omogućiti pokretanje poduzeća unutar najviše 48 sati.

Nažalost, u više država članica takav se rok ne poštuje zbog neprikladnog pravnog okvira i sporosti javne uprave. Iz tih razloga pokretanje poduzeća u roku do 10 dana u nekolicini država članica predstavlja velik uspjeh, ali je svejedno daleko od cilja koji želimo postići i koji Parlament promovira u svojoj rezoluciji.

S obzirom na presudnost ovog pitanja za jačanje poduzetničkog duha u Europi i posljedično smanjenje nezaposlenosti, željela bih znati je li Komisija svjesna da samo mali broj država članica poštuje postavljeni rok od 48 sati za pokretanje poduzeća. Što Komisija čini kako bi se taj strateški cilj Unije, važan za njezin budući gospodarski prosperitet, u što kraćem roku počeo poštovati u svim državama članicama?

Odgovor g. Tajanija u ime Komisije
(16. lipnja 2014.)

Komisija sustavno potiče države članice da pojačaju svoje institucionalne i administrativne kapacitete, pojednostavne i smanje administrativni teret za poduzeća te poboljšaju kvalitetu zakonodavstva kako bi se potaknuo gospodarski rast. Osim u pogledu administrativnog pojednostavnjenja, Komisija podliježe pravilu supsidijarnosti i nije nadležna za izravno djelovanje u državama članicama.

U dokumentima koje je Komisija do sada objavila ne spominje se razdoblje od 48 sati potrebno za pokretanje poduzeća u državama članicama.

Godine 2011. na Vijeću za konkurentnost pozvalo se države članice da „smanje vrijeme potrebno za pokretanje novih poduzeća na tri radna dana, a trošak na 100 EUR do 2012." Od 2008. kada je donesen Akt o malom poduzetništvu (AMP) prosječno vrijeme koje je potrebno za pokretanje poduzeća smanjeno je s devet na četiri dana, a trošak s 463 EUR na 315 EUR u 2013.

Trenutačno u osamnaest država članica potrebno vrijeme za osnivanje dioničkog društva iznosi tri dana ili manje. U četiri države članice za to je još uvijek potrebno od 10 do 16 dana.

Komisija će nastaviti ispitivati i pratiti stanje u državama članicama u cilju utvrđivanja je li prikladno i potrebno poduzeti dodatne mjere na razini EU-a.

Sve informacije o toj temi i o godišnjem napretku pojedinih država možete pronaći na sljedećem *web*-mjestu:
http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/business-environment/start-up-procedures/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005246/14
to the Commission
Ruža Tomašić (ECR)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Respecting the 48-hour period for starting a business in all Member States

In its resolution on creating a hospitable environment for enterprises, businesses and start-ups to create jobs, Parliament called on the Member States to meet their commitments arising from the Small Business Act, which obliges Member States to ensure that businesses can be set up within a maximum of 48 hours.

Unfortunately, though, many Member States are failing to respect this timeframe owing to an inadequate legal framework and to the slowness of public administrations. For those reasons, reducing the time required to set up a business in some Member States to 10 days can be seen as a major success. However, this is still far from the objective which we aim to achieve and which Parliament is promoting in its resolution.

This issue is of crucial importance to strengthening entrepreneurial spirit in Europe and thus to reducing unemployment. In this connection, is the Commission aware that only a small number of Member States are respecting the 48-hour timeframe for setting up a business? What steps is the Commission taking to ensure that this strategic EU goal, which is important for the EU's future economic prosperity, is respected as quickly as possible in all Member States?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(16 June 2014)

The Commission consistently encourages the Member States to strengthen their institutional and administrative capacity, simplify and reduce the administrative burden on businesses and improve the quality of legislation in order to foster economic growth. Beyond administrative simplification the Commission is subject to the rule of subsidiarity and is not competent to directly act in Member States.

There is no reference to the 48 hours period to start a company in the Member States in the documents published so far by the Commission.

In 2011, the Competitiveness Council invited Member States 'to reduce the start-up time for new enterprises to 3 days and the cost to EUR 100 by 2012'. Since 2008, when the Small Business Act (SBA) was adopted, the average time and cost of starting up a business have been reduced from 9 to 4 days and from EUR 463 to EUR 315 in 2013.

Currently, in eighteen Member States the time to start a public limited company is less or equal to 3 days. In four Member States it still takes between 10 to 16 days.

The Commission will further study and monitor the situation in the Members States with a view to establish whether further measures are appropriate and necessary at EU level.

All information on this issue and year-on-year progress for each country can be found in:
http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/business-environment/start-up-procedures/index_en.htm

(Hrvatska verzija)

Pitanje za pisani odgovor E-005247/14
upućeno Komisiji
Ruža Tomašić (ECR)
(23. travnja 2014.)

Predmet: Ubrzanje procesa pristupanja Hrvatske u zonu Schengena

U sklopu prijedloga Uredbe Europskog parlamenta i Vijeća o utvrđivanju pravila za nadzor vanjskih morskih granica u kontekstu operativne suradnje koju koordinira Europska agencija za upravljanje operativnom suradnjom na vanjskim granicama država članica EU-a Parlament je izglasao amandman i usvojio odredbe o mehanizmima solidarnosti. Na temelju tih odredbi članica suočena sa situacijom žurnog i izvanrednog pritiska na svojoj vanjskoj granici može zatražiti raspoređivanje timova europske granične straže, tehničku i operativnu pomoć ili žurnu pomoć radi rješavanja žurnih i posebnih potreba u slučaju izvanredne situacije.

Hrvatska je, kao članica s najdužom vanjskom kopnenom granicom te značajnom vanjskom morskom granicom, suočena s velikim pritiscima, osobito što se tiče krijumčarenja ljudima, drogom i krivotvorenim proizvodima.

Početkom mjeseca hrvatska je policija u šibenskom akvatoriju zaplijenila 805 kilograma marihuane u 770 paketa skrivenih u potplatima broda. Ta zaplijenjena isporuka odvijala se u sklopu organiziranog lanca krijumčarenja droge iz Albanije u Hrvatsku radi vjerojatne prodaje u zapadnoj Europi.

Željela bih znati je li Komisija svjesna pritisaka na hrvatske granice te ima li namjeru ubrzati proces pristupanja Hrvatske u šengenski prostor. Ako ne, na koje druge instrumente Hrvatska može računati kako bi se mogla još učinkovitije nositi sa svim oblicima krijumčarenja na svojim granicama?

Odgovor gđe Malmström u ime Komisije
(24. lipnja 2014.)

Od pristupanja EU-u Hrvatska primjenjuje sve odredbe o kontroli osoba i robe na vanjskim granicama iako još nije dio schengenskog prostora. Omogućeno joj je korištenje schengenskog instrumenta u svrhu postizanja visoke razine kontrole osoba na vanjskim granicama. U razdoblju od 1. srpnja 2013. do 31. prosinca 2014. Hrvatska može iskoristiti 120 milijuna EUR za financiranje aktivnosti na vanjskim granicama.

Hrvatska treba izraziti spremnost da bude ocijenjena u okviru evaluacije schengenskog prostora s ciljem ukidanja kontrole na unutarnjim granicama. Kad Hrvatska dostavi tu izjavu, Komisija će zajedno sa stručnjacima država članica ocijeniti ispunjava li ona sve preduvjete za ulazak u schengenski prostor ([1]). Nakon pozitivne ocjene Vijeće odlučuje o ukidanju kontrole na unutarnjim granicama.

Komisija se obvezala promicati, razvijati i jačati aspekte provedbe zakona koji se tiču borbe protiv nezakonitog trgovanja drogom. Ona se u EU-u vrši provedbom Pakta EU-a o drogama i njegovim proširenjem na sintetičke droge. Posebna pozornost trenutačno se posvećuje ciklusu politike EU-a o teškom i organiziranom kriminalu, što je dragocjen prvi pokušaj temeljenja suradnje na razini EU-a u području prekograničnoga kriminala na policijskoj djelatnosti na temelju obavijesnih podataka. Prioriteti trenutačnog ciklusa politike obuhvaćaju borbu protiv nezakonitog trgovanja heroinom, kokainom i psihoaktivnim tvarima. Vanjska dimenzija prijetnje dio je razmatranja.

([1]) Uredba Vijeća 1053/2013 o uspostavi mehanizma evaluacije i praćenja za provjeru primjene schengenske pravne stečevine (SL L 295, 6.11.2013.).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005247/14
to the Commission
Ruža Tomašić (ECR)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Accelerating Croatia's accession to the Schengen zone

Parliament voted for an amendment and adopted provisions on a solidarity mechanism in respect of the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing rules for the surveillance of the external sea borders in the context of operational cooperation coordinated by the European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Members States of the European Union. Pursuant to these provisions, a Member State faced with a situation of urgent and exceptional pressure on its external frontier may request the deployment of teams of European border guards, technical and operational assistance, or urgent assistance in meeting vital and exceptional needs in an extraordinary situation.

Croatia — as the Member State with the largest external land frontier and with a significant external maritime frontier — is under huge pressure caused, in particular, by people trafficking and the smuggling of drugs and counterfeit goods.

At the start of the month, Croatian police seized 770 packages containing 805 kilograms of marijuana in waters near Šibenik. The packages had been hidden beneath the deck of a boat. The seized consignment was being smuggled as part of an organised chain that smuggles drugs from Albania to Croatia, with the ultimate destination likely being Western Europe.

Is the Commission aware of the pressure being put on Croatia's frontiers, and does it intend to accelerate the process of Croatia's accession to the Schengen area? If not, then what other instruments can Croatia count on in order to deal more effectively with all forms of smuggling along its frontiers?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(24 June 2014)

Although Croatia is not yet a member of the Schengen area, since its EU accession it applies all the provisions on external border control on persons and goods. In order to achieve a high level of external border control on persons, Croatia is benefitting from the Schengen Facility. For the period 1 July 2013 to 31 December 2014, Croatia can make use of EUR 120 million in order to finance actions at the external border.

Croatia needs to declare its readiness to be evaluated for a Schengen evaluation in view of lifting internal border control. Once such a declaration is made by Croatia, the Commission, together with Member States' experts, will verify that Croatia fulfils all the preconditions for joining the Schengen area ([1]). Upon a positive evaluation, it is for the Council to decide to lift internal border control.

The Commission is committed to promoting, developing and enhancing law enforcement aspects of fight against drug trafficking. The fight against drug trafficking is carried out in the EU through the implementation of the EU Pact on drugs and its extension to synthetic drugs. Much attention is currently devoted to the EU policy cycle on serious and organised crime, which is a valuable first attempt to base cooperation at EU level on cross-border crime phenomena on the concept of intelligence-led policing. The priorities of the current cycle concern the fight against drug trafficking for heroin, cocaine and psychoactive substances. The external dimension of the threat is part of the reflection.

([1]) Council Regulation 1053/2013 establishing an evaluation and monitoring mechanism to verify the application of the Schengen *acquis* (OJ L 295 of 6.11.2013).

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005249/14
do Komisji
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)
(23 kwietnia 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Uchodźcy z Syrii

W związku z wojną domową w Syrii trwającą od 2011 r. do Unii Europejskiej przybywa coraz więcej imigrantów. Jednakże krajem, w którym zanotowano w ostatnim czasie największy napływ ludności syryjskiej, jest Bułgaria, najbiedniejszy kraj UE. Rząd bułgarski twierdzi, że nie ma wystarczających środków, aby wszystkim ubiegającym się o azyl polityczny zapewnić odpowiednie warunki bytu w obozach dla uchodźców. Obozy często są przepełnione, uchodźcy śpią w nieogrzewanych pomieszczeniach, niejednokrotnie brakuje łazienek, występują przerwy w dostawie prądu itd.

W jaki sposób Komisja planuje rozwiązać kwestię uchodźców z Syrii przebywających w Unii Europejskiej?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Cecilię Malmström w imieniu Komisji
(10 czerwca 2014 r.)

Komisja wraz z Europejskim Urzędem Wsparcia w dziedzinie Azylu (EASO) śledziła i nadal uważnie śledzi rozwój sytuacji w terenie. Komisja poruszyła również z Bułgarią szereg konkretnych problemów dotyczących jej procedury azylowej, w tym warunków życia osób ubiegających się o azyl i uchodźców w bułgarskich ośrodkach recepcyjnych. Komisja z zadowoleniem przyjmuje fakt, że władze bułgarskie podejmują działania mające na celu poprawę sytuacji osób ubiegających się o azyl i uchodźców.

Komisja przekazała Bułgarii, celem wsparcia tego kraju, około 8 mln EUR z tytułu pomocy finansowej w sytuacjach wyjątkowych. Środki te wykorzystano głównie na zwiększenie i poprawę możliwości przyjmowania i zakwaterowania osób ubiegających się o azyl (np. renowację i remonty ośrodków recepcyjnych, zapewnienie podstawowych usług takich jak żywność lub opieka medyczna) oraz zwiększenie możliwości władz bułgarskich w zakresie efektywniejszej rejestracji i rozpatrywania wniosków o azyl. W ostatnim sprawozdaniu w sprawie sytuacji w Bułgarii, Wysoki Komisarz Narodów Zjednoczonych ds. Uchodźców przyznał, że wsparcie to miało znaczący wpływ na poprawę sytuacji. Komisja jest niezmiennie zdecydowana w razie konieczności wspierać Bułgarię lub każde inne państwo członkowskie, którego system azylowy może być zagrożony.

Ponadto Urząd podpisał plan operacyjny z Bułgarią, pozwalający na wysyłanie ekspertów oddelegowanych przez inne państwa członkowskie do wspierania władz bułgarskich na miejscu. Zespoły ekspertów działać będą do września 2014 r.

Na wniosek i jeżeli uzna się to za konieczne, inne państwa członkowskie, których systemy azylowe znajdują się pod presją z powodu nagłego i nieoczekiwanego wzrostu liczby osób ubiegających się o azyl również mogą kwalifikować się do wsparcia.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005249/14
to the Commission
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Syrian refugees

Since the beginning of the Syrian civil war in 2011, ever increasing numbers of immigrants have been entering the EU. The country that has seen the greatest influx of Syrian refugees in recent times, however, is Bulgaria, the poorest of all the Member States. According to the Bulgarian Government, the country lacks the resources needed to guarantee all political asylum-seekers decent living conditions in refugee camps. Among other things, these camps are frequently overcrowded, refugees sleep in unheated buildings, with no proper sanitary facilities, and power cuts are not uncommon.

How does the Commission plan to address the problem of coping with Syrian refugees in the EU?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(10 June 2014)

The Commission, together with the European Asylum Support Office (EASO), has been and still is closely following the situation on the ground. The Commission has also raised with Bulgaria a number of specific concerns regarding its asylum procedure, including the living conditions for asylum-seekers and refugees in Bulgarian reception and accommodation centres. The Commission welcomes the fact that the Bulgarian authorities are taking measures in order to improve the situation of asylum-seekers and refugees.

The Commission has provided some EUR 8 million in emergency funding to Bulgaria to support the country. This funding has been used mainly to increase and improve reception and accommodation capacity for asylum-seekers (e.g. renovation and refurbishing of reception centres, provision of basic services such as food or medical care) and to increase the capacity of the Bulgarian authorities to register and process requests for asylum more efficiently. In a recent report on the situation in Bulgaria, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees acknowledged that this support has had a significant impact on the improvement of the situation. The Commission remains committed to supporting Bulgaria or any other Member State whose asylum system might be under pressure, if necessary.

In addition, the EASO has signed an Operational Plan with Bulgaria, allowing for the deployment of experts seconded by other Member States to support the Bulgarian authorities on the ground. The teams of experts will remain operational until September 2014.

If requested and considered necessary, other Member States whose asylum systems are under pressure due to sudden and unexpected increase in the number of asylum-seekers could also be eligible for support.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005250/14
do Komisji
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)
(23 kwietnia 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Wzrost ilości zamówień militarnych w Afryce

Afryka jest kontynentem najbiedniejszych krajów na świecie, mimo to w ostatnim czasie zaobserwowano rosnącą liczbę zamówień militarnych, co może przyczynić się do wzrostu liczebności lub intensywności konfliktów na tym obszarze. Mówi się, że w latach 2003-2012 import uzbrojenia przez kraje afrykańskie wzrósł o 104 procent. Ponadto w wielu krajach afrykańskich pieniądze są przeznaczane na zbrojenia zamiast na rozwój tych krajów.

Czy istnieje możliwość sprawdzenia, jak wydatkowane są pieniądze, które Unia Europejska przekazuje w ramach pomocy dla Afryki? Z jakich instrumentów korzysta Unia Europejska w tej kwestii?

Jakie działania powinny podjąć instytucje Unii Europejskiej, by więcej środków finansowych przeznaczano na rozwój oraz pomoc najuboższym, a nie na militaryzację na obszarze Afryki?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Andrisa Piebalgsa w imieniu Komisji
(24 czerwca 2014 r.)

Zgodnie z obowiązującymi podstawami prawnymi sprzęt wojskowy jest wykluczony z zakresu kwalifikowalności w ramach instrumentów finansowych współpracy rozwojowej UE dla Afryki. Konkretniej, w ramach Europejskiego Funduszu Rozwoju, decyzje w sprawie finansowania Instrumentu na rzecz Pokoju w Afryce wyraźnie wykluczają finansowanie amunicji, broni i określonego sprzętu wojskowego, części zamiennych, żołdu i szkoleń wojskowych.

Ponadto istnieją środki, które mają zagwarantować, że fundusze pomocy zewnętrznej UE są wydatkowane zgodnie z ich założonymi celami, określonymi w dokumentach programowych i powiązanych planach działania. Warunkiem wypłat środków partnerom wdrażającym jest przedkładanie przez nich sprawozdań finansowych i operacyjnych. Jeśli chodzi o wsparcie budżetowe, płatności są uzależnione od spełnienia kryteriów kwalifikowalności oraz od postępów w osiąganiu ustalonych i jasno określonych celów. Wszystkie przypadki pomocy zewnętrznej UE podlegają monitorowaniu zewnętrznemu i wewnętrznemu, jak również niezależnym ocenom i audytom.

Mając na uwadze, że głównym celem polityki współpracy rozwojowej UE powinno pozostać zwalczanie ubóstwa, Komisja aktywnie przyczynia się do określenia ram pomocy rozwojowej po 2015 r. i ustalenia celów zrównoważonego rozwoju.

Ze względu na fakt, że zgodnie z Traktatami współpraca rozwojowa wchodzi w zakres kompetencji równoległych, Komisja nie ingeruje w priorytety określane przez państwa członkowskie w ramach ich pomocy dwustronnej dla państw trzecich. Wspólne zasady kontroli wywozu technologii wojskowych i sprzętu wojskowego przez państwa członkowskie określono na poziomie UE w drodze wspólnego stanowiska Rady 2008/944/WPZiB, w celu ograniczenia ryzyka niewłaściwego końcowego przeznaczenia środków.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005250/14
to the Commission
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Increase in orders of military equipment in Africa

Despite containing many of the world's poorest countries, Africa has been importing ever-larger volumes of military equipment over recent years, which may help to explain the increase in the number and intensity of conflicts there. Arms imports are said to have increased by 104% between 2003 and 2012, and many African countries are spending their money on weapons rather than development.

Is there any way of ascertaining how EU aid for Africa is being spent? What means does the EU have of doing this?

What steps should the EU institutions take to ensure that funding is spent on development and helping the poor, rather than on militarisation?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(24 June 2014)

The applicable legal bases exclude military equipment from the eligibility scope of EU development cooperation financial instruments relevant to Africa. More specifically, within the European Development Fund, the Financing Decisions of the African Peace Facility expressly exclude the funding of ammunition, arms and specific military equipment, spare parts, salaries for soldiers and military training.

Furthermore, measures are in place to ascertain that EU external assistance funds are not diverted from their assigned objectives as defined in the programming documents and related action plans. Financial and operational reporting is required from the implementing partners as a condition for payment. In the case of budget support, payments are linked to the verification of eligibility criteria and progress in meeting agreed and clearly defined targets. All EU external aid interventions are subject to internal and external monitoring as well as independent evaluations and audits.

In order to keep the focus on poverty eradication as the central objective of EU development cooperation policy, the Commission is actively contributing to the framing of the post-2015 development framework and definition of the sustainable development goals.

Considering that development cooperation is a parallel competence according to the Treaties, the Commission does not intervene in Member States' priority setting regarding their bilateral aid to third countries. At EU level, the Council Common Position 2008/944/CFSP has defined common rules governing the control of exports of military technology and equipment by Member States with the view to mitigating risks of diversion in terms of end-use and end-user.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005251/14
do Komisji
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(23 kwietnia 2014 r.)

Przedmiot: Dyskryminacja osób niepełnosprawnych ruchowo

Jak poinformował mnie jeden z moich wyborców, specjalista farmacji, od 7 lat osobom niepełnosprawnym ruchowo uniemożliwia się dostęp do zawodu farmaceuty. Wydziały nie są przystosowane do przyjęcia takich studentów, nie stwarza się im możliwości odbycia stażu lub praktyk.

Co więcej, bez ukończenia stażu lub praktyk nie jest możliwe podjęcie pracy w tym zawodzie.

Takie działania to niewątpliwie łamanie praw osób niepełnosprawnych oraz uniemożliwianie im podjęcia studiów i pracy w wymarzonym dla nich kierunku.

W związku z tym zwracam się z zapytaniem, czy Komisja posiada informacje na temat dyskryminacji osób niepełnosprawnych ruchowo w zakresie ich kształcenia i pracy w zawodzie farmaceuty? Czy Komisja zamierza zbadać tę kwestię i podjąć interwencję w tej sprawie?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Viviane Reding w imieniu Komisji
(23 czerwca 2014 r.)

Komisja nie posiada szczegółowych informacji na temat dyskryminacji osób niepełnosprawnych ruchowo, które chcą kształcić się w dziedzinie farmacji i pracować jako farmaceuci.

Zgodnie z przepisami UE zawartymi w dyrektywie 2000/78/WE dyskryminacja w zakresie zatrudnienia i pracy ze względu na, między innymi, niepełnosprawność jest zakazana ([1]). Na mocy dyrektywy pracodawcy muszą wprowadzać racjonalne usprawnienia dla osób niepełnosprawnych, co oznacza, że podejmują oni środki, „aby umożliwić osobie niepełnosprawnej dostęp do pracy, wykonywanie jej lub rozwój zawodowy bądź kształcenie, o ile środki te nie nakładają na pracodawcę nieproporcjonalnie wysokich obciążeń".

Dyrektywa ta ma zastosowanie w odniesieniu do zatrudnienia, pracy na własny rachunek oraz wszelkich rodzajów kształcenia zawodowego. Orzecznictwo Trybunału Sprawiedliwości wskazuje, że poza kilkoma wyjątkami studia uniwersyteckie ogólnie uznaje się za formę kształcenia zawodowego ([2]).

Dyrektywa 2000/78/WE została prawidłowo transponowana we wszystkich państwach członkowskich. W związku z tym jeśli dana osoba uważa, że jest dyskryminowana ze względu na niepełnosprawność, może wszcząć postępowanie sądowe przewidziane w prawie krajowym i zaskarżyć ewentualne naruszenie przed sądami krajowymi.

([1]) Dyrektywa Rady 2000/78/WE z dnia 27 listopada 2000 r. ustanawiająca ogólne warunki ramowe równego traktowania w zakresie zatrudnienia i pracy, Dz.U. L 303 z 2.12.2000, s. 16.

([2]) Wyrok Trybunału Sprawiedliwości z dnia 21 lipca 2011 r. w sprawie C 104/10 Kelly, Zb.Orz. 2011, s. I-6813; zob. także wyroki Trybunału Sprawiedliwości z dnia 13 lutego 1985 r. w sprawie 293/83, Gravier Rec. 1985, s. 593, pkt 30 oraz z dnia 2 lutego 1988 r. w sprawie 24/86 Blaizot and Others, Rec. 1988, s. 379, pkt 19-20.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005251/14
to the Commission
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Discrimination against people with reduced mobility

According to one of my constituents, a pharmacy specialist, for the last seven years people with reduced mobility have been unable to enter the pharmacy profession. Universities are not equipped to cater for students with disabilities, and there are no opportunities for work placements.

It is impossible to work in the pharmacy profession without having undertaken a work placement of some kind.

This is a clear violation of the rights of people with disabilities, and it prevents them from pursuing their chosen career.

Does the Commission have any information on discrimination against people with reduced mobility who wish to train and work as pharmacists? Does it intend to look into this matter and take any action that may be appropriate?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(23 June 2014)

The Commission does not have specific information on discrimination against people with reduced mobility who wish to train and work as pharmacists.

Under EC law, Directive 2000/78/EC prohibits discrimination in employment and occupation based on, *inter alia*, disability. ([1]) According to the directive, employers have to provide reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities, meaning that they take measures 'to enable a person with a disability to have access to, participate in, or advance in employment, or to undergo training, unless such measures would impose a disproportionate burden on the employer.'

The directive applies to access to employment, self-employment, as well as to access to all types of vocational training. The case law of the EU Court of Justice indicates that, with only a few exceptions, university studies are in general to be considered as a form of vocational training. ([2])

Directive 2000/78/EC has been correctly transposed in all Member States. Therefore, if a person believes that she has been discriminated on the grounds of disability, she can initiate legal proceedings provided for in the national law and contest possible offences before the national courts.

([1]) Council Directive 2000/78/EC of 27 November 2000 establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation, OJ L 303, 2.12.2000, p. 16.

([2]) Judgment of the Court of 21 July 2011, in Case C-104/10 *Kelly* [2011] ECR I-6813; see also the judgments of the Court of 13 February 1985 in Case 293/83 *Gravier* [1985] ECR 593, paragraph 30 and of 2 February 1988 in Case 24/86 *Blaizot and Others* [1988] ECR 379, paragraphs 19-20.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-005252/14
an die Kommission
Jörg Leichtfried (S&D)
(23. April 2014)

Betrifft: Geplante Obsoleszenz von Produkten

Das Thema der geplanten Obsoleszenz (bzw. geplanter Verschleiß bzw. auch eingebaute Schwachstelle) sorgt bei immer mehr Konsumentinnen und Konsumenten in Europa für Unmut, etwa im Elektronik- oder Haushaltsbereich. Manche Hersteller setzen mit einem bewusst früh angesetzten Ablaufdatum für technische Geräte ein schlechtes Signal in Bezug auf Umwelt- und Verbraucherschutz.

1. Ist der Kommission das Problem der geplanten Obsoleszenz bewusst?

2. Liegen der Kommission Studien und Untersuchungen zu diesem Thema vor?

3. Gibt es Pläne der Kommission, nach denen hier Verbesserungen des Umwelt- und des Verbraucherschutzes erreicht werden sollen?

Antwort von Herrn Tajani im Namen der Kommission
(11. Juni 2014)

Der Herr Abgeordnete wird auf frühere Antworten auf parlamentarische Anfragen in Bezug auf die geplante Obsoleszenz, unter anderem E-3441/13 und E-6339/13, verwiesen.

Die Kommission ist der Auffassung, dass die geplante Obsoleszenz einen negativen Einfluss auf die Verbraucherinteressen, die Umwelt und auf faire Wettbewerbsbedingungen ausübt. In der EU-Gesetzgebung sind Mittel zur Bekämpfung solcher Praktiken vorgesehen. Die Ökodesign-Richtlinie ([1]) sieht Anforderungen an die Reparaturfähigkeit und die Verlängerung der Lebensdauer von Produkten und Geräten vor und schafft die Möglichkeit, beim Vorliegen schwerwiegender ökologischer Auswirkungen obligatorische Ökodesign-Anforderungen festzulegen ([2]). Anforderungen an die Produktentwicklung sind ebenfalls in der Neufassung der WEEE-Richtlinie ([3]) enthalten.

Im Allgemeinen erhalten die Verbraucher mit der Richtlinie 1999/44/EG ([4]) das Recht auf eine Garantie von mindestens zwei Jahren. Erweist sich ein Produkt als fehlerhaft oder entspricht es nicht der Darstellung oder Funktionsweise in der Werbung, ist der Verkäufer verpflichtet, das Produkt ohne Entgelt zu reparieren oder zu ersetzen. Wenn nachgewiesen werden kann, dass ein Produkt mit einer begrenzten Lebensspanne entwickelt wurde und der Verbraucher nicht über diese Tatsache informiert wurde, kann dies als eine unlautere Geschäftspraktik im Sinne der Richtlinie 2005/29/EG ([5]) betrachtet werden.

Freiwillige europäische Maßnahmen, darunter auch Umweltgütesiegel, können ebenfalls potenziell eine größere Rolle dabei spielen, umweltbezogenen Anforderungen für die gesamte Lebensdauer von Produkten, Verfahren und Dienstleistunen Rechnung zu tragen.

Zur Förderung eines stärker nachhaltigen Verbrauchs wird die Kommission Maßnahmen in Betracht ziehen, um Verbraucherprodukte länger haltbar zu machen, wozu auch die Unterstützung von Reparatur- und Instandhaltungsdienstleistungen ([6]) gehört. Jüngste Maßnahmen in diesem Zusammenhang umfassen die Prüfung der Materialeffizienz für Ökodesign, wobei der Produklebenszyklus einen der untersuchten Bereiche darstellte ([7]), darüber hinaus leitete die Kommission unlängst eine Studie zur Produkthaltbarkeit ([8]) ein, in deren Rahmen die Haltbarkeitsanforderungen entwickelt werden sollten.

([1]) Richtlinie 2009/125/EG, ABl. L 285 vom 31.10.2009.
([2]) So werden die Lebensdauer oder die Haltbarkeit beispielsweise in der Ökodesign-Verordnung Nr. 244/2009 (Lampenlebensdauer von 6 000 h) und in der Ökodesign-Verordnung Nr. 666/2013 über Staubsauger geregelt.
([3]) Richtlinie 2012/19/EU über Elektro- und Elektronik-Altgeräte (WEEE) (Neufassung), ABl. L 197 vom 24.7.2012.
([4]) Richtlinie 1999/44/EG zu bestimmten Aspekten des Verbrauchsgüterkaufs und der Garantien für Verbrauchsgüter, ABl. L 171 vom 7. Juli 1999, S. 12.
([5]) Richtlinie 2005/29/EG über unlautere Geschäftspraktiken, ABl. L 149 vom 11.6.2005, S. 22.
([6]) Dargestellt in der Mitteilung der Kommission zu einer Verbraucheragenda, KOM(2012)225 endg.
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/DocsRoom/documents/105
([8]) http://www.productdurability.eu/

(English version)

Question for written answer P-005252/14
to the Commission
Jörg Leichtfried (S&D)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Built-in obsolescence of products

Consumers in Europe are becoming increasingly impatient with the built-in obsolescence (or vulnerability to wear-and-tear and even built-in flaws) of some products, in particular electronic goods or domestic appliances. Some manufacturers deliberately underestimate the life of their technical products: this sends the wrong signal in terms of environmental and consumer protection.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Is it aware of the problem of built-in obsolescence?

2. Does it have at its disposal any studies or research findings on this topic?

3. Does it have any plans to improve environmental and consumer protection in this connection?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2014)

The Honourable Member is invited to consult previous answers to parliamentary questions concerning the area of planned obsolescence, *inter alia* E-3441/13 and E-6339/13.

The Commission considers that planned obsolescence has negative impacts on consumers' interests, on the environment, and on fair competition. European legislation provides means to combat such practices. The Ecodesign Directive ([1]) foresees requirements for reparability and the life-time extension of products and equipment, and enables mandatory ecodesign requirements to be set whenever environmental impacts are found to be significant ([2]). Product design requirements are also included in the recast WEEE Directive ([3]).

More generally, Directive 1999/44/EC ([4]) gives consumers the right to a minimum two-year guarantee. If an item turns out to be faulty or does not look or work as advertised, the seller must repair or replace it free of charge. If a product is proven to have been designed with a limited lifetime and the consumer is not informed about this fact, it could be considered as an unfair commercial practice under Directive 2005/29/EC ([5]).

Voluntary European measures, including Ecolabels, may also have the potential to play a more important role to take environmental requirements into account for the whole life cycle of products, processes and services.

In order to promote more sustainable consumption, the Commission will consider taking measures to make consumer goods more durable, including support for repair and maintenance services ([6]). Recent related activities include an examination of material efficiency for ecodesign where product lifetime was one area analysed ([7]), and the Commission recently launched a product durability study ([8]) to develop durability requirements.

([1]) Directive 2009/125/EC, OJ L 285, 31.10.2009.
([2]) Lifetime or durability is regulated, for example, in Ecodesign Regulation 244/2009 (Lamp lifetime of 6 000 h), and in Ecodesign Regulation 666/2013 on vacuum cleaners.
([3]) Directive 2012/19/EU on waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE) (recast), OJ L 197, 24.7.2012.
([4]) Directive 1999/44/EC on certain aspects of the sale of consumer goods and associated guarantees, OJ L 171 of 7.7.1999, p.12.
([5]) Directive 2005/29/EC concerning unfair commercial practices, OJ L 149, 11.6.2005, p.22.
([6]) Indicated in the communication of the Commission on a Consumer Agenda COM(2012) 225 final.
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/DocsRoom/documents/105
([8]) http://www.productdurability.eu/

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita P-005253/14
à Comissão
Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE)
(23 de abril de 2014)

Assunto: Tratamento de dados pelas agências da UE

Estarão a Europol e outras agências da UE habilitadas a continuar a proceder ao tratamento de dados armazenados em conformidade com a Diretiva relativa à conservação de dados ou será que um tal tratamento é ilegal na medida em que a respetiva base jurídica foi declarada nula?

Resposta dada por Cecilia Malmström em nome da Comissão
(12 de junho de 2014)

A Europol não tem acesso direto a dados gerados ou tratados no contexto da oferta de serviços de comunicações eletrónicas publicamente disponíveis ou de redes públicas de comunicações. A Agência recebe informações provenientes das autoridades competentes dos Estados-Membros, que, por sua vez, recolhem dados com base na sua legislação nacional.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-005253/14
to the Commission
Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Data processing by EU agencies

Can Europol and other EU agencies continue to process data stored in accordance with the Data Retention Directive, or is such processing illegal since the legal basis for it was declared void?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2014)

Europol has no direct access to any data generated or processed in connection with the provision of publicly available electronic communications services or of public communications networks. The Agency receives information from the Member States' competent authorities, which, in turn, collect data on the basis of their national legislation.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-005255/14
an die Kommission
Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE)
(23. April 2014)

Betrifft: Beihilfe für den Flughafen Berlin-Brandenburg (BER)

Die Flughafengesellschaft Berlin-Brandenburg mbH benötigt eine Kapitalzuführung in Höhe von ca. 1,1 Mrd. EUR. Laut Untersuchungsausschuss sind die Ursachen der Probleme schon weit vor 2012 zu suchen, und eine notwendige Professionalisierung des Flughafenbaus hat bis heute nicht stattgefunden. Ebenso zeigte sich, dass die Finanz-Risikovorsorge mangelhaft war und weiterhin ist.

1. Wie konnte die EU-Kommission sicher sein, dass die bisher von der Bundesregierung übermittelten Finanzeckdaten (EU-Beihilfe-Überprüfung) vollständig und umfassend waren, bzw. anhand welcher objektiven Kriterien wurde Ihre Annahme überprüft?

2. War die Bilanz 2012 Grundlage Ihrer Wirtschaftlichkeitsüberprüfung des BER? Wenn nein, wie unterscheiden sich die Ihnen vorgelegten Zahlen von den Jahresabschlusszahlen der FBB 2012?

3. Wie beurteilt die Kommission den Jahresabschluss 2012, in dem wesentliche Risiken und Verbindlichkeiten nicht bilanziert wurden (u.a. keine Bildung von Rückstellungen von 600 Mio. EUR für den Schallschutz, kein ausreichender Ausweis von Verbindlichkeiten gegenüber Auftragnehmern in Höhe von ca. 400 Mio. EUR trotz vorliegender Rechnungen und bereits erbrachter Leistungen, unzureichende Bildung von Rückstellungen u. a. für Schadenersatzverpflichtungen gegenüber Dritten wie z. B. Mietern oder Fluggesellschaften wegen der Verschiebung des Eröffnungstermins)?

4. Wie beurteilt die Kommission eine evtl. Manipulation der Bilanzzahlen und der Finanzlage der FBB und deren Auswirkungen u. a. auf den Cash Flow, die Eigenkapitalquote und den Verschuldungsgrad?

5. Gälten — in Anbetracht der bisher nicht bilanzierten Posten — die Risikovorsorge nach wie vor als ausreichend bzw. alle Aufwandsrisiken als beziffert? Wenn ja, mit welcher Begründung?

6. Wäre somit die weitere Finanzierung des BER durch die Gesellschafter vergleichbar mit einem marktwirtschaftlich handelnden Kapitalgeber? Wenn ja, bis zu welcher Finanzierungshöhe?

7. Kann eine erneute EU-Beihilfe-Genehmigung für die jetzt angeforderten weiteren Mittel erteilt werden, wenn es vorhergesehene Ereignisse waren, die zu dem Liquiditätsengpass geführt haben?

Antwort von Herrn Almunia im Namen der Kommission
(13. Juni 2014)

Der Beschluss der Kommission über die Kapitalzuführung von 1,2 Mrd. EUR an den Flughafen Berlin Brandenburg wurde nach Prüfung aller von Deutschland übermittelten Informationen am 19. Dezember 2012 verabschiedet ([1]). Die Kommission hat die wirtschaftliche Begründung der Anmeldung analysiert und geprüft, ob der Grundsatz des marktwirtschaftlich handelnden Kapitalgebers beachtet wurde. Deutschland hat wiederholt bestätigt, dass alle der Kommission übermittelten Informationen richtig und genau sind. Der Kommission liegen keine konkreten Hinweise vor, die sie dazu veranlassen würden, die Richtigkeit der von Deutschland übermittelten Informationen in Zweifel zu ziehen.

Jede von einem Mitgliedstaat übermittelte Anmeldung wird für sich geprüft. Es wäre daher verfrüht, auf den künftigen Standpunkt der Kommission zu schließen. Sollte es sich bei der künftigen Maßnahme um eine staatliche Beihilfe handeln, würde die Kommission sie im Rahmen der neuen Leitlinien für staatliche Beihilfen für Flughäfen und Luftfahrtunternehmen bewerten ([2]).

([1]) Siehe Beschluss der Kommission vom 19. Dezember 2012, ABl. C 36 vom 8.2.2013 und Antwort auf die parlamentarische Anfrage E-007630/2013.
([2]) ABl. C 99 vom 4.4.2014, S. 3.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-005255/14
to the Commission
Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Aid for Berlin-Brandenburg Airport (BER)

The airport company Berlin-Brandenburg Ltd needs a capital injection of approximately EUR 1.1 billion. According to the committee of inquiry, the problems began long before 2012, and construction work has still not been set on a professional footing. It has also been found that financial risk provisioning has been — and continues to be — inadequate.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. How could it be sure that the financial indicators so far provided by the Federal government (EU aid controls) were complete and comprehensive? What objective criteria were used for checking them?

2. Did it base its financial profitability assessment of the BER on the latter's financial performance in 2012? If not, how do the figures submitted to it differ from the BER's annual financial statement for 2012?

3. How does it view the 2012 annual statement which omits major risks and liabilities (for example, no provision was made for a reserve of EUR 600 million for noise protection; there was insufficient disclosure of EUR 400 million in liabilities in respect of contractors, despite the existence of bills and work already carried out; and no provision was made, *inter alia*, for reserves for liability for damages to third parties, such as tenants or airlines, due to a delay in the opening date)?

4. How does it view the possible manipulation of the BER's balance sheet figures and financial position and the impact thereof in particular on the cash flow and the capital adequacy ratio and the debt-to-equity ratio?

5. Taking into account items that were not previously included, could the risk provision be considered sufficient or expenditure risks quantified? If so, on what grounds?

6. If so, would the further financing of the BER by the shareholders be comparable to the action of a capital investor acting according to market economy principles? If so, up to what level of funding?

7. Can EU aid approval again be granted for the additional funds now required if the events that led to the liquidity crunch were foreseeable?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(13 June 2014)

The Commission decision regarding capital injections of EUR 1.2 billion into Flughafen Berlin Brandenburg was adopted on 19 December 2012 after all the information provided by Germany was assessed ([1]). The Commission assessed the commercial rationale of the notification, conducting a market economy investor test (MEIT). Germany has repeatedly confirmed that all information submitted to the Commission is correct and accurate. The Commission has no concrete evidence at its disposal, which would lead to put into question the correctness of the information submitted by Germany.

Each notification by a Member State is assessed on its own merits. It is thus premature to prejudge the Commission's future position. If the future measure were to constitute state aid, the Commission would assess it under the new guidelines for state aid to airports and airlines. ([2])

([1]) See Commission decision of 19.12.2012, OJ C 36, 8.2.2013 and response to the parliamentary Question E-007630/2013.
([2]) OJ C 99, 4.4.2014, p. 3.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор P-005256/14
до Комисията
Marusya Lyubcheva (S&D)
(23 април 2014 г.)

Относно: Отпускане на средства по линия на съвместната оперативна програма на Черноморския басейн 2007—2013 г. за бенефициенти от Украйна

По отношение на изпълнението на проекти в рамките на съвместната оперативна програма на Черноморския басейн 2007—2013 г., които включват украински партньори по проекти, през януари 2014 г. бившето украинското правителство прекрати използването на вече отпуснатите средства, които трябваше да покрият пътните разноски на членовете на персонала на украинските партньори по проекти. Наскоро новото временно правителство на Украйна прекрати използването на средства по тази програма, които бяха предназначени за покриване на пътните разноски и на разходите за доставяне на оборудване.

Тази мярка застрашава изпълнението на вече одобрени и финансирани проекти и създава предпоставки за неспазване на вече поети ангажименти. Тя засяга както украинските бенефициенти — главно академични институции, които разчитат на средствата от такива проекти, така и техните партньори от ЕС, които са поставени под натиск да продължат с изпълнението на проектите, но не знаят как да действат след наложените ограничения.

Като се има предвид политическият обхват на проблема и неговото значение за постигането на целите на съвместната оперативна програма на Черноморския басейн:

1. Запозната ли е Комисията с решението на украинските органи да ограничат използването от страна на местните бенефициенти на вече разпределените и преведени средства от европейските фондове, като по този начин се нарушават принципите и правилата за изпълнение на съвместната оперативна програма на Черноморския басейн 2007—2013 г.?

2. Какви мерки счита Комисията за подходящи за осигуряване на непрекъснатото изпълнение на вече одобрените проекти по тази програма в случаите, в които бенефициентите са украински партньори по проекта?

Отговор, даден от г-н Фюле от името на Комисията
(18 юни 2014 г.)

1. Комисията напълно осъзнава трудностите, свързани с плащанията, пред които са изправени украинските партньори, участващи в програмите за трансгранично сътрудничество на Европейския инструмент за съседство и партньорство (ЕСП ТГС). Публичните институции, които участват като партньори в проекти, финансирани от ЕС, са задължени да откриват сметки с украинската държавна хазна. В миналото се наблюдаваха случаи (например през 2011г. и 2012 г.), когато държавната хазна временно спря прехвърлянето на получени от донори средства към субекти от публичния сектор на местно равнище. В хода на 2013 г. положението стана много сериозно, тъй като държавната хазна дължеше стотици милиони. Тези пречки имат много отрицателно въздействие върху изпълнението на проектите, защото украинските партньори по проекти за трансгранично сътрудничество не получават достъп до прехвърлените от страна на ЕС средства.

2. Делегацията на ЕС в Киев официално повдигна въпроса пред украинските власти по няколко различни повода (с писма от ноември 2013 г. и март 2014 г.). Новото правителство реагира положително и извършва плащания, когато бъде информирано от страна на Делегацията относно конкретен проблем. Също така румънското министерство на регионалното развитие, отговарящо за програмите за трансгранично сътрудничество, обсъди този въпрос с отговорното украинско министерство. По предложение на Румъния Комисията ще проучи възможността за удължаване на периода на изпълнение на проекти за трансгранично сътрудничество. За да бъде ефикасна такава промяна обаче, се предполага, че от своя страна украинското правителство ще предприеме всички необходими стъпки, за да продължат плащанията за проекти, финансирани от ЕС, по автоматичен начин, а не само при поискване.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-005256/14
to the Commission
Marusya Lyubcheva (S&D)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Appropriation of funds under the Black Sea Basin Joint Operational Programme 2007-2013, concerning Ukrainian beneficiaries

With regard to the implementation of projects under the Black Sea Basin Joint Operational Programme 2007-2013 that include project partners from Ukraine, in January 2014 the former Ukrainian government suspended the use of already allocated funds which were supposed to cover the travel expenses of staff members of Ukrainian project partners. Recently, the new interim government in Ukraine suspended the use of funds under this programme, which were intended to cover travel expenses and expenses for procurement of equipment.

This measure jeopardises the implementation of already approved and funded projects and creates preconditions for failure to comply with commitments already made. It affects both Ukrainian beneficiaries — mainly academic establishments, which rely on the funds from such projects — and their partners from the EU, who are put under pressure to continue with the implementation of the projects, but do not know how to proceed following the imposed restrictions.

Considering the political scope of the issue and its importance for achieving the goals of the Black Sea Basin Joint Operational Programme:

1. Is the Commission aware of the decision of the Ukrainian authorities to restrict local beneficiaries from using already allocated and transferred European funds, thus violating the principles and rules of implementation of the Black Sea Basin Joint Operational Programme 2007-2013?

2. In cases where Ukrainian beneficiaries are project partners, what measures does the Commission consider appropriate for ensuring the uninterrupted implementation of the projects already approved under this programme?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(18 June 2014)

1. The Commission is fully aware of the difficulties the Ukrainian partners participating in the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument Cross Border Cooperation (ENPI CBC) programmes are facing due to payment problems. Public institutions participating as partners in EU funded projects are obliged to open accounts with the Ukrainian State Treasury. There were instances in the past (e.g. in 2011 and 2012) when the Treasury suspended the transfer to local level public sector entities of project funds received from donors. In the course of 2013 the situation became very serious with hundreds of millions owed by the state Treasury. These blockages have had a very negative impact on project implementation preventing namely Ukrainian CBC project partners from getting access to the transferred EU funds.

2. The EU Delegation in Kiev has officially raised the problem with the Ukrainian authorities at several occasions (letters in November 2013 and March 2014). The new government is reacting positively and now release payments when they are informed by the Delegation about a specific problem. Also the Romanian Ministry for Regional development responsible for the CBC programmes has discussed this issue with the Ukrainian responsible ministry. On the suggestion of the Romania, the Commission will explore the possibility of extending the implementation period for CBC projects. Such a change in order to be efficient supposes however that the Ukrainian government on its side takes all necessary steps to proceed with payments to EU funded projects on an automatic basis and not only when asked to do so.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-005257/14
an die Kommission
Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE)
(23. April 2014)

Betrifft: Kosovarischer Gesetzesentwurf zur Datenüberwachung

Der Gesetzesentwurf Kosovos mit dem Titel „Überwachung der elektronischen Kommunikation" enthält eine Reihe von Bestimmungen in Bezug auf die Vorratsspeicherung von Daten. Laut einer Twitter-Meldung des kosovarischen Ministers für europäische Integration, Vlora Citaku, vom 3. April 2014 ([1]) „war das Gesetz sechs Monate in Brüssel, und der Europarat und die Europäische Kommission haben dafür gesorgt, dass es den EU-Praktiken entspricht".

Hat die Kommission den kosovarischen staatlichen Stellen signalisiert, dass das Gesetz im Einklang mit den „bewährten Verfahrensweisen" der Europäischen Union und der Entscheidung des Europäischen Gerichtshofs zur Vorratsdatenspeicherung steht? Falls ja, welche Methode wendet die Kommission an, um festzulegen, was als „bewährte Verfahrensweisen" zu betrachten sind?

Antwort von Herrn Füle im Namen der Kommission
(5. Juni 2014)

Die Kommission wies in ihrem Fortschrittsbericht zu Kosovo ([2]) im Jahr 2011 darauf hin, dass in künftigen Rechtsvorschriften über das Abhören elektronischer Kommunikation im Einklang mit den bewährten Praktiken der EU klar zwischen Abhörungen aufgrund eines richterlichen Beschlusses und Abhörungen zu nachrichtendienstlichen Zwecken unterschieden werden muss. Kurz darauf legte Kosovo einen Gesetzentwurf vor, der diese Anforderung nicht erfüllte. Nach Gesprächen mit dem Kosovo wurde ein neuer Gesetzentwurf ausgearbeitet, der diese wichtige und notwendige Unterscheidung enthält. Dieser neue Entwurf für ein Gesetz über das Abhören elektronischer Kommunikation wurde der Europäischen Kommission im zweiten Halbjahr 2013 zur Konsultation vorgelegt. Wiederholt unterstützte die EU das Kosovo hinsichtlich des Entwurfs, unter anderem durch Expertenmissionen im Rahmen des Dialogs über die Visaliberalisierung, wobei sie insbesondere betonte, dass klar zwischen Abhörungen aufgrund eines richterlichen Beschlusses und Abhörungen zu nachrichtendienstlichen Zwecken zu unterscheiden ist, und überdies Erläuterungen zum jüngsten Urteil des Europäischen Gerichtshofs zur Vorratsdatenspeicherung bereitstellte. Die Regierung des Kosovos nahm den Gesetzentwurf am 29. April 2014 an. Da die Kosovo-Versammlung am 7. Mai im Hinblick auf die für den 8. Juni geplanten Wahlen aufgelöst wurde, wird der Entwurf zwecks weiterer Bearbeitung durch die neue Verwaltung an die Regierung zurückgesandt.

([1]) https://twitter.com/vloracitaku/status/451688612523175936
([2]) „Diese Ausnahmeregelung berührt nicht die Standpunkte zum Status des Kosovos und steht im Einklang mit der Resolution 1244 des VN-Sicherheitsrates und dem Gutachten des Internationalen Gerichtshofs zur Unabhängigkeitserklärung des Kosovos".

(English version)

Question for written answer P-005257/14
to the Commission
Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Kosovan draft law on interception

The Kosovan draft law entitled 'Interception of Electronic Communication' contains a number of provisions for data retention. The Kosovan Minister for European Integration, Vlora Citaku, said in a tweet on 3 April 2014 ([1]) that 'the law was in Brussels for 6 months, Council of Europe and EU Commission made sure best EU practices are reflected.'

Did the Commission indicate to the Kosovan authorities that the law was in line with European 'best practices' and with the data retention ruling of the Court of Justice? If yes, what measure does the Commission use to establish what it considers to be 'best practices'?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2014)

The Commission in its progress report on Kosovo ([2]) in 2011 indicated that the future legislation on interception of electronic communications needed to clearly distinguish between judicial interception and interception for intelligence services, in line with European best practice. Shortly after, Kosovo proposed a draft law which did not meet that requirement. After discussion with Kosovo, a new law was drafted that does include this important and necessary distinction. This revised draft law on interception has been sent for consultation to the European Commission in the second half of 2013. EU input has been provided to Kosovo on the draft law on several occasions, including in the context of expert missions conducted for the visa liberalisation dialogue. One consistent factor in the assistance has been to underline the need to distinguish clearly between judicial interception and interception for intelligence services, and explanations on the recent European Court of Justice ruling on data retention have also been provided. The government of Kosovo introduced the draft law on 29 April 2014. Since the Kosovo Assembly was dissolved on 7 May in view of elections on 8 June, the draft law will be sent back to the government, to be further handled by the new administration.

([1]) https://twitter.com/vloracitaku/status/451688612523175936
([2]) 'This derogation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSCR 1244 and the ICJ Opinion of the Kosovo Declaration of Independence'.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005259/14
a la Comisión
Andrés Perelló Rodríguez (S&D)
(23 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: Denominaciones de origen en la Comunitat Valenciana

El artículo 93 del Reglamento (CE) n° 1308/2013, afirma que se entenderá por denominación de origen el nombre de una región que sirve para designar un producto cuya calidad y características se deba básica o exclusivamente a un entorno geográfico particular, con los factores naturales y humanos inherentes a él y que las uvas utilizadas en su elaboración procedan exclusivamente de esa zona geográfica.

Por otro lado, el artículo 94 del Reglamento (CE) n° 1308/2013, establece que las solicitudes en las que se pida la protección de ciertos nombres mediante su inclusión en la categoría de denominaciones de origen deberán ir acompañadas de un expediente técnico en el que conste, entre otras cosas: a) nombre que se desee proteger; b) nombre, apellidos y dirección del solicitante; c) pliego de condiciones del producto mencionado en el apartado 2, y d) un documento único en el que se resuma el pliego de condiciones del producto mencionado en el apartado 2.

Con mayor precisión, el artículo 7 del Reglamento (CE) n° 607/2009, señala que el «vínculo» debe servir para aclarar en qué medida las características de la zona geográfica delimitada influyen en el producto final.

La Denominación de Origen Protegida Valencia no ha establecido ni fija ningún vínculo con determinados territorios que, con el consentimiento de las autoridades regionales, ha incorporado a su zona de producción, a pesar de que los agricultores nunca han registrado voluntariamente sus viñedos, ni ha identificado su zona de producción delimitando las parcelas y explotaciones respecto de algunos de los términos municipales que se citan como zona de producción.

1. ¿Está dispuesta la Comisión a consentir que se incluyan en las denominaciones de origen territorios y zonas de producción con los que no se posea ningún vínculo entre estas con el nombre geográfico protegido?

2. ¿Está dispuesta la Comisión a consentir la inclusión de zonas de producción ocupadas por viñedos no identificados y cuyos agricultores nunca han inscrito las explotaciones ni han participado en esa denominación?

3. ¿No debería la Comisión, al verificar si existe el «vínculo» con todas las zonas de producción delimitadas por una denominación de origen, rechazar cualquier territorio y cualquier vínculo que tenga o haya tenido por objeto disimular la adquisición encubierta de vinos de distintas demarcaciones geográficas pertenecientes a otras denominaciones de origen?

Respuesta del Sr. Cioloş en nombre de la Comisión
(17 de junio de 2014)

Según el artículo 107, apartado 3, del Reglamento (UE) n° 1308/2013 ([1]), la Comisión tiene hasta el 31 de diciembre de 2014 para comprobar si la denominación de origen protegida (DOP) Valencia (PDO-ES-A0872) y las demás denominaciones de vino que existían a 31 de julio de 2009 cumplen los requisitos enunciados en el artículo 93 de ese mismo Reglamento.

1. En particular, la Comisión se cerciora de que la calidad y las características de los vinos producidos al amparo de esas denominaciones se deben fundamentalmente al medio geográfico y a los factores naturales y humanos inherentes a él. En diciembre de 2013, la Comisión hizo una serie de observaciones sobre la DOP Valencia a raíz de las cuales se modificó la parte del pliego de condiciones de esa denominación en la que se exponía el vínculo con la zona geográfica.

2. En lo que se refiere a la comercialización de vinos de la DOP Valencia cuyos productores supuestamente no se han dado a conocer a la autoridad competente en materia de controles, compete al Estado miembro tomar las medidas necesarias para impedir la utilización ilícita de las DOP/IGP vinícolas. En cuando a la inscripción de los viñedos de la DOP Valencia, el Consejo Regulador de esta DOP se remite al catastro vitícola de la Comunidad Valenciana, de cuya gestión se encarga la administración autonómica y que está reconocido por el Ministerio de Agricultura y por la Unión.

([1]) DO L 347 de 20.12.2013, p. 671.

3. El Derecho de la Unión no impide en modo alguno que una misma zona de producción esté incluida en la demarcación geográfica de varias DOP/IGP, con la condición de que las características de la zona permitan obtener un producto final que tenga la calidad y las características de los vinos producidos al amparo de esas denominaciones. La DOP Valencia amplió su territorio a municipios pertenecientes a las DOP Utiel-Requena y Alicante ya en 1995 y en 2001 ([2]).

([2]) Los municipios de la DOP Utiel-Requena (Utiel, Camporrobles, Caudete, Fuenterrobles, Requena, Siete Aguas, Sinarcas Utiel, Venta del Moro y Villargordo Cabriel) fueron incluidos por primera vez en la DOP Valencia en 1995 (Orden de 20 de abril de 1995 de la Consellería de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación por la que se modifica la de 21 de julio de 1986, por la que se aprueba el Reglamento de la Denominación de Origen Valencia y su Consejo Regulador (DOCV n° 2502 de 8.5.1995), ratificada posteriormente por la Orden de 29 de noviembre de 1995 (BOE n° 293 de 8.12.1995). Del mismo modo, los municipios de la DOP Alicante fueron incluidos por primera vez en la DOP Valencia en 2001 (Orden de 4 de octubre de 2001 de la Consellería de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación por la que se modifica la Orden de 15 de noviembre de 1999 de la Consellería de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación, por la que se aprueba el nuevo texto del Reglamento de la Denominación de Origen Valencia y su Consejo Regulador), ratificada posteriormente por la Orden APA/1815/2002 (BOE n° 169 de 16.7.2002).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005259/14
to the Commission
Andrés Perelló Rodríguez (S&D)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Designations of origin in the Valencia region of Spain

Article 93 of Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 states that designation of origin means the name of a region used to describe a product whose quality and characteristics are essentially or exclusively due to a particular geographical environment, with its inherent natural and human factors. In the case of wine, this means that the grapes from which it is produced come exclusively from this geographical area.

Article 94 of the aforementioned regulation states that applications for protection of names as designations of origin should include a technical file containing, among other things: (a) the name to be protected; (b) the name and address of the applicant; (c) a product specification, as referred to in paragraph 2 of the article; and (d) a single document summarising the product specification also referred to in paragraph 2.

More specifically, Article 7 of Commission Regulation (EC) No 607/2009 of 14 July 2009 states that the 'link' should explain to what extent the features of the demarcated geographical area influence the final product.

The body responsible for the Valencia protected designation of origin has failed to establish a link in the case of certain areas of land that, with the approval of the regional authorities, have been incorporated into its production zone, even though the producers concerned have never sought to register their vineyards, and has failed to officially define the production zone by specifying which plots and holdings belong to it.

1. Is the Commission prepared to allow land and production zones that have no link with a protected name to be included in an area covered by a designation of origin?

2. Will it allow wines from production areas containing unidentified vineyards, and whose producers have never registered their holdings or participated in the designation of origin scheme, to bear the designation?

3. When verifying that all the production zones share a link with the area covered by the designation of origin, should the Commission not exclude any land which produces wines which are more characteristic of other designations of origin and any link put forward in an effort to conceal that fact?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(17 juin 2014)

Conformément à l'article 107, paragraphe 3 du règlement (UE) n° 1308/2014 ([1]), la Commission a jusqu'au 31 décembre 2014 pour vérifier que l'appellation d'origine protégée (AOP) Valencia (PDO-ES-A0872) ainsi que les autres dénominations de vin existantes au 31 juillet 2009 remplissent les conditions énoncées à l'article 93 de ce même règlement.

1. La Commission vérifie en particulier que la qualité et les caractéristiques des vins produits sous ces dénominations sont dues essentiellement au milieu géographique et aux facteurs naturels et humains qui lui sont inhérents. En décembre 2013, à la suite d'observations de la Commission, la partie du cahier des charges de l'AOP Valencia définissant le lien avec la zone géographique a été modifiée.

2. En ce qui concerne la mise sur le marché de vins de l'AOP Valencia dont les producteurs ne se seraient pas déclarés à l'autorité compétente en matière de contrôle, il appartient à l'État membre de prendre les mesures nécessaires pour empêcher l'utilisation illicite des AOP/IGP vinicoles. Au sujet de l'enregistrement des vignobles de l'AOP Valencia, le conseil régulateur de cette AOP fait référence au cadastre viticole de la Communauté de Valencia géré par l'administration régionale et reconnu par le ministère de l'agriculture et par l'Union.

([1]) JO L 347, 20.12.2013, p. 671.

3. Le droit de l'Union n'empêche nullement qu'une même zone de production puisse être incluse dans la zone géographiquement délimitée de différentes AOP/IGP; ceci à condition que les caractéristiques de la zone permettent la production d'un produit final ayant la qualité et les caractéristiques des vins produits sous ces dénominations. L'AOP Valencia a élargi son territoire à des municipalités appartenant déjà aux AOP Utiel-Requena et Alicante en 1995 et en 2001 ([2]).

([2]) Les municipalités de la DOP Utiel-Requena (Utiel, Camporrobles, Caudete, Fuenterrobles, Requena, Siete Aguas, Sinarcas Utiel, Venta del Moro et Villargordo Cabriel) ont été inclues à l'AOP pour la première fois à l'AOP Valencia en 1995 (Orden de 20 de abril de 1995 de la Conselleria de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación, por la que se modifica la de 21 de julio de 1986, por la que se aprueba el Reglamento de la Denominación de Origen Valencia y su Consejo Regulador (DOCV n º 2502 de 8/05/1995) qui a été ensuite ratifié par la Orden de 29 de noviembre de 1995 (BOE nº 293 de 8/12/1995). Egalement, les municipalités de la DOP Alicante ont été inclus pour la première fois à l'AOP Valencia en 2001 (Orden de 4 de octubre de 2001, de la Conselleria de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación por la que se modifica la Orden de 15 de noviembre de 1999, de la Conselleria de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación, por la que se aprueba el nuevo texto del Reglamento de la Denominación de Origen Valencia y su consejo Regulador.) qui a éte ensuite ratifié par Orden APA/1815/2002 (BOE nº 169 de 16/07/2002).

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005261/14
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(23 de abril de 2014)

Asunto: Obligaciones para proyectos y proyecto Castor

En julio de 2012 el Parlamento Europeo aprobó la Iniciativa de Obligaciones para la Financiación de Proyectos para destinar 230 millones de euros en garantías para la emisión privada de bonos para la financiación de proyectos de infraestructuras. El grupo de los Verdes/ALE pedimos que estos bonos de proyecto sirvieran para invertir en proyectos de infraestructuras sostenibles. En la votación los eurodiputados pidieron criterios transparentes para la selección de proyectos, disposiciones de información y evaluación consistentes y la posibilidad de introducir cambios en función de los resultados de la fase piloto ([1]).

— Considerando que la primera lista de nueve proyectos contempla cuatro autopistas y dos proyectos de energía no renovable (almacenaje de gas natural);

— Considerando que, para la aprobación de los proyectos candidatos, esta iniciativa deja en manos de los países en los que se promueven los proyectos la responsabilidad de los estudios de impacto ambiental y de los procesos de participación e información pública;

— Considerando la situación actual del primer proyecto financiado por esta iniciativa, el almacén de gas Castor Vinarós (Castellón), actualmente paralizado a causa de los más de 500 terremotos (dos de ellos de 4,1 grados en la escala de Richter) ocurridos en octubre de 2013 y que se enfrenta a una fuerte oposición pública (los Parlamentos de Cataluña y Valencia se posicionaron en contra a finales de 2013);

— Considerando que, incluso después de los terremotos, la Iniciativa de Obligaciones para la Financiación de Proyectos no obliga ni al BEI ni a la Comisión Europea a asumir responsabilidad activa en el asunto y sigue dejando la decisión final en manos del Gobierno español;

— Considerando que la Iniciativa de Obligaciones para la Financiación de Proyectos está en fase piloto y que los proyectos a los que ha atraído no son los esperados en un principio;

— Considerando los impactos ambientales, sociales y económicos del proyecto Castor y cómo estos se relacionan con la forma de financiamiento del proyecto que lo hizo posible;

1. ¿Se cuestiona la Comisión la continuidad de la Iniciativa de Obligaciones para la Financiación de Proyectos?

2. ¿Estudiará la Comisión los impactos negativos ocurridos y también los potenciales de esta iniciativa?

3. ¿Qué acciones realizará la Comisión para evitar más daños a la población y al medio ambiente en el caso concreto del proyecto Castor, más allá de lo que decida el Gobierno español?

4. ¿Considera la Comisión que se deberían introducir cambios, teniendo en cuenta los resultados de la fase piloto tal y como pidió el Parlamento Europeo?

5. ¿Considera la Comisión que se han implementado unas correctas disposiciones de evaluación para el proyecto Castor tal y como pidió el Parlamento Europeo?

Respuesta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión
(17 de junio de 2014)

La base jurídica (Reglamento n° 670/2012) de la Iniciativa Europa 2020 de Obligaciones para la Financiación de Proyectos (IOP) prevé una evaluación completa e independiente, que se llevará a cabo en 2015. La evaluación abarcará, entre otras cosas, el valor añadido y la adicionalidad en comparación con otros instrumentos de la Unión o de los Estados miembros y otras formas existentes de financiación de la deuda a largo plazo. Sobre la base de esa evaluación, la Comisión valorará la pertinencia de la IOP y su eficacia a la hora de incrementar el volumen de inversiones en proyectos prioritarios. La plena aplicación de la iniciativa en el marco del Mecanismo «Conectar Europa» se someterá a una evaluación de este tipo. Además, a la vista de esta evaluación, la Comisión estudiará la posibilidad de proponer las modificaciones normativas pertinentes.

([1]) http://www.library.sso.ep.parl.union.eu/lis/lisrep/09-Briefings/2012/120326REV1-Europe-2020-Project-Bonds-initiative-ES.pdf

En relación con los estudios de impacto ambiental llevados a cabo en relación con el proyecto Castor, la Comisión remite a Su Señoría a las respuestas a las preguntas escritas E-003789/2010 y E-011478/2011, en las que recuerda que, tras haber llevado a cabo una investigación, no detectó ninguna posible violación del Derecho medioambiental de la UE ([2]). Los Estados miembros son responsables de la incorporación exacta y puntual de las Directivas a su ordenamiento jurídico, así como de su correcta aplicación y ejecución. Por lo tanto, les incumbe decidir sobre la continuación o la suspensión de la actividad de los proyectos.

También hay que recordar que la Comisión no participa en el proceso de diligencia debida de los proyectos financiados en virtud de la IOP, que es una labor que realiza el BEI, y que no hubo ninguna contribución del presupuesto de la UE al proyecto Castor. Asimismo, la Comisión recuerda a Su Señoría las respuestas de la Comisión a las preguntas parlamentarias E-012052/2013, E-012144/2013, E-000829/2014 y E-002372/2014 ([3]), que se refieren al mismo asunto.

([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/es/parliamentary-questions.html
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/es/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005261/14
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Project bonds and the Castor project

In July 2012 Parliament adopted the Europe 2020 Project Bonds initiative under which EUR 230 million was set aside to guarantee privately issued bonds used to fund infrastructure projects. The Verts/ALE Group calls for the project bonds to be invested in sustainable infrastructure projects. During the vote on the initiative, MEPs called for transparent criteria for project selection, strong reporting and evaluation provisions and the possibility to make changes based on the results of the pilot phase ([1]).

— The first list of nine projects includes four motorways and two non-renewable-energy projects (for natural gas storage).

— Under the initiative, responsibility for carrying out environmental impact assessments and organising the public information and consultation phases in the context of the project approval process lies with the countries in which the projects are being developed.

— Progress on the first project to be funded under this initiative — the Castor Vinarós gas storage facility (in Castellón) — has been halted by the more than 500 earthquakes (two of which reached 4.1 on the Richter scale) that occurred in October 2013, and the project has encountered serious public opposition (the Catalonian and Valencian Parliaments came out against the project at the end of 2013).

— Even after the earthquakes, neither the European Investment Bank nor the Commission is required to take a more active role in the project, and the final decision still lies with the Spanish Government.

— The initiative is in the pilot phase, and the projects which it has attracted are not of the kind initially hoped for.

— The Castor project will have major environmental, social and economic ramifications, which are partly linked to the way in which the project has been financed.

1. In the light of the above, is the Commission considering discontinuing the Project Bonds initiative?

2. Will the Commission look into the negative impact that this initiative has had, as well as the potential benefits it may offer?

3. What steps will it take to prevent further harm to local residents and the environment in the context of the Castor project, irrespective of what the Spanish Government decides?

4. Does it think that changes should be made to the initiative in the light of the results of the pilot phase, as requested by Parliament?

5. Does it think that appropriate evaluation provisions have been implemented in respect of the Castor project, as requested by Parliament?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2014)

The Europe 2020 Project Bond Initiative (PBI) legal base (Regulation no 670/2012) foresees an independent full-scale evaluation to be carried out in 2015. The evaluation will cover, *inter alia*, the value added and additionally compared to other Union or Member State instruments and other existing forms of long-term debt financing. Based on this evaluation, the Commission will assess the relevance of PBI as well as its effectiveness in increasing the volume of investments in priority projects. Full implementation of the initiative under the Connecting Europe Facility will be subject to such evaluation. Moreover, in the light of that evaluation, the Commission will consider proposing appropriate regulatory changes.

In relation to the environmental impact studies carried out for the Castor project, the Commission refers the Honourable Member to the answers to Written Questions E-003789/2010 and E-011478/2011 ([2]), where it recalled that, after having carried out an investigation, it could not find a potential breach of the applicable EU environmental law. Member States are responsible for the timely and accurate transposition of directives as well as their correct application and implementation. It is therefore their responsibility to decide on the continuation or suspension of the activity of projects.

([1]) http://www.library.sso.ep.parl.union.eu/lis/lisrep/09-Briefings/2012/120326REV1-Europe-2020-Project-Bonds-initiative-ES.pdf
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

It should also be recalled that the Commission is not involved in due diligence of the projects financed under PBI, which is undertaken by the EIB, and that no EU budget contribution was involved in the Castor project. The Commission would also like to draw the attention of the honourable MEP to the Commission replies to Parliamentary Questions E-012052/2013, E-012144/2013 and E-000829/2014 E-002372/2014 ([3]) referring to the same subject.

([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005262/14
an die Kommission
Evelyn Regner (S&D)
(23. April 2014)

Betrifft: Anteil Frauen/Männer in der Kommission

Mit der Europäischen Strategie für die Gleichstellung von Frauen und Männern für den Zeitraum 2010-2015 hat sich die EU-Kommission zur Förderung der Gleichstellung der Geschlechter in all ihren Politiken verpflichtet. Dazu zählt unter anderem auch die ausgewogene Repräsentanz in Entscheidungsprozessen.

1. Wie viele Frauen und Männer arbeiten in der Kommission in folgender Position:

a. Generaldirektor/in

b. Direktor/in

c. Abteilungsleiter/in

zum Zeitpunkt des Amtsantritts der vorhergehenden Kommission unter Kommissionspräsident Barroso 2004 sowie zum Amtsantritt der aktuellen Kommission 2010. Wie ist der aktuelle Stand der Geschlechterverteilung in den oben genannten Führungspositionen in der Europäischen Kommission?

2. Welches konkrete Ziel verfolgt die Kommission diesbezüglich bis zum Ende ihres Mandats im Oktober 2014? Wie hoch soll bis dahin der Frauen-/Männeranteil in den drei oben genannten Führungsfunktionen sein?

3. Welche Maßnahmen werden in der Kommission zur Förderung einer ausgewogenen Repräsentanz beider Geschlechter in Führungsfunktionen gesetzt?

Antwort von Herrn Šefčovič im Namen der Kommission
(25. Juni 2014)

1. Die beigefügte Tabelle enthält die angeforderten Informationen.

2. In der Strategie der Chancengleichheit von Frauen und Männern in der Europäischen Kommission (2010-2014) ([1]) sind für Ende 2014 folgende Ziele vorgesehen: 25 % Frauen in der höheren Führungsebene und 30 % Frauen in der mittleren Führungsebene. Wie aus der Tabelle ersichtlich ist, hat die Kommission diese Ziele bereits am 1. Mai 2014 erreicht und sogar überschritten.

3. Damit wurde die Repräsentanz der Frauen in Führungspositionen deutlich verbessert. Die Kommission verbindet in ihrem Ansatz die Festlegung entsprechender Zielvorgaben mit einer engen Überwachung durch die zentralen Dienststellen. Ebenfalls erwähnenswert ist die Entwicklung eines mehrere Aspekte umfassenden Index der Chancengleichheit, die dazu geführt hat, das ersten Generaldirektionen für ihre Anstrengungen zur Förderung einer fairen und flexiblen Arbeitsorganisation das Label „Balanced Workplace“ verliehen wurde. Der Ansatz der Kommission sieht darüber hinaus Maßnahmen zur Ermittlung und Förderung kompetenter Kandidaten für Positionen in der höheren und mittleren Führungsebene vor, die unter anderem kommissionsinterne sowie GD-spezifische Fortbildungskurse und Coaching/Mentoring-Programme umfassen.

([1]) SEK(2010)1554/3.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005262/14
to the Commission
Evelyn Regner (S&D)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Ratio of men/women in the Commission

In the EU Strategy for equality between men and women 2010-2015, the Commission committed itself to promoting gender equality in all its policies. A balanced representation in the decision-making process forms part of this.

1. How many men and women were employed at the Commission in the following posts:

(a) Director-General,

(b) Director,

(c) Head of Unit,

when the previous Commission under Commission President Barroso took up office in 2004 and when the current Commission took up office in 2010? What is the current situation regarding gender distribution in the aforementioned management positions in the Commission?

2. What is the specific goal being pursued by the Commission in this respect up to the end of its term in office in October 2014? How high should the male/female ratio be in these three management positions by then?

3. What action is the Commission taking to promote a balanced representation of both sexes in management positions?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(25 June 2014)

1. Information requested is presented in the annexed Table.

2. The strategy on Equal Opportunities for Women and Men within the European Commission (2010-2014) ([1]) sets the following targets by 2014: 25% of women in senior management positions and 30% of female middle managers. On 1 May 2014, as shown in the Table, the Commission's gender targets were met, and even exceeded.

3. This progress has resulted in a marked progress in female representation in management positions. The Commission's approach combines definition of gender targets with a close monitoring by the central services. Also worth mentioning is the development of a composite Equal Opportunities Index which led to the award of the 'Balanced Workplace' Labels to the first Directorates-Generals (DG) in recognition of their achievement in respect to the promotion of a fair and flexible workplace. Equally, the Commission's approach integrates actions aimed at identifying and developing potential talents for future senior management and middle management positions. This involves among others specific corporate or local training sessions and coaching/mentoring schemes.

([1]) SEC(2010) 1554/3.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005263/14
an die Kommission
Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE)
(23. April 2014)

Betrifft: Verbindlichkeit von Lärmgrenzwerten in der Richtlinie 2014/38/EU

Die Richtlinie 2014/38/EU der Kommission vom 10. März 2014 zur Änderung von Anhang III der Richtlinie 2008/57/EG ändert die Vorgaben für Lärmgrenzwerte im europäischen Eisenbahnsystem. Die verschiedenen Sprachfassungen machen dabei in meinen Augen unterschiedliche Aussagen zur Verbindlichkeit dieser Grenzwerte möglich, weshalb ich die Kommission hiermit um eine Klarstellung bitte.

Die deutsche Fassung von Artikel 1 legt fest, dass „eine Überschreitung der zulässigen Grenzwerte durch die davon ausgehenden Lärmemissionen […] zu vermeiden" ist. Die englische Fassung hingegen bestimmt explizit, dass eine Überschreitung der Grenzwerte rechtlich unzulässig ist: „The design and operation of the rail system must not lead to an inadmissible level of noise".

1. Implizieren beide Sprachfassungen, dass eine Überschreitung der Lärmgrenzwerte nicht nur zu vermeiden, sondern auch rechtlich unzulässig ist?

2. Wird die Kommission ihre Dienste anweisen, die deutsche Sprachfassung zu überprüfen? Wenn nein: warum nicht?

Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(4. Juni 2014)

1. Alle Sprachfassungen der Richtlinie 2014/38/EU [1] der Kommission sollten dieselbe Bedeutung haben, d. h., dass ein Überschreiten der zulässigen Lärmgrenzwerte verboten ist.

2. Die Kommission wird geeignete Maßnahmen zur Korrektur der deutschen Fassung dieser Richtlinie ergreifen.

[1] ABl. L 70 vom 11.3.2014, S. 20.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005263/14
to the Commission
Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Binding nature of noise limits in Directive 2014/38/EU

Commission Directive 2014/38/EU of 10 March 2014 amending Annex III to Directive 2008/57/EC changes the requirements for noise limits in the European railway system. The different language versions appear to me to allow of different interpretations concerning the binding nature of these limits. Will the Commission therefore clarify the following point:

The German version of Article 1 reads: 'The design and operation of the rail system *should* not lead to an inadmissible level of noise generated by it'. The English version, however, specifically states that exceeding the limits is prohibited by law: 'The design and operation of the rail system *must* not lead to an inadmissible level of noise generated by it.'

1. Do both language versions mean not just that exceeding the noise limits should be avoided, but that it is prohibited by law?

2. Will the Commission instruct its services to review the German language version? If not, why not?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(4 June 2014)

1. All language versions of Commission Directive 2014/38/EU ([1]) should have the same meaning i.e. that exceeding the admissible level of noise is prohibited

2. The Commission will take appropriate steps to correct the German version of this directive.

([1]) OJ L 70, 11.3.2014, p. 20.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005264/14
an die Kommission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(23. April 2014)

Betrifft: Duftmarketing und Duftstoffallergiker (MCS)

Experten zeigen sich zunehmend aufgrund des massiven Einsatzes von Duftstoffen zunehmend besorgt. Duftmarketing, auch „Neuromarketing" genannt, nimmt in Europa inakzeptable Ausmaße an. Da es sich bei den Inhaltsstoffen um bedenkliche Chemikalienmischungen handeln kann, leiden nicht nur Allergiker an den eingesetzten Duftstoffen, sondern besonders auch die Menschen, die duftstoffassoziiert in Isolation geführt werden. Der DAAB (Deutsche Allergiker- und Asthmabund) fordert Maßnahmen. In außereuropäischen Ländern wird bereits auf die Zunahme der Duftstoffallergiker reagiert.

1. Ist die Kommission bereit, das Duftmarketing in der EU durch gesetzliche Regeln zu beschränken und somit die Gesundheit europäischer Bürger mehr zu schützen?

2. Spricht sich die Kommission — im Sinne der Prävention sowie im Interesse der vielen Duftstoffallergiker (rund 30 % der EU-Bürger), MCS-Erkrankten und genetisch eingeschränkten Menschen — für ein Duftmarketing-Verbot in öffentlichen Gebäuden, Toiletten, Verkehrsmitteln und Lebensmittelgeschäften aus? Wenn nicht: Welche alternativen und präventiven Maßnahmen hält sie für umsetzbar?

3. Erklärt sich die Kommission bereit, zeitnah eine Änderung von Rechtsakten herbeizuführen, die Duftmarketinganwender dazu verpflichtet, bereits vor den Eingängen auf die chemisch und neurologisch wirkenden Maßnahmen hinzuweisen?

4. Duftstoffallergiker und MCS-Patienten sind in besonderem Maße auf duftstofffreie und ökologisch sanierte Kliniken und Praxen angewiesen. Welche Verbesserungsmaßnahmen möchte die Kommission vorschlagen und umsetzen?

Antwort von Tonio Borg im Namen der Kommission
(24. Juni 2014)

Die Kommission legt bei der Frage der Luftqualität von Innenräumen eine umfassende Betrachtungsweise zugrunde, die Forschung, Normung, Kennzeichnung und Verbraucherinformation berücksichtigt.

Der Kommission sind die potenziellen Gesundheitsrisiken im Zusammenhang mit der Verwendung von Verbraucherprodukten wie Reinigungsmitteln und Lufterfrischern in Innenräumen bekannt. Das von der EU bezuschusste Projekt EPHECT ([1]) hatte die Beurteilung der diesbezüglichen Exposition und des damit verbundenen Gesundheitsrisikos zum Gegenstand.

Die allgemeinen Vorschriften über die Sicherheit von Produkten sind in der Richtlinie über die allgemeine Produktsicherheit festgelegt ([2]). Darüber hinaus müssen Duftprodukte in Form von Stoffen oder Gemischen die Anforderungen an Einstufung, Kennzeichnung und Verpackung erfüllen, die für alle chemischen Erzeugnisse gemäß der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1272/2008 ([3]) und der REACH-Verordnung ([4]) gelten. Sind solche Stoffe und Gemische nach den genannten Vorschriften als Inhalationsallergene eingestuft, müssen besondere Warnhinweise auf dem Etikett angebracht werden. Die Verordnung 1272/2008 enthält auch Vorschriften für die Kennzeichnung von Gemischen, die nicht als sensibilisierend eingestuft sind, aber mindestens einen als sensibilisierend eingestuften Stoff enthalten.

Zum Vorschlag der Frau Abgeordneten für ein Verbot des Duftmarketing in bestimmten Umgebungen nimmt die Kommission nicht Stellung. Dabei handelt es sich um eine Frage für die nationalen Behörden unter Berücksichtigung der verfügbaren Risikobewertungen. Wenn eine solche Maßnahme als Beschränkung im Sinne der REACH-Verordnung konzipiert würde, könnte das Beschränkungsverfahren in Betracht kommen. Eine Beschränkung von 1,4-Dichlorbenzol in Lufterfrischern wurde kürzlich von der Kommission angenommen. Der Kommission liegen keine Informationen über alternative und präventive Maßnahmen vor.

Die Organisation des Gesundheitswesens und die medizinische Versorgung schließlich fällt in die Zuständigkeit der Mitgliedstaaten.

([1]) https://sites.vito.be/sites/ephect/Pages/home.aspx
([2]) ABl. L 11 vom 15.1.2007, S. 4.
([3]) ABl. L 353 vom 31.12.2008, S. 1.
([4]) ABl. L 136 vom 29.5.2007, S. 3.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005264/14
to the Commission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Scent marketing and scent allergies- multiple chemical sensitivity (MCS)

Experts are becoming increasingly concerned by the large-scale use of scents. Scent marketing, also known as 'neuromarketing', is assuming unacceptable proportions in Europe. Since the ingredients can consist of a dubious mix of chemicals it is not just those who are allergic to the scents used who suffer, but also particularly people who are driven into isolation through the associations they have with certain scents. The German Allergy and Asthma Association DAAB is calling for action. Countries outside the EU are already reacting to the rise in the number of people with scent allergies.

1. Is the Commission prepared to legislate to restrict scent marketing in the EU, thereby better protecting the health of the public in the EU?

2. Is the Commission in favour of a ban on scent marketing in public buildings, toilets, means of transport and food stores, to be introduced by way of prevention as well as in the interests of the many people who suffer from scent allergies (approximately 30% of EU citizens), MCS-related illnesses or restrictions arising from their genetic make-up? If not, what alternative and preventive measures would it consider practicable?

3. Is the Commission prepared to bring about a change in the law promptly so as to oblige users of scent marketing to place notices at entrances advising of the chemical and neurological effects of their actions?

4. Those allergic to scents and MCS patients rely especially upon scent-free and ecologically sanitised hospitals and surgeries. What improvements would the Commission like to propose and implement?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(24 June 2014)

The Commission is considering the issue of indoor air quality in a comprehensive manner including research, standardisation, labelling and consumer information.

The Commission is aware of the potential health risks associated to the indoor use of consumer products such as cleaning agents and air fresheners. The EU funded EPHECT ([1]) project aimed to assess the related exposure and health risk.

General obligations on the safety of products are set out in the General Product Service Safety Directive ([2]). Moreover, scent products in the form of substances or mixtures have to meet the rules regarding classification, labelling and packaging that apply to all chemical products as laid down in Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008 ([3]) and the REACH Regulation ([4]). Where such substances and mixtures are classified under this legislation as respiratory sensitisers, special warnings need to be included in the label. Regulation 1272/2008 also includes labelling requirements for mixtures not classified as sensitising but containing at least one substance classified as sensitising.

The Commission has no view on the Honourable Member's proposal to ban scent marketing in certain settings. This would appear to be a matter for national authorities taking account of available risk assessments. If such a measure were to be conceived as a restriction as defined by REACH, the restrictions process may be considered. A restriction on 1,4-dichlorobenzene in air fresheners has been recently adopted by Commission. The Commission does not have information on alternative and preventive measures.

Finally, the organisation and delivery of health services is a matter of Member State responsibility.

([1]) https://sites.vito.be/sites/ephect/Pages/home.aspx
([2]) OJ L 11, 15.1.2002, p. 4.
([3]) OJ L 353, 31.12.2008, p. 1.
([4]) OJ L 136, 29.5.2007, p. 3.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005265/14
an die Kommission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(23. April 2014)

Betrifft: Homöopathische und anthroposophische Arzneimittel

Es ist bekannt, dass homöopathische und anthroposophische Arzneimittel von immer mehr Bürgerinnen und Bürgern in der EU genutzt werden, da sie preiswerte, wirksame und gut verträgliche Medikamente sind.

1. Stimmt die Kommission zu, dass aufgrund fehlender Nebenwirkungen und der gleichzeitig hohen Wirksamkeit dieser Arzneimittel ein Fast-Track-Verfahren (zur Zulassung) nützlich und sinnvoll wäre?

2. Ist die Kommission nicht auch der Meinung, dass für diese Arzneimittel die Zulassungsbedingungen verbessert werden sollten?

Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(2. Juni 2014)

1. Die Kommission möchte die Frau Abgeordnete darüber informieren, dass in den 1990er Jahren ein besonderes, vereinfachtes Registrierungsverfahren für Homöopathika eingeführt wurde und die Mitgliedstaaten seit 2005 verpflichtet sind, über ein solches Verfahren zu verfügen ([1]). Für dieses Verfahren kommen Homöopathika in Frage, die oral oder äußerlich angewendet werden, auf deren Etikett keine spezifische therapeutische Wirkung angegeben ist und die eine ausreichende Verdünnung aufweisen, um die Unbedenklichkeit des Produktes zu garantieren.

Einige anthroposophische Arzneimittel, die in einer offiziellen Pharmakopöe beschrieben und nach einem homöopathischen Verfahren zubereitet werden, können ebenfalls mittels des besonderen, vereinfachten Registrierungsverfahrens für Homöopathika zugelassen werden.

2. Die Kommission hat keine Pläne, die aktuellen Registrierungs- und Zulassungsverfahren für homöopathische und anthroposophische Arzneimittel zu ändern.

([1]) Titel III Kapitel 2 der Richtlinie 2001/83/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 6. November 2001 zur Schaffung eines Gemeinschaftskodexes für Humanarzneimittel, ABl. L 311 vom 28.11.2001, S. 67.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005265/14
to the Commission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Homoeopathic and anthroposophic medicines

It is well known that more and more members of the public in the EU are using homoeopathic and anthroposophic medicines, as these remedies are good value, effective and well tolerated.

1. Does the Commission agree that it would be useful and sensible to have a fast-track authorisation procedure for these medicines on the strength of their having no side effects and being at the same time highly effective?

2. Does the Commission not also agree that the authorisation requirements for these medicines should be improved?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(2 June 2014)

1. The Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that a special, simplified registration procedure for homeopathic medicinal products was introduced in the 1990s and became mandatory for the Member States to have in place in 2005 ([1]). Homeopathic medicinal products that are administered orally or externally, that bear no specific therapeutic indication on the labelling and that have a sufficient degree of dilution to guarantee the safety of the product are eligible for this procedure.

Some anthroposophic medicinal products described in an official pharmacopoeia and prepared by homeopathic method may also use the special, simplified registration procedure for homeopathic medicinal products.

2. The Commission has no plans to modify the current registration and authorisation procedures for homeopathic and anthroposophic medicinal products.

([1]) Title III, Chapter 2 of Directive 2001/83/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6.11.2001 on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use, OJ L 311, 28.11.2001, p. 67.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005266/14
an die Kommission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(23. April 2014)

Betrifft: Handel mit Huskies

Zunehmend häufig werden Huskies von EU-Mitgliedstaaten oder Beitrittsländern aus in Länder mit tropischen Temperaturen verkauft.

1. Ist der Kommission bekannt, dass dieser Handel insofern tierquälerisch ist, als nach Studien von Prof. Muscatello die Tiere Hirntod infolge dieser hohen Temperaturen erleiden, da ihr Körper die hohen Temperaturen nicht bewältigen kann?

2. Was wird die Kommission gegen diesen tierquälerischen Handel unternehmen?

Antwort von Tonio Borg im Namen der Kommission
(11. Juni 2014)

Der Kommission liegen keine Informationen über die Zahl der in Drittländer ausgeführten Hunde vor und kann eine Zunahme des Exports von Huskies in tropische Länder nicht bestätigen. Der Kommission ist ferner keine Studie über die Anfälligkeit von Huskies gegenüber tropischem Klima — wie in der Anfrage erwähnt — bekannt. Allerdings liegen die Risiken von tropischen Temperaturen für die Gesundheit und das Wohlergehen einer für die Arbeit im Freien in der Arktis gezüchteten Hunderasse auf der Hand. Folglich ist es an den Hundebesitzern, ihre Tiere gegen ungünstige klimatische Bedingungen zu schützen.

Die bestehenden EU-Vorschriften gewährleisten, dass der Handel mit Hunden die Gesundheit von Mensch und Tier nicht gefährdet. Im Kontext der Strategie der Europäischen Union für den Schutz und das Wohlergehen von Tieren 2012-2015 ([1]) hat die Kommission beschlossen, eine Studie über das Wohlergehen von Hunden und Katzen im Rahmen von Geschäftspraktiken, einschließlich des Exports in Drittländer, durchzuführen. Ausgehend von dieser Studie, die Ende 2014 abgeschlossen sein dürfte, wird die Kommission unter gebührender Berücksichtigung der im Vertrag über die Europäische Union festgelegten Zuständigkeiten entscheiden, ob es spezifischer Maßnahmen auf diesem Gebiet bedarf.

([1]) KOM(2012)6 endg.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005266/14
to the Commission
Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Trade in huskies

It is becoming increasingly common in EU Member States or candidate countries for huskies to be sold to countries with a tropical climate.

1. Is the Commission aware that this trade constitutes cruelty to animals in that, according to studies by Professor Muscatello, the high temperatures cause the animals to suffer brain death, as their bodies cannot cope with high temperatures?

2. What action will the Commission take to combat this cruel trade in animals?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2014)

The Commission has no information on the numbers of dogs exported to third countries and cannot confirm an increase in exports of huskies to tropical countries. Also, the Commission is not aware of a study on the susceptibility of husky dogs to tropical climate as mentioned in the question. However, the risks of tropical climate to the health and welfare of a dog bred for outdoor work in the Arctic would appear self-evident. It is therefore the responsibility of the owners to protect their dogs from adverse climate conditions.

The existing EU rules ensure that trade in dogs does not cause spread of risks to animal and public health. In the context of the EU strategy for the protection and welfare of animals 2012-2015 ([1]), the Commission decided to perform a study on the welfare of dogs and cats involved in commercial practices, including the export to third countries. In the light of this study, which is expected to be finalised by the end of 2014, the Commission will consider if it is necessary to take specific initiatives in this field with due regard to the competences conferred by the Treaty to the European Union.

([1]) COM(2012) 6 final.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005267/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(23 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Πώληση των μετοχών του ΟΛΘ κατά παραβίαση της ευρωπαϊκής νομοθεσίας για τις δημόσιες συμβάσεις

Το ΤΑΙΠΕΔ στις 10 Απριλίου έβγαλε ανακοίνωση στην οποία σημείωνε ότι «σε συνέχεια της συζήτησης στην Επιτροπή Οικονομικών Υποθέσεων της Βουλής, που πραγματοποιήθηκε στις 9 Απριλίου, έκρινε ότι απαιτείται περαιτέρω ενημέρωση των αρμόδιων φορέων και πολιτικών κομμάτων, πριν την έναρξη του διαγωνισμού αξιοποίησης του Οργανισμού Λιμένος Θεσσαλονίκης ΑΕ». Τέσσερις μέρες μετά, στις 14 Απριλίου, το ΤΑΙΠΕΔ ανακοίνωσε την προκήρυξη διαγωνισμού για την πώληση του 67% των μετοχών του Οργανισμού Λιμένος Θεσσαλονίκης, παρά τις έντονες διαμαρτυρίες και αντιδράσεις των τοπικών αρχών, των εργαζομένων, της ελληνικής κοινωνίας. Το λιμάνι της Θεσσαλονίκης είναι κερδοφόρος Οργανισμός με αποθεματικό της τάξης των 100 εκατ. ευρώ. Η πώληση του πλειοψηφικού πακέτου των μετοχών δημιουργεί ένα ιδιότυπο μονοπώλιο στο λιμάνι, που αποτελεί έναν από τους μεγαλύτερους θαλάσσιους κόμβους των Βαλκανίων. Επιπλέον, η πώληση γίνεται χωρίς να τηρούνται οι ευρωπαϊκοί κανόνες για τη διαφάνεια στις δημόσιες συμβάσεις.

Στην «Πρόσκληση για την εκδήλωση ενδιαφέροντος» του ΤΑΙΠΕΔ, παρότι αντικείμενο της συναλλαγής είναι η πώληση μετοχών του ΟΛΘ ΑΕ, αναφέρεται ότι «στο πλαίσιο της Διαδικασίας, προβλέπεται ότι η Σύμβαση Παραχώρησης Ελληνικού Δημοσίου θα αποτελέσει αντικείμενο αναδιαπραγμάτευσης, και ενδεχομένως τροποποίησης ή και σύνταξης εκ νέου». Αυτό συνεπάγεται ότι η συναλλαγή δεν αφορά απλώς τους όρους πώλησης των μετοχών της εταιρείας, αλλά αποτελεί διαπραγμάτευση για τους όρους παραχώρησης από την πλευρά του ελληνικού Δημοσίου, των δημόσιων υποδομών του λιμανιού, παρότι στην «Πρόσκληση» αναφέρεται ότι η «Διαδικασία δεν θα διεξαχθεί σύμφωνα με τους κανόνες που εφαρμόζονται αναφορικά με την ανάθεση δημοσίων συμβάσεων». Ερωτάται η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή, ως μέλος της τρόικας: Παραβιάζεται η ευρωπαϊκή νομοθεσία για τις δημόσιες συμβάσεις, που διασφαλίζει τη διαφάνεια ως προς τις συμβάσεις παραχώρησης του Δημοσίου, από την προκήρυξη του διαγωνισμού πώλησης των μετοχών του ΟΛΘ; Ποιες δράσεις αναμένεται να αναλάβει η Επιτροπή για να διασφαλίσει ότι όλες οι διαδικασίες πώλησης πληρούν τους όρους διαφάνειας;

Ποιες δράσεις αναμένεται να αναλάβει η Επιτροπή για να διασφαλίσει ότι η εταιρεία που θα έχει στο εξής τον έλεγχο του λιμανιού θα τηρήσει τους εργασιακούς και περιβαλλοντικούς όρους που προβλέπονται από το ευρωπαϊκό δίκαιο;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(17 Ιουνίου 2014)

Βάσει των διαθέσιμων μέχρι στιγμής πληροφοριών, η Επιτροπή δεν έχει υπόψη της τυχόν προβληματισμούς σχετικά με την εφαρμογή της νομοθεσίας της ΕΕ περί δημοσίων συμβάσεων (εφόσον εφαρμόζεται) στη συναλλαγή αυτή.

Η εφαρμογή της διαδικασίας ιδιωτικοποιήσεων αποτελεί αποκλειστική αρμοδιότητα των εθνικών αρχών. Εναπόκειται δε στις εθνικές αρχές να διασφαλίσουν την τήρηση της σχετικής νομοθεσίας της ΕΕ και της εθνικής νομοθεσίας.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005267/14
to the Commission
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Sale of shares in Thessaloniki Port Authority (TPA) in breach of European public procurement law

On 10 April, the HRADF put out a statement in which it noted that 'following a discussion in the Hellenic Parliament's Committee on Economic Affairs on 9 April, it deemed that the stakeholders and political parties should be further informed before the tendering procedure for the exploitation of Thessaloniki Port Authority SA begins'. Four days later, on 14 April, the HRADF announced a call for tenders for the sale of 67% of shares in Thessaloniki Port Authority, despite strong protests and opposition by local authorities, workers and Greek society. The port of Thessaloniki is a profitable organisation with reserves of the order of EUR 100 million. The sale of the majority of shares will create a special monopoly in the port, which is one of the busiest seaports in the Balkans. In addition, the sale is going ahead without complying with EU rules on transparency in public procurement.

Although the transaction involves the sale of shares of in TPA SA, HRADF's call for expressions of interest states that 'as part of the procedure, it is provided that the Greek State concession contract will be subject to renegotiation, and possibly modified or completely re-written'. This implies that the transaction is not just about the terms of sale of shares in the company, but also involves negotiations by the Greek Government in respect of the terms of the concession of the public infrastructure of the port, even though the 'call for expressions of interest' states that the 'the procedure will not be conducted in accordance with the rules regarding the awarding of public contracts.'

Will the Commission, as part of the Troika, say: does the announcement of a call for tenders for the sale of shares in TPA represent a violation of European public procurement law, which is supposed to ensure the transparency of public procurement contracts? What actions will the Commission take to ensure that all sales procedures meet the requisite conditions of transparency?

What actions will the Commission take to ensure that the company that will henceforth control the port respects the labour and environmental conditions set by European law?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2014)

Based on the available information to date, the Commission is not aware of any concerns relating to the application of EU public procurement law (if applicable) to this transaction.

The implementation of the privatisation process is the exclusive responsibility of the national authorities. And it is the responsibility of the national authorities to ensure the compliance with the relevant EU and National law.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005268/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(23 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Αποστράγγιση του Στρατωνικού όρους από τις δραστηριότητες της «Ελληνικός Χρυσός»

Στα πλαίσια των δραστηριοτήτων της «Ελληνικός Χρυσός ΑΕ», στις Σκουριές Χαλκιδικής, εντάσσεται και η κατασκευή συνδετήριας στοάς Μάντεμ Λάκκου-Ολυμπιάδας, μήκους 8 800 μ. Η στοά αυτή διαπερνά το Στρατωνικό όρος, που ανήκει στο δίκτυο Natura 2000. Οι εργασίες διάνοιξης της στοάς έχουν εδώ και λίγο καιρό σταματήσει λόγω της έκλυσης υδάτων που, σύμφωνα με πληροφορίες, φτάνει και τα 300 κυβικά την ώρα, φαινόμενο το οποίο η «Ελληνικός Χρυσός» αδυνατεί να αντιμετωπίσει. Η εξέλιξη αυτή συνεπάγεται την ταχύτατη και άμεση αποστράγγιση του ορεινού όγκου του Στρατωνικού, που εντάσσεται σε ειδικό καθεστώς προστασίας.

Με βάση τα παραπάνω ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Είναι σε γνώση της το συγκεκριμένο περιστατικό;

— Θεωρεί ότι η αποστράγγιση του Στρατωνικού όρους από τις δραστηριότητες της «Ελληνικός Χρυσός» συνιστά παραβίαση της οδηγίας 2000/60/ΕΚ για τα ύδατα και της οδηγίας 92/43/ΕΟΚ περί οικοτόπων;

— Προτίθεται να ζητήσει από τις ελληνικές αρχές στοιχεία για τυχόν ενέργειες αναφορικά με το εν λόγω περιστατικό;

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005269/14
προς την Επιτροπή
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(23 Απριλίου 2014)

Θέμα: Ρύπανση υπόγειων υδάτων στη Β.Α. Χαλκιδική από τις δραστηριότητες της εταιρείας «Ελληνικός Χρυσός»

Η προβλεπόμενη από την Απόφαση Έγκρισης Περιβαλλοντικών Όρων λιθογόμωση της στοάς του μεταλλείου «μαύρων Πετρών» στη Χαλκιδική, που έγινε με μεταλλευτικά απόβλητα της εταιρείας Ελληνικός Χρυσός τα οποία περιέχουν αρσενικό και άλλα βαρέα μέταλλα, θέτει σε άμεσο κίνδυνο τη δημόσια υγεία. Οι λιθογομωμένες με αδρανή υλικά στοές παρουσιάζουν προβλήματα έκλυσης αρσενικού, γεγονός που επιβάλλει συνεχή παρακολούθηση και έλεγχο. Κατ' επανάληψη έχουν επισημανθεί περιστατικά ρύπανσης των υδάτων με αρσενικό στα παρακείμενα χωριά (Νεοχώρι, Ολυμπιάδα κ.α.)

Με βάση τα παραπάνω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Είναι σε γνώση της το συγκεκριμένο περιστατικό;

2. Θεωρεί ότι η ρύπανση των υπογείων υδάτων από τις δραστηριότητες της Ελληνικός Χρυσός συνιστά παραβίαση της οδηγίας 2000/60/ΕΚ;

3. Προτίθεται να ζητήσει από τις ελληνικές αρχές στοιχεία για τυχόν ενέργειες και ελέγχους που έχει διενεργήσει για τη διασφάλιση της δημόσιας υγείας στις παρακείμενες περιοχές;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Potočnik εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(16 Ιουνίου 2014)

Η Επιτροπή δεν είναι ενήμερη για τα περιστατικά έκλυσης και ρύπανσης των υπόγειων υδάτων που αναφέρθηκαν από τον κ. βουλευτή.

Λόγω των περιορισμένων πληροφοριών που παρασχέθηκαν, η Επιτροπή δεν είναι σε θέση να προβεί σε λεπτομερή αξιολόγηση του κατά πόσο το περιστατικό συνιστά παραβίαση της οδηγίας πλαισίου για τα ύδατα ([1]) ή της οδηγίας για τους οικοτόπους ([2]).

Όπως προκύπτει από τις εν λόγω πληροφορίες, η έκλυση οφείλεται σε ατύχημα. Η οδηγία πλαίσιο 2000/60/ΕΚ για τα ύδατα επιβάλλει στα κράτη μέλη να λαμβάνουν μέτρα για την πρόληψη της υποβάθμισης της κατάστασης των υδατικών συστημάτων. Επομένως, εναπόκειται στις ελληνικές αρχές να διασφαλίσουν ότι λαμβάνονται μέτρα για την πρόληψη της μόνιμης υποβάθμισης των σχετικών υδατικών συστημάτων και των συναφών προστατευόμενων περιοχών, εάν υπάρχουν.

([1]) Οδηγία 2000/60/ΕΚ, ΕΕ L 327 της 22.12.2000.
([2]) Οδηγία 92/43/ΕΟΚ του Συμβουλίου, της 21ης Μαΐου 1992, για τη διατήρηση των φυσικών οικοτόπων καθώς και της άγριας πανίδας και χλωρίδας, ΕΕ L 206 της 22.7.1992.

Το Στρατωνικό όρος περιλαμβάνεται στο δίκτυο Natura 2000 ως ειδική ζώνη διατήρησης, βάσει της οδηγίας 92/43/ΕΟΚ για τους οικοτόπους. Ως εκ τούτου, η περιοχή υπόκειται στις διατάξεις περί προστασίας και διαχείρισης που καθορίζονται στο άρθρο 6 της οδηγίας και η Ελλάδα πρέπει να διασφαλίσει ότι λαμβάνονται κατάλληλα μέτρα για την πρόληψη της υποβάθμισης της περιοχής και την επίτευξη των στόχων διατήρησης.

Η Επιτροπή θα ζητήσει από τις ελληνικές αρχές να παράσχουν πληροφορίες σχετικά με τα εν λόγω ζητήματα.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005268/14
to the Commission
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Drainage of Mt Stratonikos through the activities of the Hellas Gold

As part of the activities of *Hellas Gold at* Skouries in Chalkidiki, an 8 800 m connecting gallery is being built from Madem, Lakkos, to Olympiada. This gallery will pass through Mt Stratonikos which forms part of the Natura 2000 network. The construction of this gallery has recently been suspended due to water seepage, reportedly at a rate of 300 cubic metres an hour; *Hellas Gold* is unable to do anything to stop it. This development means that the Stratonikos massif -which enjoys special protection status — is being very rapidly drained of its water.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

— Is it aware of this incident?

— Does it consider that the drainage of Mt Stratonikos through the activities of *Hellas Gold* constitutes a violation of the Water Framework Directive 2000/60/EC and the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC?

— Will it ask the Greek authorities to provide information on any measures taken in respect this incident?

Question for written answer E-005269/14
to the Commission
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(23 April 2014)

Subject: Contamination of groundwater in NE Chalkidiki through the activities of Hellas Gold

The environmental permit issued for the 'Mavra Petra' mine gallery in Chalkidiki provided for the backfilling of the gallery. However, Hellas Gold has done so with extractive waste that contains arsenic and other heavy metals which pose a direct risk to public health: the galleries filled with extractive waste are releasing arsenic, a development that requires continuous monitoring and controls. Repeated incidents have been identified in which water in nearby villages (Neochori, Olympiada, etc.) has been contaminated by arsenic.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Is it aware of this state of affairs?

2. Does it consider that groundwater contamination due to the activities of *Hellas Gold* constitutes a violation of Directive 2000/60/EC?

3. Does it intend to ask the Greek authorities to brief it on any measures and controls the company has carried out to safeguard public health in nearby areas?

Joint answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2014)

The Commission is not aware of the water seepage and the groundwater pollution incidents reported by the Honourable Member.

Based on the limited information provided, the Commission is not in a position to give a detailed assessment of whether the incident constitutes a violation of either the Water Framework Directive ([1]) or the Habitats Directive ([2]).

It appears in the information provided that the seepage was due to an accident. The Water Framework Directive 2000/60/EC requires Member States to take measures to prevent the deterioration of status of the water bodies. Therefore, it is for the Greek authorities to ensure that action is taken to prevent permanent deterioration to affected water bodies and associated protected areas, if any.

([1]) Directive 2000/60/EC, OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.
([2]) Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21.5.1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.

Mount Stratonikos is included in the Natura 2000 network as a Special Area of Conservation by virtue of the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC. The area is therefore subject to the protection and management provisions laid down in Article 6 of the directive and Greece needs to ensure that adequate measures are taken to prevent the deterioration of the area and to meet its conservation objectives.

The Commission will ask the Greek authorities for information on these issues.

ISSN 1977-0979 (elektronikus kiadás)
ISSN 1725-518X (nyomtatott kiadás)

Az Európai Unió Kiadóhivatala
2985 Luxembourg
LUXEMBURG

HU