ISSN 1725-2466

Gazzetta ufficiale dell'Unione europea

C 35 E

Edizione in lingua italiana

Comunicazioni e informazioni

57° anno

6 febbraio 2014

Numero d'informazione | Sommario | Pagina

IV *Informazioni*

INFORMAZIONI PROVENIENTI DALLE ISTITUZIONI, DAGLI ORGANI E DAGLI ORGANISMI DELL'UNIONE EUROPEA

Parlamento europeo

INTERROGAZIONI SCRITTE CON RISPOSTA

2014/C 35 E/01 Interrogazioni scritte presentate dai deputati al Parlamento europeo e relative risposte date da un'Istituzione dell'Unione europea 1

(Cfr. nota per il lettore)

IT

Nota per il lettore

Questa pubblicazione contiene interrogazioni scritte presentate dai deputati al Parlamento europeo e le relative risposte date da un'istituzione dell'Unione europea.

Per ciascuna interrogazione e risposta, la versione nella lingua originale è presentata prima di un'eventuale traduzione.

In alcuni casi è possibile che la risposta sia redatta in una lingua diversa da quella dell'interrogazione: questo dipende dalla lingua di lavoro della commissione che deve fornire la risposta.

Queste interrogazioni e risposte sono pubblicate in conformità degli articoli 117 e 118 del regolamento del Parlamento europeo.

Tutte le interrogazioni e le relative risposte sono accessibili attraverso il sito web del Parlamento europeo (Europarl) alla rubrica «Interrogazioni parlamentari»:

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

SIGNIFICATO DELLE ABBREVIAZIONI DEI GRUPPI POLITICI

PPE	gruppo del Partito popolare europeo (Democratico cristiano)
S&D	gruppo dell'Alleanza progressista di Socialisti e Democratici al Parlamento europeo
ALDE	gruppo dell'Alleanza dei Democratici e dei Liberali per l'Europa
Verts/ALE	gruppo Verde/Alleanza libera europea
ECR	gruppo dei Conservatori e Riformisti europei
GUE/NGL	gruppo confederale della Sinistra unitaria europea/Sinistra verde nordica
EFD	gruppo Europa della Libertà e della Democrazia
NI	non iscritti

IT

IV

(Informazioni)

INFORMAZIONI PROVENIENTI DALLE ISTITUZIONI, DAGLI ORGANI E DAGLI ORGANISMI DELL'UNIONE EUROPEA

PARLAMENTO EUROPEO

INTERROGAZIONI SCRITTE CON RISPOSTA

Interrogazioni scritte presentate dai deputati al Parlamento europeo e relative risposte date da un'Istituzione dell'Unione europea

(2014/C 35 E/01)

Sommario **Pagina**

E-004317/13 by Nikos Chrysogelos to the Commission
Subject: Progress with the implementation of a Greek National Land Registry and the likelihood of an immediate funding cut
Ελληνική έκδοση 25
English version 27

E-004318/13 by Andrea Zanoni and Nadja Hirsch to the Commission
Subject: Export of livestock from the EU to third countries (follow-up question to Written Question E-001116/2013)
Deutsche Fassung 28
Versione italiana 29
English version 30

E-004319/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: EU protection of Internet operators against cyber-attacks
Versione italiana 31
English version 32

E-004320/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: EU action to safeguard the health of European consumers
Versione italiana 33
English version 34

E-004321/13 by Andrea Zanoni to the Commission
Subject: Possible violations of sectoral EU legislation with regard to the severe mercury pollution of a deep aquifer in the province of Treviso
Versione italiana 35
English version 36

E-004322/13 by Ivo Belet to the Commission
Subject: Rescue of Vauxhall Ellesmere Port: consequences for subcontractors in other EU Member States
Nederlandse versie ... 37
English version ... 38

E-004323/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission
Subject: Ploughing of land in the Paraje de la Herradura
Versión española ... 39
English version ... 40

E-004533/13 by James Nicholson to the Commission
Subject: European Report on Development 2013
English version ... 41

E-004534/13 by James Nicholson to the Commission
Subject: Hourly labour costs in the EU
English version ... 42

E-004535/13 by Mojca Kleva Kekuš to the Commission
Subject: Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence
Slovenska različica ... 43
English version ... 44

E-004536/13 by Aldo Patriciello to the Commission
Subject: Internet neutrality
Versione italiana ... 45
English version ... 46

E-004537/13 by Marina Yannakoudakis to the Commission
Subject: The Temporary Agency Work Directive (2008/104/EC)
English version ... 47

E-004538/13 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Possible funding to develop the Campello plateau in Itri (Latina)
Versione italiana ... 48
English version ... 50

P-004540/13 by Richard Falbr to the Commission
Subject: Financial correction in the Severozápad Regional Operation Programme (ROP) — ongoing failure of national authorities to act regarding financial correction procedure in the Severozápad ROP (Letter Regio DGA1.C.4/PH/PJkfD)2012)1671651 of 31 January 2013)
České znění ... 52
English version ... 53

E-004541/13 by Josefa Andrés Barea to the Commission
Subject: Bankia preferred shares following the publication of the CNMV report
Versión española ... 54
English version ... 55

E-004542/13 by Marian Harkin to the Commission
Subject: Roaming charges in Europe
English version ... 56

E-004543/13 by Christine De Veyrac to the Commission
Subject: Rationalisation and efficiency of European defence instruments for the benefit of citizens
Version française ... 57
English version ... 58

E-004544/13 by Christine De Veyrac to the Commission
Subject: Importance of action at European level for the regulation of the digital sector
Version française ... 59
English version ... 60

E-004545/13 by Peter van Dalen to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Two bishops kidnapped in Syria
Nederlandse versie ... 61
English version ... 62

P-004546/13 by Fiorello Provera to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Prime Minister Erdoğan plans to visit Gaza despite opposition from the US and from the President of the Palestinian National Authority, Mahmoud Abbas
Versione italiana ... 63
English version ... 64

E-004547/13 by Alyn Smith to the Commission
Subject: Illegal bird hunting in Cyprus
English version ... 65

E-004548/13 by Julie Girling to the Commission
Subject: Eggs — follow-up to Written Question E-001299/2013
English version ... 66

E-004549/13 by Claude Moraes to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Chronic hunger in Bangladesh
English version ... 67

E-004550/13 by Claude Moraes to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Bangladesh elections
English version ... 68

E-004553/13 by Claude Moraes to the Commission
Subject: European business corporate social responsibility (CSR) in third countries
English version ... 69

E-004555/13 by Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė to the Commission
Subject: Violation of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union
Tekstas lietuvių kalba ... 70
English version ... 71

E-004556/13 by Mikael Gustafsson to the Commission
Subject: Israel's treatment of Palestinian children
Svensk version ... 72
English version ... 73

E-004557/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Application of Directive 2008/48/EC — credit agreements for consumers
Versão portuguesa ... 74
English version ... 75

E-004558/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: A step change in the economy — policies to be applied
Versão portuguesa ... 76
English version ... 77

E-004559/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: EURES — jobseekers and placements
Versão portuguesa ... 78
English version ... 79

E-004560/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: EURES — jobseekers and placements
Versão portuguesa ... 80
English version ... 81

E-004561/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: EURES — programming and reporting cycle
Versão portuguesa ... 82
English version ... 83

E-004562/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: E-exclusion of the elderly
Versão portuguesa ... 84
English version ... 85

E-004563/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Data protection — notification of personal data breaches
Versão portuguesa ... 86
English version ... 87

E-004564/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Hot-air balloon operations
Versão portuguesa ... 88
English version ... 89

E-004565/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Return of national treasures
Versão portuguesa ... 90
English version ... 91

E-004566/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission
Subject: Food safety
Versão portuguesa ... 92
English version ... 93

E-004567/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission
Subject: Tackling illegal downloads
Versão portuguesa ... 94
English version ... 96

E-004568/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission
Subject: International Day for Monuments and Sites
Versão portuguesa ... 97
English version ... 98

E-004569/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission
Subject: Proposal to tackle youth unemployment using EU funds for special schemes
Versão portuguesa ... 99
English version ... 100

E-004570/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission
Subject: College of Europe Degrees
Versão portuguesa ... 101
English version ... 102

P-004571/13 by María Irigoyen Pérez to the Commission
Subject: Amendments to Law 10/2012 still infringe the right of equal access to justice in Spain
Versión española ... 103
English version ... 104

P-004572/13 by François Alfonsi to the Commission
Subject: EU policy and state aid for the French film industry
Version française ... 105
English version ... 106

E-004573/13 by Theodoros Skylakakis to the Commission
Subject: Protection of Europe's cultural and architectural heritage
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 107
English version ... 108

E-004575/13 by Claude Moraes to the Commission
Subject: Burma/Myanmar sanctions/Rohingya Muslim persecution
English version ... 109

E-004576/13 by Jelko Kacin and Sir Graham Watson to the Commission
Subject: Protection of women and children against human trafficking in Moldova
Slovenska različica ... 110
English version ... 111

E-004577/13 by Fiorello Provera to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Palestinian Authority payments to jailed militants
Versione italiana ... 112
English version ... 113

E-004578/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: The Commission should actively supervise German banks
Versione italiana ... 114
English version ... 115

E-004579/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: The Commission should make bisphenol A in food packaging illegal
Versione italiana ... 116
English version ... 117

E-004581/13 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: Crisis in the leather industry
Versione italiana ... 118
English version ... 119

E-004582/13 by Giancarlo Scottà to the Commission
Subject: Illegal marketing of sambuca liqueur
Versione italiana ... 120
English version ... 121

E-004585/13 by Juozas Imbrasas to the Commission
Subject: Sale of land to foreign nationals
Tekstas lietuvių kalba ... 122
English version ... 123

E-004586/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Banco Santander predicts that Spain's three biggest banks will hold a market share of 70% after the crisis — competition and abuses of dominant position
Versión española ... 124
English version ... 125

E-004587/13 by María Irigoyen Pérez to the Commission
Subject: Fraudulent marketing of financial products in Spain
Versión española ... 126
English version ... 127

E-004588/13 by Michael Theurer to the Commission
Subject: Life+ programme — EU support for German environmental projects
Deutsche Fassung ... 128
English version ... 129

E-004589/13 by Nikolaos Salavrakos to the Commission
Subject: Destruction of monuments in Albania
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 130
English version ... 131

E-004590/13 by Amelia Andersdotter to the Commission
Subject: Weakening of the rule of law through the influence of Special 301 Reports
Svensk version ... 132
English version ... 133

E-004592/13 by Alyn Smith to the Commission
Subject: European Directory of Notaries
English version ... 134

E-004593/13 by Isabelle Thomas to the Commission
Subject: Negotiation of fisheries agreements with Norway
Version française ... 135
English version ... 136

E-004594/13 by Andrea Zanoni to the Commission
Subject: Building work on the dunes at Badesi (province of Olbia-Tempio) in Sardinia, in clear breach of Directives 92/43/EEC and 2011/92/EU
Versione italiana ... 137
English version ... 138

E-004595/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: EU action to safeguard public health
Versione italiana ... 139
English version ... 140

E-004596/13 by Marita Ulvskog, Göran Färm, Anna Hedh and Jens Nilsson to the Commission
Subject: State aid for regional airports
Svensk version ... 141
English version ... 142

E-004597/13 by Maria Badia i Cutchet, Raimon Obiols and Andrés Perelló Rodríguez to the Commission
Subject: Shortcomings of the preventive aspects of EU legislation with respect to fracking — the case of Riudaura
Versión española ... 143
English version ... 144

E-004598/13 by Michael Theurer to the Commission
Subject: The distribution of contributions to the EU budget
Deutsche Fassung ... 145
English version ... 146

E-004599/13 by Amelia Andersdotter to the Commission
Subject: Reliability of assistants in dealing with confidential documents
Svensk version ... 147
English version ... 148

E-004600/13 by Minodora Cliveti to the Commission
Subject: Childcare services in the European Union — a solution to help women achieve a work-life balance
Versiunea în limba română ... 149
English version ... 150

E-004601/13 by Gay Mitchell, Peter Skinner, Charles Tannock, Marianne Thyssen, Angelika Werthmann, Nathalie Griesbeck, Nirj Deva, Filip Kaczmarek, Diane Dodds, Nessa Childers, Emer Costello, Marian Harkin, Michael Cashman, David Casa, Mairead McGuinness, Wim van de Camp, Hannu Takkula, András Gyürk, Struan Stevenson, Evgeni Kirilov, Pavel Poc, Francisco José Millán Mon, Pat the Cope Gallagher, Giancarlo Scottà, Zuzana Roithová, Miroslav Ouzký and Miroslav Mikolášik to the Commission
Subject: Follow-up to the Written Declaration on Epilepsy
българска версия ... 151
Versión española ... 152
České znění ... 153
Deutsche Fassung ... 154
Version française ... 155
Versione italiana ... 156
Magyar változat ... 157
Verżjoni Maltija ... 158
Nederlandse versie ... 159
Wersja polska ... 160
Slovenské znenie ... 161
Suomenkielinen versio ... 162
English version ... 163

P-004605/13 by Antonio Cancian to the Commission
Subject: Breach of the right of establishment and of competition rules in Poland
Versione italiana ... 164
English version ... 165

E-004606/13 by Jörg Leichtfried to the Commission
Subject: National action plans for animal health
Deutsche Fassung ... 166
English version ... 167

E-004607/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Commission
Subject: Conversion of Turkish churches into mosques
Versione italiana ... 168
English version ... 169

E-004608/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Commission
Subject: Rising opium production in Afghanistan
Versione italiana ... 170
English version ... 172

E-004610/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Commission
Subject: Alleged presence of lead in rice imports
Versione italiana ... 173
English version ... 174

E-004611/13 by Louis Michel and Michèle Striffler to the Commission
Subject: Humanitarian aid and the rebuilding of Haiti
Version française ... 175
English version ... 176

P-004614/13 by Ingeborg Gräßle to the Commission
Subject: Alcohol-fuelled late lunch with the principal witness in the Dalli case
Deutsche Fassung ... 177
English version ... 179

E-004615/13 by Bart Staes to the Commission
Subject: Solar panels and green energy in Hungary
Nederlandse versie ... 181
English version ... 182

E-004616/13 by Ria Oomen-Ruijten and Esther de Lange to the Commission
Subject: Inconsistencies between the Dutch Health Insurance Act and the free movement of patients
Nederlandse versie ... 183
English version ... 184

E-004617/13 by Ivo Vajgl to the Commission
Subject: Measures to protect bees and other insects against certain pesticides to improve food security in the EU
Slovenska različica ... 185
English version ... 186

E-004618/13 by Marita Ulvskog to the Commission
Subject: EU cabotage rules
Svensk version ... 187
English version ... 188

E-004619/13 by Véronique Mathieu Houillon to the Commission
Subject: Consistent application of the Birds Directive across the EU
Version française ... 189
English version ... 190

E-004620/13 by Robert Goebbels to the Commission
Subject: Commission grants for certain non-governmental organisations
Version française ... 191
English version ... 192

E-004621/13 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: Marine turbines for clean energy
Versione italiana ... 193
English version ... 194

E-004622/13 by Cristiana Muscardini and Susy De Martini to the Commission
Subject: Wind energy dominates in the United States
Versione italiana ... 195
English version ... 196

E-004623/13 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: Derivatives, or weapons of mass destruction
Versione italiana ... 197
English version ... 198

E-004624/13 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: The hidden side of counterfeiting
Versione italiana ... 199
English version ... 201

E-004625/13 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: Crisis in the metalworking industry
Versione italiana ... 202
English version ... 203

E-004626/13 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: Blocking the metabolism of tumour cells
Versione italiana ... 204
English version ... 205

E-004627/13 by Chrysoula Paliadeli to the Commission
Subject: Euronews in Greek
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 206
English version ... 207

E-004628/13 by Marietje Schaake to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Unanswered question: 'Sanctions against Iran blocking access to life-saving medicine'
Nederlandse versie ... 208
English version ... 209

E-004629/13 by Jens Rohde to the Commission
Subject: Approval of compensation for buffer strips
Dansk udgave ... 210
English version ... 211

E-004640/13 by Corina Crețu to the Commission
Subject: Impact of an ageing population
Versiunea în limba română ... 212
English version ... 213

E-004641/13 by Corina Crețu to the Council
Subject: Measures for combating tax evasion in the European Union
Versiunea în limba română ... 214
English version ... 215

E-004642/13 by Mitro Repo to the Commission
Subject: Continued discrimination against Roma in the EU Member States
Suomenkielinen versio ... 216
English version ... 217

E-004644/13 by Jill Evans to the Commission
Subject: Decontamination of EU-protected wetlands
English version ... 218

E-004645/13 by Anna Rosbach to the Commission
Subject: Clostridium difficile research
Dansk udgave ... 219
English version ... 220

E-004646/13 by Anna Rosbach to the Commission
Subject: Healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) and medical devices
Dansk udgave ... 221
English version ... 222

E-004647/13 by Anna Rosbach to the Commission
Subject: National action plans on combating healthcare associated infections
Dansk udgave ... 223
English version ... 224

E-004648/13 by Anna Rosbach to the Commission
Subject: Risk of acquiring healthcare-associated infections at EU hospitals
Dansk udgave ... 225
English version ... 227

E-004649/13 by Anna Rosbach to the Commission
Subject: Surveillance of the spread of *Clostridium difficile*
Dansk udgave ... 228
English version ... 229

E-004650/13 by Francesco Enrico Speroni to the Commission
Subject: Implementation of the European Act of 1976 and age discrimination
Versione italiana ... 230
English version ... 231

E-004651/13 by Francesco Enrico Speroni to the Commission
Subject: Exclusion from work on the grounds of age
Versione italiana ... 232
English version ... 233

E-004652/13 by Jan Březina to the Commission
Subject: Impact of the revised Tobacco Products Directive (TPD) on growth of the black market
České znění ... 234
English version ... 235

P-004653/13 by Spyros Danellis to the Commission
Subject: Applications for direct aid to Greece
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 236
English version ... 237

P-004654/13 by Olle Schmidt to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Human trafficking in Sinai
Svensk version ... 238
English version ... 239

E-004655/13 by Dolores García-Hierro Caraballo to the Commission
Subject: European Maritime and Fisheries Fund
Versión española ... 240
English version ... 241

E-004656/13 by Dolores García-Hierro Caraballo to the Commission
Subject: Training in the fisheries sector
Versión española ... 242
English version ... 243

E-004658/13 by Antolín Sánchez Presedo to the Commission
Subject: Procedure for preventing and correcting macroeconomic imbalances: Commission analysis
Versión española ... 244
English version ... 245

E-004659/13 by Antolín Sánchez Presedo to the Commission
Subject: Combating tax fraud: protection of informers and limits on confidentiality clauses
Versión española ... 246
English version ... 247

E-004660/13 by Andreas Mölzer to the Commission
Subject: The accumulation of bad debt in euro banks
Deutsche Fassung ... 248
English version ... 249

E-004661/13 by Andreas Mölzer to the Commission
Subject: Switzerland — immigration restrictions for EU citizens
Deutsche Fassung ... 250
English version ... 251

E-004662/13 by Andreas Mölzer to the Commission
Subject: TAP Agreement
Deutsche Fassung ... 252
English version ... 253

E-004663/13 by Andreas Mölzer to the Commission
Subject: Re-entry ban for social security fraud
Deutsche Fassung ... 254
English version ... 255

E-004664/13 by Sir Graham Watson, Romana Jordan, Vladko Todorov Panayotov, Adina-Ioana Vălean, Daciana Octavia Sârbu, Silvia-Adriana Ţicău, Hélène Flautre and Claude Turmes to the Commission
Subject: South-East Europe as an electricity corridor
българска версия ... 256
Version française ... 257
Versiunea în limba română ... 258
Slovenska različica ... 259
English version ... 260

E-004665/13 by David Martin to the Commission
Subject: Rights of workers questioning health and safety issues at their workplace
English version ... 261

E-004666/13 by Marielle de Sarnez to the Commission
Subject: Impact assessment of the common agricultural policy (CAP) in respect of agriculture in developing countries
Version française ... 262
English version ... 263

E-004667/13 by Marielle de Sarnez to the Commission
Subject: Enhancing safety standards for megaships
Version française ... 264
English version ... 265

E-004668/13 by Michel Dantin to the Commission
Subject: The European egg market
Version française ... 266
English version ... 267

E-004669/13 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Kokopelli
Version française ... 268
English version ... 269

E-004670/13 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: Counterfeiting via the web
Versione italiana ... 270
English version ... 271

E-004671/13 by Giancarlo Scottà to the Commission
Subject: Birds in small numbers (Article 9(1)(c) of Directive 147/2009/EC)
Versione italiana ... 272
English version ... 273

E-004672/13 by Giancarlo Scottà to the Council
Subject: Tax revenue from electronic cigarettes
Versione italiana ... 274
English version ... 275

E-004673/13 by Patricia van der Kammen to the Commission
Subject: Benefit and allowance fraud in the Netherlands
Nederlandse versie ... 276
English version ... 277

E-004674/13 by Patricia van der Kammen to the Commission
Subject: Reports of a possible requirement for using only EU-approved seed and plant propagating material
Nederlandse versie ... 278
English version ... 279

P-004675/13 by Eva Ortiz Vilella to the Commission
Subject: Retroactivity of anti-dumping measures against mandarin orange imports from China
Versión española ... 280
English version ... 281

P-004676/13 by Claude Turmes to the Commission
Subject: Fugitive methane emissions of shale gas
Version française ... 282
English version ... 283

P-004677/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Rare disease investigation funds
Versão portuguesa ... 284
English version ... 286

P-004678/13 by Marian-Jean Marinescu to the Commission
Subject: Emergency Ordinance No 25 of 10 April 2013 amending and supplementing the audiovisual law
Versiunea în limba română ... 287
English version ... 288

E-004679/13 by Daniël van der Stoep to the Commission
Subject: European index of subsidies
Nederlandse versie ... 289
English version ... 290

E-004680/13 by Ingeborg Gräßle to the Commission
Subject: Ombudsman confirms maladministration by OLAF
Deutsche Fassung ... 291
English version ... 293

E-004681/13 by Jörg Leichtfried to the Commission
Subject: Pig fattening on cargo ships with subsequent slaughtering in the EU
Deutsche Fassung ... 295
English version ... 296

E-004682/13 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission
Subject: Pan-European Game Information System (PEGI)
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 297
English version ... 298

E-004683/13 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission
Subject: The Excessive Imbalance Procedure and households
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 299
English version ... 300

E-004684/13 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission
Subject: Action on voluntary repatriation
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 301
English version ... 302

E-004685/13 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission
Subject: Investments in pre-school education and care
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 303
English version ... 304

E-004686/13 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission
Subject: The ARROW Plus project in Greece
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 305
English version ... 306

E-004687/13 by Knut Fleckenstein to the Commission
Subject: Implementation of the LeaderSHIP 2020 strategy
Deutsche Fassung ... 307
English version ... 309

E-004689/13 by David Martin to the Commission
Subject: Use of Alpha Bank bailout funds in property legal cases
English version ... 311

E-004690/13 by Linda McAvan to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Somalia — abuse against displaced persons
English version ... 312

E-004691/13 by Jim Higgins to the Commission
Subject: Impact of public procurement on small businesses
English version ... 313

E-004692/13 by Sharon Bowles to the Commission
Subject: Leniency notice
English version ... 314

E-004693/13 by Sharon Bowles to the Commission
Subject: Leniency Notice
English version ... 316

E-004694/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: 'Made in Italy' products and the leather industry: difficulties in procuring raw material
Versione italiana ... 318
English version ... 319

E-004695/13 by Carl Schlyter to the Commission
Subject: Case SA.33618 Uppsala arena
Svensk version ... 320
English version ... 321

E-004696/13 by Marco Scurria to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Raif Badawi sentenced to death
Versione italiana ... 322
English version ... 323

E-004697/13 by Marietta Giannakou and Maria Eleni Koppa to the Commission
Subject: Non-transparent EU recruitment procedures for staff on fixed-term contracts (CAST)
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 324
English version ... 325

E-004698/13 by Chris Davies to the Commission
Subject: Raising standards in European zoos
English version ... 326

E-004699/13 by Bastiaan Belder to the Commission
Subject: Implementation of the Falsified Medicines Directive
Nederlandse versie ... 327
English version ... 329

E-004701/13 by Philippe Boulland to the Commission
Subject: Banning geraniol in perfume manufacturing
Version française ... 331
English version ... 332

E-004702/13 by Cristiana Muscardini, Sonia Alfano, Oreste Rossi and Anna Rosbach to the Commission
Subject: Deviant culture
Dansk udgave ... 333
Versione italiana ... 334
English version ... 335

E-004703/13 by Barbara Matera to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Persecution of Christians in Nigeria
Versione italiana ... 336
English version ... 337

P-004704/13 by Andrew Henry William Brons to the Commission
Subject: Police raid at the home of the former MEP, Mr Ashley Mote
English version ... 338

E-004705/13 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: General Court of the European Union's rejection of Italy's appeal against the blocking of ERDF funds for the Operational Programme for Campania
Versione italiana ... 339
English version ... 340

E-004706/13 by Mark Demesmaeker to the Commission
Subject: Implementation by Belgium of Directive 2010/41/EU (equal treatment of self-employed men and women)
Nederlandse versie ... 341
English version ... 342

E-004707/13 by Auke Zijlstra to the Commission
Subject: Breach of Oslo II
Nederlandse versie ... 343
English version ... 344

E-004709/13 by Adam Bielan to the Commission
Subject: Situation of girls in South Sudan
Wersja polska ... 345
English version ... 346

E-004710/13 by Adam Bielan to the Commission
Subject: '50 000 Tourists' initiative
Wersja polska ... 347
English version ... 348

E-004711/13 by Adam Bielan to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Violence in Bahrain
Wersja polska ... 349
English version ... 350

E-004712/13 by Adam Bielan to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Discrimination against NGOs in Russia
Wersja polska ... 351
English version ... 352

E-004713/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission
Subject: State aid to recapitalise Portuguese bank
Versão portuguesa ... 353
English version ... 354

E-004714/13 by María Irigoyen Pérez to the Commission
Subject: Madrid Operational Programme
Versión española ... 355
English version ... 356

E-004715/13 by Cristiana Muscardini and Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Industrial exploitation of a biotechnology method
Versione italiana ... 357
English version ... 359

E-004716/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Automated defibrillators
Versão portuguesa ... 360
English version ... 361

E-004717/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Bluetongue outbreak in Spain
Versão portuguesa ... 362
English version ... 363

E-004718/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Discovery of new cork-expansion method
Versão portuguesa ... 364
English version ... 365

E-004719/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Attacks in Iraq
Versão portuguesa ... 366
English version ... 367

E-004720/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Israel — Syria has used chemical weapons
Versão portuguesa ... 368
English version ... 369

E-004722/13 by Nuno Melo to the Council
Subject: Result of elections in Croatia
Versão portuguesa ... 370
English version ... 371

E-004723/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Guido Mantega's statements
Versão portuguesa ... 372
English version ... 373

E-004724/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Unemployment in Spain
Versão portuguesa ... 374
English version ... 375

E-004725/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Greece's claim for war reparations from Germany
Versão portuguesa ... 376
English version ... 377

E-004726/13 by Nuno Melo to the Council
Subject: Guido Mantega's statements
Versão portuguesa ... 378
English version ... 379

E-004727/13 by Nuno Melo to the Council
Subject: Angela Merkel's statements
Versão portuguesa ... 380
English version ... 381

E-004728/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Angela Merkel's statements
Versão portuguesa ... 382
English version ... 383

E-004729/13 by Gaston Franco and Theodoros Skylakakis to the Commission
Subject: Strategic framework on Mediterranean forests
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 384
Version française ... 385
English version ... 386

E-004730/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Attack on the French embassy
Versão portuguesa ... 387
English version ... 388

E-004731/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Syrian opposition — Request for arms at the G8
Versão portuguesa ... 389
English version ... 390

E-004732/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Israel — Syria has used chemical weapons
Versão portuguesa ... 391
English version ... 392

E-004733/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Attack on Somalia's Supreme Court
Versão portuguesa ... 393
English version ... 394

E-004734/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Fitch's downgrading of the UK's credit rating
Versão portuguesa ... 395
English version ... 396

E-004735/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Serbia's entry into the EU
Versão portuguesa ... 397
English version ... 398

E-004736/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: One in every five children worldwide is not vaccinated
Versão portuguesa ... 399
English version ... 400

E-004737/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Platform for fighting tax fraud
Versão portuguesa ... 401
English version ... 402

E-004738/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Effects of biosimilar medicines
Versão portuguesa ... 403
English version ... 404

E-004739/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: New strain of the bird-flu virus
Versão portuguesa ... 405
English version ... 406

E-004740/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: 17 EU Member States are in breach of the Stability and Growth Pact
Versão portuguesa ... 407
English version ... 408

E-004741/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Addiction to technology
Versão portuguesa ... 409
English version ... 410

E-004742/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Bitcoins
Versão portuguesa ... 411
English version ... 412

E-004743/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Quick blood test
Versão portuguesa ... 413
English version ... 414

E-004744/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Attacks by the Islamist militia in Somalia
Versão portuguesa ... 415
English version ... 416

E-004745/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Error in the formula on which austerity policies are based
Versão portuguesa ... 417
English version ... 418

E-004746/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Global warming: consequences for Portuguese wine
Versão portuguesa ... 419
English version ... 420

E-004747/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Cypriot citizenship
Versão portuguesa ... 421
English version ... 422

E-004748/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Limitation on emigrants to Switzerland
Versão portuguesa ... 423
English version ... 424

E-004749/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Age-related diseases
Versão portuguesa ... 425
English version ... 426

P-004750/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: The STEP market in France, the instruments negotiated in it and the ECB — doubts that have arisen and possible measures to be adopted
Versione italiana ... 427
English version ... 429

E-004751/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Mexican organised crime in Europe
Versão portuguesa ... 431
English version ... 432

E-004752/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Possible outbreak of tropical diseases
Versão portuguesa ... 433
English version ... 434

E-004753/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Cuts in medication for haemophiliacs
Versão portuguesa ... 435
English version ... 436

E-004754/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Osteoporosis medicines associated with heart problems
Versão portuguesa ... 437
English version ... 438

E-004755/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria
Versão portuguesa ... 439
English version ... 440

E-004757/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Invasive pneumococcal disease
Versão portuguesa ... 441
English version ... 442

E-004758/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Statements by Germany's Finance Minister
Versão portuguesa ... 443
English version ... 444

E-004759/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: European company law
Versão portuguesa ... 445
English version ... 446

E-004760/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Strengthening air passengers' rights in the EU
Versão portuguesa ... 447
English version ... 448

P-004761/13 by Emine Bozkurt to the Commission
Subject: Pelješac bridge
Nederlandse versie ... 449
English version ... 450

E-004762/13 by Richard Seeber to the Commission
Subject: Safety of food supplements with vegetable ingredients
Deutsche Fassung ... 451
English version ... 452

E-004764/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: Religious crisis in Nigeria: raising awareness and dealing with an emergency situation
Versione italiana ... 453
English version ... 454

E-004766/13 by Anna Rosbach to the Commission
Subject: Rules relating to websites for medical devices
Dansk udgave ... 455
English version ... 456

E-004768/13 by Julie Girling to the Commission
Subject: Follow-up: Migratory pathways for European eel stocks
English version ... 457

E-004769/13 by Arlene McCarthy to the Commission
Subject: Implementation of the 116000 hotline
English version ... 458

E-004770/13 by Peter Skinner to the Commission
Subject: Discrepancy between Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport and Directive 96/53/EC concerning maximum weight of vehicles
English version ... 459

E-004772/13 by Rachida Dati to the Commission
Subject: UfM energy project: the time has come to put ambitions into action
Version française ... 460
English version ... 461

E-004773/13 by Rachida Dati to the Commission
Subject: Measures to boost consumer confidence in meat industry professionals
Version française ... 462
English version ... 463

E-004774/13 by Rachida Dati to the Commission
Subject: Bringing women into the new technology sector: urgently needed for growth
Version française ... 464
English version ... 465

E-004776/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: Better quality of life for young people in Europe: what are the prospects?
Versione italiana ... 466
English version ... 467

E-004778/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: Safety at work in Europe: what to expect in the future
Versione italiana ... 468
English version ... 469

E-004780/13 by Sergio Gaetano Cofferati to the Commission
Subject: Restructuring of the Bank of Ireland's subordinated bond debt and consequences for consumers
Versione italiana ... 470
English version ... 471

E-004781/13 by Lorenzo Fontana to the Commission
Subject: Violence in the Central African Republic and arms trafficking
Versione italiana ... 472
English version ... 473

E-004782/13 by Elena Băsescu to the Commission
Subject: Measures to protect cetaceans in the Black Sea
Versiunea în limba română ... 474
English version ... 475

E-004783/13 by Elena Băsescu to the Commission
Subject: Concluding the negotiations on the EU-Republic of Moldova Association Agreement
Versiunea în limba română ... 476
English version ... 477

E-004784/13 by Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă to the Commission
Subject: Economic performance in agriculture
Versiunea în limba română ... 478
English version ... 479

E-004785/13 by Alf Svensson to the Commission
Subject: Immunisation and vaccines within the framework of the DCI budget
Svensk version ... 480
English version ... 481

P-004786/13 by Andrés Perelló Rodríguez to the Commission
Subject: Landfill in Jumilla (Murcia, Spain)
Versión española ... 482
English version ... 483

P-004787/13 by Frank Vanhecke to the Commission
Subject: Mercury in energy-saving light bulbs
Nederlandse versie ... 484
English version ... 485

E-004789/13 by Karl-Heinz Florenz to the Commission
Subject: Harmful organisms and the updating of the European list of harmful organisms and measures to combat them (Directive 2000/29/EC)
Deutsche Fassung ... 486
English version ... 488

E-004790/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Cancellation of Standing Committee meetings on genetically modified organisms (GMOs)
Versión española ... 489
English version ... 490

E-004791/13 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: Greek bailout
English version ... 491

E-004793/13 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Political deadlock in Bosnia and Herzegovina
English version ... 492

E-004794/13 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — EU training mission in Mali
English version ... 493

E-004795/13 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Earthquake in Iran
English version ... 494

E-004796/13 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: EU-Egypt taskforce
English version ... 495

E-004797/13 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: EUPOL in Afghanistan
English version ... 496

E-004799/13 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: Fuel poverty
English version ... 497

E-004800/13 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: Forced sterilisation in India
English version ... 498

E-004801/13 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Lifting of Burmese sanctions
English version ... 499

E-004802/13 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: Europeans fighting in Syria
English version ... 500

E-004803/13 by Phil Bennion to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Somalia armed forces capacity building
English version ... 501

E-004804/13 by Diane Dodds to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — EEAS reorganisation
English version ... 502

E-004805/13 by Paolo Bartolozzi to the Commission
Subject: Recognition of foreign qualifications and access to the profession of lawyer in Spain
Versione italiana ... 503
English version ... 504

E-004806/13 by Francesco Enrico Speroni to the Commission
Subject: Items of clothing acquired in non-EU countries for European Union missions
Versione italiana ... 505
English version ... 506

E-004807/13 by Arkadiusz Tomasz Bratkowski, Jacek Protasiewicz, Véronique Mathieu Houillon, Axel Voss and Elena Oana Antonescu to the Commission
Subject: Agreements on cooperation in the fight against serious crime between Eurojust and Croatia, Iceland, Switzerland, Norway, the USA and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Deutsche Fassung ... 507
Version française ... 508
Wersja polska ... 509
Versiunea în limba română ... 510
English version ... 511

P-004808/13 by Paul Murphy to the Council
Subject: Addition of the LTTE to the EU 'terrorist list'
English version ... 512

E-004810/13 by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission
Subject: Six million unemployed in Spain
Versión española ... 513
English version ... 514

E-004812/13 by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission
Subject: Emergency plan for youth unemployment
Versión española ... 515
English version ... 516

E-004814/13 by Francisco Sosa Wagner to the Commission
Subject: Protecting the Mediterranean Sea
Versión española ... 517
English version ... 518

E-004815/13 by Francisco Sosa Wagner to the Commission
Subject: Introduction of banned plant health products into the European Union
Versión española ... 519
English version ... 520

E-004816/13 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: Increased need for financing in Cyprus
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 521
English version ... 522

E-004817/13 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: Remuneration of independent authority members
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 523
English version ... 524

E-004818/13 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: Exchange of information on bank savings in the EU
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 525
English version ... 526

E-004819/13 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: Increase in the Greek deficit
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 527
English version ... 528

E-004820/13 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: State aid and the expansion of Chania airport
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 529
English version ... 530

E-004821/13 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: Bank debts to the Greek State
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 531
English version ... 532

E-004823/13 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: European bank stress tests
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 533
English version ... 534

P-004824/13 by Philip Claeys to the Council
Subject: Retirement allowance, salary, pension and rules on the remuneration of the President of the European Council
Nederlandse versie ... 535
English version ... 536

E-004825/13 by Patrick Le Hyaric to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Palestinian political prisoners
Version française ... 537
English version ... 538

E-004826/13 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: Money laundering in the EU
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 539
English version ... 540

E-004827/13 by Derek Vaughan to the Commission
Subject: Rare earth metals
English version ... 541

E-004828/13 by Matteo Salvini to the Commission
Subject: Implementation of the recommendations contained in the Vitorino report on private copying levies in the EU
Versione italiana ... 542
English version ... 543

E-004830/13 by Barbara Matera to the Commission
Subject: Treatment and research in the field of rare diseases
Versione italiana ... 544
English version ... 545

E-004831/13 by Herbert Dorfmann, Giovanni La Via, Elisabeth Jeggle, Aldo Patriciello, Clemente Mastella, Antonio Cancian, Hans-Peter Mayer, Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris, Mariya Gabriel, Salvatore Iacolino, Peter Jahr, Michel Dantin, Albert Deß, Maria do Céu Patrão Neves, Giancarlo Scottà, Astrid Lulling, Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines, Lara Comi, Paolo De Castro, Esther Herranz García, Mairead McGuinness, Giuseppe Gargani, Angelika Niebler, Amalia Sartori, Agnès Le Brun, Rareş-Lucian Niculescu, Anja Weisgerber, Licia Ronzulli, Véronique Mathieu Houillon, Filip Kaczmarek, Lorenzo Fontana, Vincenzo Iovine, Carlo Fidanza, Salvatore Tatarella, Christa Klaß, Markus Ferber, Dimitar Stoyanov and Janusz Wojciechowski to the Commission
Subject: Wine exports to the USA
българска версия ... 546
Versión española ... 547
Deutsche Fassung ... 549
Version française ... 550
Versione italiana ... 552
Wersja polska ... 554
Versão portuguesa ... 556
Versiunea în limba română ... 558
English version ... 559

E-004832/13 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Alcohol abuse among young males — prevention
Deutsche Fassung ... 560
English version ... 561

E-004833/13 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Gender-specific support requirements in schools
Deutsche Fassung ... 562
English version ... 563

E-004834/13 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: EU seed regulation
Deutsche Fassung ... 564
English version ... 565

E-004835/13 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Early diagnosis of depression in male patients
Deutsche Fassung ... 566
English version ... 567

P-004836/13 by Ivo Belet to the Commission
Subject: Refusal to recognise the European Health Insurance Card in Spain
Nederlandse versie ... 568
English version ... 569

P-004837/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Conditions for being part of the EU
Versión española ... 570
English version ... 571

E-004838/13 by Patrick Le Hyaric to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Destruction of a Bedouin camp in the Jordan Valley by the Israeli army
Version française ... 572
English version ... 573

E-004839/13 by Philip Claeys to the Commission
Subject: Retirement allowance, salary, pension and rules on the remuneration of the President of the Commission
Nederlandse versie ... 574
English version ... 575

E-004840/13 by Philip Claeys to the Commission
Subject: Retirement allowance, salary, pension and rules on the remuneration of the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy
Nederlandse versie ... 576
English version ... 577

E-004841/13 by Philip Claeys to the Commission
Subject: Activities of retired officials of the Commission in European institution buildings
Nederlandse versie ... 578
English version ... 579

E-004842/13 by Alain Cadec to the Commission
Subject: European egg market
Version française ... 580
English version ... 581

E-004843/13 by Patrick Le Hyaric to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Labelling of West Bank and East Jerusalem settlement goods by the Member States
Version française ... 582
English version ... 583

E-004844/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission
Subject: Imports of organic products into Europe
Versión española ... 584
English version ... 585

E-004845/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission
Subject: Participatory Guarantee Systems
Versión española ... 586
English version ... 587

E-004846/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission
Subject: Exports of organic products
Versión española ... 588
English version ... 589

E-004847/13 by Raimon Obiols to the Commission
Subject: Situation of the textile industry in Bangladesh
Versión española ... 590
English version ... 591

E-004848/13 by Giommaria Uggias to the Commission
Subject: Law of the Autonomous Region of Sardinia No 18/2012 of 12 October 2012 establishing Flotta Sarda Spa
Versione italiana ... 592
English version ... 593

E-004850/13 by Kinga Göncz to the Commission
Subject: Nationalisation of the Archives of the Hungarian Institute of Political History
Magyar változat ... 594
English version ... 595

E-004851/13 by Zbigniew Ziobro to the Commission
Subject: FEMEN attacks on the Catholic Church and the Christian faith
Wersja polska ... 596
English version ... 597

E-004852/13 by Zbigniew Ziobro to the Commission
Subject: Vaccinations for children in the EU
Wersja polska ... 598
English version ... 599

E-004853/13 by Zbigniew Ziobro to the Commission
Subject: Poultry meat imports in the EU
Wersja polska ... 600
English version ... 601

E-004854/13 by Zbigniew Ziobro to the Commission
Subject: Rules on the spending of EU funds
Wersja polska ... 602
English version ... 603

E-004856/13 by Zbigniew Ziobro to the Commission
Subject: Elderly people in the EU
Wersja polska ... 604
English version ... 605

P-004857/13 by Patrick Le Hyaric to the Commission
Subject: Finals of the 2013 European Under-21 Championships in Israel
Version française ... 606
English version ... 607

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004317/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(17 Απριλίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ρυθμοί υλοποίησης του Ελληνικού Εθνικού Κτηματολογίου και την πιθανότητα άμεσης διακοπής κονδυλίων

Σύμφωνα με δημοσιεύματα του ελληνικού τύπου, η πρόοδος των εργασιών για την κατάρτιση του Εθνικού Κτηματολογίου βρίσκεται μόλις σε ποσοστό 17% κάλυψης του συνολικού έργου κτηματογράφησης της χώρας σε περίοδο 17 ετών, παρά το γεγονός ότι ένα δισεκατομμύριο ευρώ έχει στο ίδιο διάστημα δαπανηθεί — περίπου κατ' αναλογία — από τέλη ιδιοκτητών ακινήτων, εγχώριους και κοινοτικούς πόρους.

Ειδικότερα, σε δημοσίευμα της αθηναϊκής εφημερίδας «Ελευθεροτυπία», της 11ης Ιανουαρίου 2013 ([1]), γίνεται λόγος για πορεία «ναυαγίου» του έργου, άποψη που βασίζεται σε παρέμβαση της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής για τη μη ολοκλήρωση οποιουδήποτε από τα είκοσι τρία (23) εκκρεμή προγράμματα κτηματογράφησης, ενώ για τουλάχιστον δέκα (10) σχετικά προγράμματα δεν έχει υπάρξει προς το παρόν ούτε ανάθεση μελετών υλοποίησής τους.

Στο ίδιο δημοσίευμα αποκαλύπτεται έγγραφο της Επιτροπής του Απριλίου του 2012, και συγκεκριμένα της Γενικής Διεύθυνσης Περιφερειακής Πολιτικής, με το οποίο απευθύνεται ρητή προειδοποίηση προς το Υπουργείο Περιβάλλοντος, Ενέργειας και Κλιματικής Αλλαγής και την εταιρία Αποκλειστικού Σκοπού «Κτηματολόγιο ΑΕ», για απαίτηση άμεσης επιστροφής πόρων συγχρηματοδότησης του Κτηματολογίου ύψους 80 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ, αλλά και πιθανής συνολικής διακοπής χρηματοδότησης της Επιτροπής για τα υποστηρικτικά έργα του βασικού έργου, αν δεν ολοκληρωθούν οι προγραμματισμένες εργασίες μέχρι τον Μάρτιο του 2013.

Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη τα ανωτέρω και υπογραμμίζοντας ότι η ολοκλήρωση του Εθνικού Κτηματολογίου αποτελεί ένα ζωτικής σημασίας έργο τόσο για την ανάπτυξη όσο και για την περιβαλλοντική προστασία, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Ισχύουν τα όσα αναφέρονται στην αποκαλυφθείσα από τον ελληνικό τύπο επιστολή της Γενικής Διευθύντριας Περιφερειακής Πολιτικής της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής; Αν ναι, υπάρχει πράγματι ζήτημα άμεσης διακοπής της χρηματοδότησης των υποστηρικτικών έργων για την υλοποίηση του Κτηματολογίου της Ελλάδας από την πλευρά της Επιτροπής;

— Πώς θεωρεί ότι μπορεί να ξεπεραστεί το διαφαινόμενο αδιέξοδο και να επιτευχθεί, τελικά, η ολοκλήρωση του Κτηματολογίου στην Ελλάδα;

— Υπάρχει οποιαδήποτε αλλαγή, ή σκέψη για ενδεχόμενη αλλαγή πολιτικής, σε ό,τι αφορά την παροχή της απαιτούμενης χρηματοδοτικής ενίσχυσης στις ελληνικές αρχές για την κατάρτιση του Κτηματολογίου, είτε μέσω του Ευρωπαϊκού Στρατηγικού Σχεδίου Στήριξης είτε μέσω της Ευρωπαϊκής Τράπεζας Επενδύσεων ή άλλης πηγής;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(7 Ιουνίου 2013)

Κατά την περίοδο 2000-2006, το έργο για την κατάρτιση του κτηματολογίου χρηματοδοτήθηκε από την ΕΕ με περίπου 80 εκατ. ευρώ. Στο τέλος της προγραμματικής περιόδου, το έργο δεν είχε ολοκληρωθεί. Το εν λόγω έργο αφορά κυρίως την ψηφιοποίηση των ενεργών δικαιωμάτων ιδιοκτησίας στις αστικές περιοχές χωρίς καμία μορφή σύνδεσης μεταξύ της ψηφιοποίησης των ενεργών τίτλων ιδιοκτησίας και της νομικής επικύρωσης των εμπράγματων δικαιωμάτων, η οποία θα χρηματοδοτούνταν αποκλειστικά από εθνικούς πόρους. Στο τέλος της περιόδου 2000-2006, ορισμένα στοιχεία του εν λόγω έργου έλειπαν. Συνεπώς, το έργο συμπεριλήφθη στον κατάλογο των «ημιτελών έργων» που θα χρηματοδοτηθούν από εθνικούς πόρους έως τον Μάρτιο του 2013. Ύστερα από απόφαση της Επιτροπής, η εν λόγω προθεσμία παρατάθηκε έως τις 31 Δεκεμβρίου 2013, λόγω έκτακτων οικονομικών συγκυριών. Εάν το έργο δεν έχει ολοκληρωθεί πλήρως έως την εν λόγω ημερομηνία, θα εφαρμοστεί δημοσιονομική διόρθωση για το συγχρηματοδοτούμενο μέρος του έργου.

([1]) http://www.enet.gr/?i=news.el.article&id=334804

Οι ελληνικές αρχές δεσμεύονται να ολοκληρώσουν το κτηματολόγιο έως το 2020 στο πλαίσιο του δεύτερου προγράμματος οικονομικής προσαρμογής για την Ελλάδα. Για τον σκοπό αυτό, σκοπεύουν να προκηρύξουν συμβάσεις παροχής των λοιπών υπηρεσιών έως τον Ιούνιο του 2013. Η συνεργασία των ελληνικών αρχών με εμπειρογνώμονες του κτηματολογίου από άλλα κράτη μέλη, η οποία συντονίζεται από την ομάδα δράσης της Επιτροπής για την Ελλάδα, επικεντρώθηκε κυρίως στον σχεδιασμό και την προκήρυξη συμβάσεων παροχής υπηρεσιών κατά το πρώτο τρίμηνο του 2013. Οι διεθνείς εμπειρογνώμονες παρέχουν στις ελληνικές αρχές την κατάλληλη εμπειρογνωμοσύνη για την έγκαιρη ολοκλήρωση του κτηματολογίου, υπό τον όρο ότι οι ελληνικές αρχές θα διαθέσουν την αναγκαία χρηματοδότηση και θα δημιουργήσουν τις σχετικές νομικές προϋποθέσεις.

Η Επιτροπή δεν γνωρίζει κάποια αλλαγή πολιτικής στην υλοποίηση του έργου, ούτε είναι ενήμερη για τη συμμετοχή άλλων πηγών χρηματοδότησης — πέραν της συγχρηματοδότησης της ΕΕ — στην υλοποίηση του προγράμματος.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004317/13
to the Commission
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(17 April 2013)

Subject: Progress with the implementation of a Greek National Land Registry and the likelihood of an immediate funding cut

According to Greek press reports, progress in establishing the National Land Registry currently stands at just 17% of the total registration work in a 17-year period, in spite of the fact that EUR 1 billion has been spent over the same period, from the contributions — approximately proportionate — of land owners, and national and Community funds.

More specifically, the 11 January 2013 edition of the Athens newspaper *Eleftherotypia* ([1]) reports that the project is heading for the rocks, a view based on an intervention of the European Commission for non-completion of any of the 23 outstanding registration programmes, and failure even to commission implementation studies in respect of at least 10 related programmes.

The same article referred to a Commission letter from April 2012 — specifically the Directorate General for Regional Policy — explicitly warning the Ministry for the Environment, Energy and Climate Change and the single purpose company Ktimatologio S.A., demanding the immediate return of Land Registry co-financing resources amounting to EUR 80 million, and a likely total suspension of Commission funding for work supporting the main project, if the planned tasks are not completed by March 2013.

With regard to the above, and emphasising that completion of the National Land Registry is an essential project for development and for environmental protection, will the Commission say:

— Whether the contents of the letter from the Directorate General for Regional Policy revealed by the Greek press are valid? If so, is the Commission really considering an immediate suspension of funds supporting projects to implement the Greek National Land Registry?

— How does it believe that the apparent impasse can be overcome, and completion of the Land Registry finally achieved in Greece?

— Whether there has been a change, or consideration of a possible policy change, on providing the financial support to the Greek authorities required for the establishment of the National Land Registry, either through the European Strategic Support Plan or through the European Investment Bank or another source?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(7 June 2013)

In 2000-2006, the cadastre project was granted EU funding of about EUR 80 million. At the closure of this programming period, the project had not been fully realised. This project mainly related to the digitisation of active property rights in the urban areas without any form of connection between the digitalisation of active titles and the legal validation of real rights which would be financed exclusively by national funds. At the closure of 2000-2006 period, some elements of this project were missing. The project was therefore included in the list of 'uncompleted projects' to be financed by national funds by March 2013. Following a Commission decision, this deadline was extended to 31 December 2013 due to the exceptional economic circumstances. If the project is not fully completed by that date, a financial correction will apply on the EU co-financed part of the project.

The Greek authorities are committed to completing the land register by 2020 in the context of the 2nd economic adjustment programme for Greece. To this end, they plan to tender out the remaining services by June 2013. The cooperation between the Greek authorities and land register experts from other Member States, coordinated by the Commission's Task Force for Greece, mainly focused on planning and tendering of the projects in the first quarter of 2013. The international experts provide the Greek authorities with the appropriate expertise to complete the land register on time, provided the Greek Authorities put in place the necessary financing and legal preconditions.

The Commission is not aware of any policy change in the implementation of the project nor is it informed of any — other than EU co-funding — potential financial sources involved in the project implementation.

([1]) http://www.enet.gr/?i=news.el.article&id=334804

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004318/13
an die Kommission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE) und Nadja Hirsch (ALDE)
(17. April 2013)

Betrifft: Ausfuhr lebender Tiere aus der EU in Drittländer (Anschlussfrage zur schriftlichen Anfrage E-001116/2013)

Bezug nehmend auf die Antwort der Kommission auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-001116/2013 wird die Kommission um Beantwortung der folgenden Fragen ersucht:

1. Die Ausfuhrerstattungen für zur Schlachtung vorgesehenes Lebendvieh wurden 2005 vollständig eingestellt. Bei Rindfleisch und zur Zucht vorgesehenem Lebendvieh sind die Ausfuhrerstattungen zwar zurzeit auf 0 EUR festgelegt, sie können aber im Ausnahmefall einer Krise gewährt werden. Werden die Erstattungen also gewährt, sobald sich die Marktbedingungen ändern? Anhand welcher messbaren Indikatoren wird die Kommission feststellen, dass der Ausnahmefall einer Marktkrise eingetreten ist?

2. Aus der Antwort der Kommission auf die vorstehend genannte Anfrage geht eindeutig hervor, dass die Zahl der ausgeführten Rinder, Schafe und Ziegen zwischen 2009 und 2012 erheblich gestiegen ist. Das in Erwägungsgrund 5 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2005 des Rates formulierte Ziel, dass „aus Tierschutzgründen […] lange Beförderungen von Tieren — auch von Schlachttieren — auf ein Mindestmaß begrenzt werden [sollten]", wurde also nicht erreicht. Was gedenkt die Kommission zu unternehmen, damit diese Zielsetzung verwirklicht wird?

Antwort von Herrn Cioloş im Namen der Kommission
(12. Juni 2013)

1. Ein Beschluss der Kommission zur Reaktivierung von Ausfuhrerstattungen für Rindfleisch müsste im Einklang mit den Artikeln 162, 163 und 164 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1234/2007 des Rates [1] stehen, in denen der Geltungsbereich für die Aktivierung von Ausfuhrerstattungen für Rindfleisch sowie die bei der Festsetzung dieser Erstattung zu berücksichtigenden Parameter festgelegt sind. In jedem Fall muss einem solchen Beschluss eine Verschlechterung der Marktlage zugrunde liegen, und es muss ihm eine Analyse der diesbezüglich aussagekräftigsten Marktvariablen wie Inlandspreise, Entwicklung des Handels, Auslandspreise (Stellung der Wettbewerber) usw. vorausgehen.

2. Zu diesem Punkt verweist die Kommission auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-003942/2013 [2].

---

[1] ABl. L 299 vom 16.11.2007.
[2] http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/de/parliamentary-questions.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004318/13
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE) e Nadja Hirsch (ALDE)
(17 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Esportazione di bestiame dall'UE verso paesi terzi (interrogazione complementare all'interrogazione scritta E-001116/2013)

Con riferimento alla risposta della Commissione all'interrogazione scritta E-001116/2013, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. Le restituzioni all'esportazione per i bovini vivi destinati alla macellazione sono state completamente vietate nel 2005, mentre le restituzioni all'esportazione per le carni bovine e il bestiame vivo destinato alla riproduzione, anche se attualmente fissato al livello 0 euro, possono essere rese disponibili in circostanze eccezionali di crisi. Le restituzioni alle esportazioni saranno attivate non appena cambiano le condizioni del mercato? Quali sono gli indicatori misurabili che la Commissione intende utilizzare per determinare queste circostanze eccezionali di crisi del mercato?

2. Come risulta chiaramente dalla risposta della Commissione all'interrogazione summenzionata, il numero di bovini, ovini e caprini esportati è considerevolmente aumentato tra il 2009 e il 2012. Pertanto non è stato raggiunto l'obiettivo di cui al considerando 5 del regolamento (CE) n. 1/2005 del Consiglio, in base al quale, tenuto conto del benessere degli animali, il trasporto di animali, compresi quelli da macello, che comporta lunghi viaggi va limitato nella misura del possibile. Quali misure intende prendere la Commissione per conseguire questo obiettivo?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(12 giugno 2013)

1. Una decisione della Commissione sulla riattivazione delle restituzioni all'esportazione per le carni bovine dovrebbe essere in linea con il regolamento (CE) n. 1234/2007 del Consiglio ([1]), articoli 162-164, che stabilisce l'ambito di applicazione in cui è possibile attivare le restituzioni all'esportazione per le carni bovine e i parametri da tenere in considerazione per la determinazione della restituzione. In ogni caso, tale decisione dovrà tener conto dell'aggravarsi della situazione del mercato ed essere preceduta da un'analisi delle variabili di mercato più rilevanti, quali prezzi interni, sviluppo del commercio, prezzi esterni (posizione dei concorrenti), ecc.

2. La Commissione rimanda alla sua risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-3942/2013 ([2]).

([1]) GU L 299 del 16.11.2007.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/it/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004318/13
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE) and Nadja Hirsch (ALDE)
(17 April 2013)

Subject: Export of livestock from the EU to third countries (follow-up question to Written Question E-001116/2013)

With regard to the Commission's answer to Written Question E-001116/2013, could the Commission answer the following questions:

1. While export refunds for live cattle intended for slaughter were completely outlawed in 2005, export refunds for beef and live cattle intended for breeding, although presently fixed at EUR 0, can be made available in exceptional circumstances of crisis. Will export refunds become available as soon as market conditions change? What are the measurable indicators that the Commission will use in determining these exceptional circumstances of market crisis?

2. As is evident from the Commission's answer to the abovementioned question, the numbers of cattle, sheep and goats exported rose considerably between 2009 and 2012. Therefore, the objective set out in Recital 5 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, which states that 'for reasons of animal welfare the transport of animals over long journeys, including animals for slaughter, should be limited as far as possible', was not achieved. What measures does the Commission intend to take in order to achieve this objective?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2013)

1. A Commission decision on the re-activation of export refunds for beef and veal would have to be in line with Council Regulation No 1234/2007 ([1]), Articles 162-164, that stipulates the scope in which the activation of export refunds for beef and veal is possible and the parameters to be taken into account for the fixation of that refund. In any case an aggravated market situation will have to lay on the basis of such a decision, preceded by an analysis of the most pertinent market variables such as internal prices, trade development, external prices (competitors' position), etc.

2. The Commission would refer to its reply to Written Question E-003942/2013 ([2]).

([1]) OJ L 299, 16.11.2007.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004319/13
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(17 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Protezione europea degli operatori di Internet dai ciberattacchi

Secondo l'ENISA, l'Agenzia europea per la sicurezza delle reti e dell'informazione, i fornitori di servizi Internet sono ancora impotenti di fronte ai ciberattacchi di grandi dimensioni.

In effetti, non sono stati in grado di prevenire e contrastare l'attacco sferrato nel marzo scorso da un gruppo di pirati informatici avverso l'organizzazione di lotta contro lo «spamhouse», di modo che vi sono stati ritardi notevoli nell'attività su Internet soprattutto in Gran Bretagna e in Germania, ma anche in altri Stati membri dell'UE.

Quali urgenti misure intende attuare la Commissione, posto che questi ciberattacchi, come quello citato che ha raggiunto le dimensioni di più di 300 gbit di dati al secondo, stanno registrando una sempre maggiore ampiezza senza che siano state attuate adeguate protezioni contro gli attacchi diretti, compromettendo anche i punti di scambi commerciali Internet, che pure beneficiano normalmente di infrastrutture molto potenti?

Risposta di Neelie Kroes a nome della Commissione
(28 maggio 2013)

La Commissione condivide l'opinione dell'onorevole deputato in merito all'urgenza e all'importanza di intraprendere azioni per migliorare il livello della sicurezza informatica nell'Unione europea.

Il 7 febbraio la Commissione e l'Alta Rappresentante dell'Unione europea per gli affari esteri e la politica di sicurezza hanno adottato una comunicazione sulla strategia dell'Unione europea per la cibersicurezza ([1]) che delinea una visione integrata in questo campo. Essa presenta provvedimenti concreti volti a garantire un ambiente digitale sicuro e resiliente e a intensificare la lotta contro la criminalità informatica, rispettando e promuovendo i diritti fondamentali e i valori costitutivi dell'Unione europea. La strategia indaga le sinergie tra la prevenzione e la resilienza, le attività di contrasto, la cooperazione internazionale e la difesa dalla criminalità informatica.

In parallelo la Commissione ha proposto una direttiva sulla sicurezza delle reti e dell'informazione nell'Unione per garantire l'armonioso funzionamento del mercato interno. La proposta ha l'obiettivo di potenziare la preparazione a livello nazionale, di rafforzare la cooperazione a livello europeo e di imporre obblighi in materia di sicurezza e di messa in rete delle informazioni agli operatori di mercato strategici per l'economia, la società e le pubbliche amministrazioni. Ciò consentirà di prevenire e reagire meglio agli attacchi, così come agli incidenti causati da interruzioni, errori umani o eventi naturali.

([1]) Presentata dalla Vicepresidente della Commissione Neelie Kroes, dalla commissaria Cecilia Malmström e dall'Alta Rappresentante Catherine Ashton.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004319/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(17 April 2013)

Subject: EU protection of Internet operators against cyber-attacks

According to ENISA, the European Network and Information Security Agency, Internet service providers are still powerless against large-scale cyber-attacks.

Indeed, they were unable to prevent and combat the attack mounted in March this year by a group of computer hackers against the anti-spam organisation, Spamhaus, which caused substantial delays on the Internet, especially in Great Britain and in Germany, but also in other EU Member States.

What urgent measures does the Commission intend to implement, given that these cyber-attacks, such as the above attack which reached 300 Gbps of traffic, are becoming increasingly large-scale, without adequate protection being put in place against direct attacks, thereby also jeopardising e-commerce sites which normally benefit from very powerful infrastructure?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(28 May 2013)

The Commission shares the view of the Honourable Member on the urgency and the importance of taking action to improve the level of cybersecurity across the EU.

On 7 February, the Commission and the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy have adopted a communication on a Cybersecurity Strategy for the European Union ([1]) putting forward an integrated vision in this domain. It presents concrete policy actions to ensure a safe and resilient digital environment and step up the fight against cybercrime, while respecting and promoting fundamental rights and EU core values. The strategy explores synergies among prevention and resilience, law enforcement, international cooperation and cyber defence.

The strategy is accompanied by a Commission proposal for a directive on network and information security across the EU to ensure the smooth functioning of the internal market. The proposal aims to strenghten national preparedness; reinforce EU-level cooperation; and impose network and information security obligations on market operators which are critical for the economy and society and public administrations. This will ensure better prevention and response to attacks as well as to incidents caused by outages, human mistakes, or natural events.

([1]) presented by Commission Vice-President Neelie Kroes, Commissioner Cecilia Malmström and High representative Catherine Ashton.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004320/13
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(17 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Intervento dell'UE a tutela della salute dei consumatori europei

Dai dati relativi al 2011 che emergono dalla relazione sulle infezioni da cibo pubblicata dall'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare (EFSA), in collaborazione con il Centro europeo di prevenzione e di controllo delle malattie (ECDC), si rileva che in Europa aumentano le infezioni alimentari con gravi conseguenze sulla salute dei consumatori: in un solo anno, infatti, le persone colpite sono passate da 43 500 a poco meno di 70 000, provocando ben 93 decessi, quasi quattro volte di più rispetto all'anno precedente. La causa del preoccupante aumento dei decessi è da ricercare nel batterio killer *Escherichia Coli* che, nel 2011, ha provocato decine di morti in Germania, per poi diffondersi in Francia e in una dozzina di paesi dell'Europa centrale.

Quali azioni intende intraprendere la Commissione a difesa della salute dei consumatori, in particolare nei settori del controllo e della prevenzione?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(11 giugno 2013)

La relazione annuale di sintesi dell'Unione Europea sulle tendenze e sulle fonti di zoonosi, agenti zoonotici e focolai di tossinfezione alimentare ([1]) costituisce uno strumento importante per valutare gli effetti delle azioni intraprese dall'Unione al fine di contrastare le infezioni di origine alimentare; essa permette altresì di individuare i rischi emergenti e di avviare eventualmente le azioni opportune.

Il successo delle azioni di contrasto alle infezioni da salmonella è dimostrato dalla diminuzione ininterrotta dei casi registrati di infezione negli esseri umani: se nell'anno 2004 si sono avuti quasi 200 000 casi in 24 Stati membri, nel 2011 se ne sono verificati circa 95 500 nei 27 Stati membri.

L'aumento dei casi di infezione negli esseri umani, anche con esiti letali, riscontrato nel 2011 in confronto al 2010 si può attribuire in larga misura:

— ad un focolaio di cryptosporidium (a bassa patogenicità), diffusosi attraverso l'acqua in Svezia, che ha colpito 20 000 persone;

— ad un'epidemia di infezioni da *Escherichia coli* dovuta a semi di fieno greco contaminati di provenienza egiziana, che ha avuto conseguenze molto rilevanti sulla salute pubblica (più di 3 700 casi, più di 2 300 ricoveri e più di cinquanta decessi).

Al di là delle misure immediate di gestione della crisi prese durante l'epidemia di *Escherichia coli*, la Commissione ha avviato tempestivamente un ventaglio di azioni in risposta a tali eventi:

— È stato pubblicato un documento sugli insegnamenti tratti da tali situazioni ([2]), che riporta i provvedimenti adottati al fine di prevenire l'insorgenza di focolai simili in futuro, o quanto meno di limitarne le ripercussioni sulla salute pubblica e sull'economia.

— Le prescrizioni in materia di igiene e i controlli sui semi destinati alla germinazione e sui germogli sono stati resi più severi sia in fase di produzione, sia in sede di importazione ([3]).

— È stata richiesta una consulenza scientifica dell'EFSA in merito ai rischi rappresentati dagli alimenti di origine non animale.

La Commissione ha inoltre avviato un'opera di revisione delle prescrizioni contenute nel regolamento (CE) n. 854/2004 ([4]) sulle ispezioni delle carni, al fine di commensurare i controlli più strettamente al rischio e prendendo in considerazione i rischi emergenti e i rischi nuovi.

([1]) La relazione del 2011 è consultabile al seguente indirizzo: http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/3129.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/biosafety/salmonella/docs/cswd_lessons_learned_en.pdf
([3]) Regolamenti (UE) n. 208/2013, (UE) n. 209/2013, (UE) n. 210/2013 e (UE) n. 211/2013.
([4]) Regolamento (CE) n. 854/2004 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 29 aprile 2004, che stabilisce norme particolareggiate per l'organizzazione dei controlli ufficiali sui prodotti di origine animale destinati al consumo umano (GU L 139 del 30.4.2004, pag. 206).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004320/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(17 April 2013)

Subject: EU action to safeguard the health of European consumers

The 2011 data contained in the report on food-borne infections produced jointly by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) and the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC), show that in Europe food-borne infections are on the increase with serious consequences for consumer health: in fact in a single year, the number of people affected rose from 43 500 to slightly under 70 000, causing 93 deaths, almost four times more than in the previous year. The worrying increase in deaths is attributable to the lethal bacterium, *Escherichia Coli*, which in 2011, resulted in dozens of deaths in Germany before spreading to France and a dozen Central European countries.

What action does the Commission intend to take to protect consumer health, in particular in terms of control and prevention?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2013)

The annual European Union Summary Report on Trends and Sources of Zoonoses, Zoonotic Agents and Food-borne Outbreaks ([1]) is an important tool to evaluate the effect of its actions taken on food-borne infections and to detect emerging risk, possibly triggering the need for action.

The success of actions taken on 'Salmonella' is illustrated by the continuous drop of reported human cases from almost 200 000 in 2004 in 24 Member States, to about 95 500 in 2011 in 27 Member States.

The increase of human cases and deaths observed in 2011 compared to 2010 in outbreaks can largely be attributed to:

— A water-borne outbreak in Sweden involving 20 000 people, caused by cryptosporidium (low pathogenicity);

— The outbreak by 'Escherichia coli' (E. coli) contaminated fenugreek seeds from Egypt, with a very high public health impact (over 3 700 cases, over 2 300 hospitalisations and over 50 deaths).

Apart from the immediate crisis management measures taken during the 'E. coli' outbreak, immediate follow-up actions were taken by the Commission:

— A document on the lessons learnt ([2]) was published. The document refers to actions taken to ensure that similar outbreaks are avoided or at least limited as regards the public health and economic impact.

— Hygiene requirements and controls of seeds intended for sprouting and sprouts both at production level and at import have been strengthened ([3]).

— EFSA have been requested to provide scientific advice on risks posed by food of non-animal origin.

In addition, the Commission launched the work to review the requirements in Regulation (EC) No 854/2004 ([4]) on meat inspection to make it more risk-based taking into account emerging and new risks.

([1]) 2011 report available at: http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/3129.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/biosafety/salmonella/docs/cswd_lessons_learned_en.pdf
([3]) Regulations (EU) No 208/2013, EU (No) 209/2013, (EU) No 201/2013 and (EU) No 211/2013.
([4]) Regulation (EC) No 854/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 laying down specific rules for the organisation of official controls on products of animal origin intended for human consumption (OJ L 139, 30.4.2004, p. 206).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004321/13
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(17 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Possibili violazioni della normativa comunitaria di settore nella vicenda del grave inquinamento da mercurio di una profonda falda acquifera in provincia di Treviso

Come già segnalato nella precedente interrogazione E-010520/2011, in alcune aree dei comuni di Treviso, Casier (TV), Preganziol (TV) e Quinto di Treviso, in una fascia che va da nord-ovest a sud-est lunga circa 10 km e larga circa 2 km, è in espansione una grave situazione di inquinamento da mercurio della falda acquifera. Il fenomeno è localizzato a una profondità di circa 240 m e i valori rilevati di concentrazione dell'inquinante arrivano fino a 18 µg/l, a fronte del limite di 1 µg/l stabilito dalla direttiva 98/83/CE sulla qualità delle acque destinate al consumo umano ([1]). Tale pericolosa contaminazione ha reso inutilizzabili i pozzi privati dai quali i cittadini coinvolti estraevano l'acqua potabile, nonché due pozzi della rete pubblica, rendendo necessario l'ampliamento della rete acquedottistica (ancora in corso e parziale), per il quale la Regione Veneto ha stanziato circa 2 500 000 EUR. A due anni di distanza, non è ancora stata individuata la fonte primaria dell'inquinamento, che si sospetta provenire da nord/nord-ovest, probabilmente all'altezza del Comune di Paese (TV). La Regione Veneto ha concesso la somma di 65 000 EUR effettuare un'indagine geologica sull'origine del fenomeno, sul possibile risanamento e sulla prevenzione della propagazione ([2]); tale finanziamento si è rivelato del tutto insufficiente per addivenire a un risultato in una vicenda di inquinamento di una falda così profonda, fatto anomalo e senza precedenti a livello nazionale e forse internazionale, come dichiarato dall'ARPAV, ente incaricato dell'indagine ([3]).

Nella risposta fornita in data 16 gennaio 2012 alla succitata interrogazione, la Commissione rimandava una presa di posizione sulla vicenda alla pubblicazione della propria relazione sull'attuazione della direttiva quadro sulle acque n. 2000/60/CE sulla base dei piani di gestione dei bacini idrografici elaborati dagli Stati membri.

1. In seguito all'intervenuta pubblicazione della relazione di cui sopra, intende ora aprire un'indagine sulla vicenda, al fine di verificare eventuali violazioni della normativa comunitaria di settore da parte delle autorità coinvolte?

2. Non ritiene opportuno approfondire le ragioni della mancata concessione di un finanziamento più adeguato all'ARPAV, in ragione dell'importanza di individuare al più presto l'origine dell'inquinamento per risolvere l'emergenza ambientale e applicare il principio «chi inquina paga» sancito all'articolo 191 del TFUE, viste l'ingente spesa necessaria per collegare agli acquedotti i cittadini interessati e la probabile origine dolosa/colposa di un fenomeno così grave?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(13 giugno 2013)

In base alle informazioni ricevute dalle autorità italiane, nonostante l'ampio monitoraggio effettuato dal rilevamento dall'inquinamento ad oggi (più di 6 300 analisi compiute), la complessa situazione idrogeologica della zona e l'alta densità delle attività umane non hanno permesso di stabilire la causa dell'inquinamento. Le autorità ritengono che ulteriori controlli potrebbero consentire in futuro di risalire all'origine dell'inquinamento. La Commissione non è in grado di valutare se ulteriori finanziamenti permetterebbero di determinare l'origine dell'inquinamento in breve tempo, tantomeno può mettere in discussione il livello dei finanziamenti stanziati finora.

Si ritiene che le autorità italiane abbiano adottato le misure necessarie in merito alla direttiva sull'acqua potabile (98/83/CE) ([4])con la decisione di vietare l'uso delle forniture contaminate (e informando la popolazione al riguardo), al fine di studiare l'origine dell'inquinamento ed ampliare la rete pubblica di acqua potabile nelle zone colpite.

([1]) Per i dati presenti nell'interrogazione si rinvia ai documenti inseriti nel sito web del comitato «Tutela Acque Potabili Preganziol», link: http://goo.gl/mYil8. Cfr. Mappa dei pozzi inquinati con relativi valori, pubblicata dall'ARPAV (Agenzia regionale per la Prevenzione e Protezione Ambientale del Veneto), al link: http://goo.gl/CLsQd.

([2]) Progetto «ME.MO» (Monitoraggio d'indagine del mercurio nelle acque sotterranee in provincia di Tv), finanziato con delibera della Giunta regionale del Veneto n. 962 del 5 luglio 2011.

([3]) In occasione di un incontro tenutosi sulla vicenda presso la Segreteria regionale per l'Ambiente del Veneto, Direzione Geologia e Georisorse, Servizio Tutela Acque, Osservatorio Qualità delle Acque di Venezia in data 12 settembre 2012. Cfr. sito web del comitato.

([4]) GU L 330 del 5.12.1998.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004321/13
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(17 April 2013)

Subject: Possible violations of sectoral EU legislation with regard to the severe mercury pollution of a deep aquifer in the province of Treviso

As previously highlighted in Question E-010520/2011, in certain areas of the municipalities of Treviso, Casier (Treviso), Preganziol (Treviso) and Quinto di Treviso, the aquifer is being severely polluted by mercury in a 10 km-long and 2 km-wide band that stretches from north-west to south-east. The phenomenon is located at a depth of approximately 240 metres with pollutant concentrations reaching 18 µg/l, while Directive 98/83/EC on the quality of water intended for human consumption lays down a limit of 1 µg/l ([1]). Private wells from which citizens drew drinking water, together with two wells in the public network, were rendered unusable by this dangerous contamination. Expansion of the water supply network was therefore necessary (still under way and only partially completed), with EUR 2 500 000 being allocated by the Veneto Regional Government for this purpose. Two years later, the primary source of the pollution has still not been identified, though it is thought to originate in the north/north-east, probably near the municipality of Paese (Treviso). The Veneto Regional Government granted EUR 65 000 to carry out a geological investigation into the origin of the phenomenon, its possible clean-up and how to prevent its spread ([2]); this funding proved to be completely inadequate to obtain results for a case of pollution in such a deep aquifer. As ARPAV, the agency responsible for the investigation stated, this is an anomalous event without precedent at both national and international level ([3]).

In its answer of 16 January 2012 to the above question, the Commission put off taking a position on the matter until it had published its report on the implementation of the Water Framework Directive 2000/60/EC, based on river basin management plans drawn up by the Member States.

1. Now that the above report has been published, does the Commission intend to launch an inquiry into the matter to determine whether the authorities concerned have violated any EU legislation in this sector?

2. Does it not believe it appropriate to examine the reasons why more adequate funding was not granted to ARPAV, given the importance of identifying as soon as possible the origin of the pollution in order to resolve the environmental emergency and to apply the 'polluter pays' principle, enshrined in Article 191 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, in view of the considerable expense necessary to connect the citizens concerned to the water network and the probable intentional/negligent origin of such a serious phenomenon?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(13 June 2013)

According to the information received from the Italian authorities, despite the extensive monitoring carried out since the pollution was discovered (more than 6 300 analyses) to date the complex hydrogeology of the area and the high density of human activities have not allowed the establishment of the origin of the pollution. The authorities expect that further monitoring may allow tracing the source of pollution in the future. The Commission is not in a position to assess whether additional funding would allow tracing the source of pollution in a short time nor to question the level of funding allocated so far.

In relation to the Drinking Water Directive (98/83/EC) ([4]), it appears that the Italian authorities have undertaken the required action when they decided to prohibit the use of the contaminated supplies (including informing the population thereof), to investigate the cause of pollution and to extend the public drinking water supply in the affected areas.

([1]) See the documents on the website of the Committee for the Protection of Drinking Water of Preganziol for the data referred to in the question: http://goo.gl/mYil8. See the map of polluted wells with the relative values, published by ARPAV (Environmental Protection Agency for the Veneto Region): http://goo.gl/CLsQd.

([2]) ME.MO project (Investigative monitoring of mercury in groundwater in the province of Treviso) funded by Decision No 962 of 5 July 2011 of the Veneto Regional Council.

([3]) On the occasion of a meeting regarding the case, held at the Veneto Regional Secretariat for the Environment, Geology and Georesources Office, Water Protection Department, Observatory for the Quality of Water of Venice, on 12 September 2012. See committee's website.

([4]) OJ L 330, 5.12.98.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004322/13
aan de Commissie
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(17 april 2013)

Betreft: Redding Vauxhall Ellesmore Port: gevolgen voor toeleveranciers in andere EU-lidstaten

Om de bedreigde Vauxhall-fabriek van Ellesmore Port in Wales te redden hebben de Britse regering, Unite (vakbond) en het management van Vauxhall een akkoord uitgewerkt.

De Britse overheid zou aan Vauxhall (onrechtstreeks, via de Ellesmore Port Development Board) een subsidie hebben gegeven ten bedrage van ongeveer 6 miljoen Britse pond, in ruil voor de creatie door Vauxhall van 700 extra banen, met daarboven op de verplichting om alle auto-onderdelen te laten leveren door ondernemingen uit de eigen regio (West-Midlands).

Dit heeft uiteraard een grote impact op toeleveranciers die actief zijn in andere lidstaten, aangezien de toeleveringscontracten met deze bedrijven worden stopgezet.

Heeft de Commissie reeds kennis hiervan?

Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie deze situatie in het licht van de vrije concurrentie?

Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie deze situatie in het licht van de regels over staatssteun?

Antwoord van de heer Almunia namens de Commissie
(19 juni 2013)

De Commissie is niet op de hoogte gesteld van steun met betrekking tot de subsidie die de regering van het Verenigd Koninkrijk aan Vauxhall zou hebben gegeven. Bijgevolg kan zij geen standpunt innemen over de verenigbaarheid ervan met de regels inzake staatssteun. De Commissie zal de autoriteiten van het Verenigd Koninkrijk om meer informatie vragen.

De Commissie benadrukt in ieder geval dat het verlenen van staatssteun niet mag afhangen van de voorwaarde dat de begunstigde van de steun onderdelen van binnenlandse bedrijven afneemt ([1]). Een dergelijke voorwaarde is in strijd met de regels van de interne markt en de regels inzake staatssteun.

([1]) Zie bijvoorbeeld het arrest van het Hof van 5 juni 1986, zaak 103/84.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004322/13
to the Commission
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(17 April 2013)

Subject: Rescue of Vauxhall Ellesmere Port: consequences for subcontractors in other EU Member States

The UK Government, Unite (trade-union) and Vauxhall management have worked out an agreement to rescue the threatened Vauxhall plant at Ellesmere Port.

The UK Government has given Vauxhall a subsidy (indirectly via the Ellesmere Port Development Board), amounting to around GBP 6 million, in exchange for Vauxhall creating an extra 700 jobs, with the additional undertaking to have all car components supplied by companies from the West Midlands region in the UK.

This has a major impact, naturally, on subcontractors operating in other Member States, given that the supply contracts with these companies are being terminated.

Is the Commission already aware of this?

How does the Commission view this situation in the light of free competition?

How does the Commission view this situation in the light of the rules on state aid?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2013)

The Commission has not been notified of any aid in relation to the subsidy allegedly given by the UK Government to Vauxhall. Therefore it is not able to take a view on its compliance with the state aid rules. The Commission will ask the UK authorities for information.

In any event the Commission wishes to emphasise that state aid cannot be granted on the condition that a beneficiary is supplied by domestic companies ([1]). Such a condition would create a breach of internal market and state aid rules.

([1]) See e.g. Judgment of the Court of 5 June 1986, Case 103/84.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004323/13
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(17 de abril de 2013)

Asunto: Roturación de tierras en el Paraje de la Herradura

En la provincia española de Zaragoza se ha producido una nueva violación de la Directiva europea de aves (2009/147/CE). En el Paraje de la Herradura, una Zona de Especial Protección para las Aves (ZEPA) se han permitido actividades que ponen en riesgo la conservación de las aves.

Este excepcional Paraje que forma la ribera del Ebro en el término municipal de Caspe es parte de la Zona de protección de Valcuerna, Serreta Negra y Liberola, integrada dentro de la red Natura 2000, lo cual supone que se encuentra protegida por la Directiva sobre aves. En esta zona se han roturado más de 280 hectáreas de regadío con arreglo a una autorización concedida por la Dirección General de Agricultura del Gobierno Autonómico de Aragón para tan solo 140 hectáreas. Según informaciones aparecidas en diferentes medios de comunicación regionales, se produjo la roturación de estas 140 hectáreas, la instalación de equipamientos y la extracción de aguas sin declaración de impacto ambiental ni autorización previa alguna.

El titular de la explotación resulta haber sido el ex alcalde de Caspe, que parece haber desarrollado su explotación agrícola haciendo caso omiso al carácter protegido del terreno donde lo realizaba. El ex alcalde desoyó las advertencias de los Agentes de Protección de la Naturaleza y de los técnicos de agricultura y continuó con la construcción de edificios sin permiso, se produjo la extracción de áridos y todo tipo de agresivas modificaciones del entorno, produciendo incalculables daños en el entorno, su vegetación y las especies asociadas a ella. Este claro proceso de infracción supone un nuevo incumplimiento de la citada Directiva 2009/147/CE y un nuevo impacto negativo en zonas de especial protección. Las autoridades competentes deben actuar con mayor rapidez para evitar este tipo de pérdidas ambientales, puesto que se trata de pérdidas que son potencialmente irrecuperables.

¿Dispone la Comisión de información sobre la DIA y la autorización de las 140 hectáreas extras roturadas?

¿Considera que las autoridades competentes han actuado con la suficiente velocidad considerando que el Paraje de la Herradura está localizado en un espacio de la Red Natura 2000?

¿Piensa emprender algún tipo de acción contra el Gobierno Regional de Aragón la infracción que supone el caso expuesto?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(17 de junio de 2013)

La Comisión no tiene conocimiento de la situación descrita por Su Señoría ni dispone de información sobre la declaración de impacto ambiental o la autorización para roturar 140 hectáreas adicionales en el Paraje de la Herradura.

De acuerdo con el artículo 6, apartado 3, de la Directiva de Hábitats, cualquier plan o proyecto que pueda afectar de forma apreciable a un lugar Natura 2000 ha de someterse a una adecuada evaluación teniendo en cuenta los objetivos de conservación de dicho lugar. La responsabilidad de garantizar el cumplimiento de la Directiva de Hábitats ([1]) corresponde principalmente a los Estados miembros.

La Comisión solicitará a las autoridades españolas aclaraciones sobre las cuestiones planteadas por Su Señoría con objeto de garantizar el cumplimiento de lo dispuesto en la Directiva de Hábitats.

([1]) 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).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004323/13
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(17 April 2013)

Subject: Ploughing of land in the Paraje de la Herradura

There has been another breach of the Birds Directive (2009/147/EC) in the Spanish province of Zaragoza. Activities that threaten the conservation of wild birds have been allowed to take place in an area known as the Paraje de la Herradura, which is a Special Protection Area for birds.

This exceptional site beside the river Ebro near the town of Caspe lies within the protected area of Valcuerna, Serreta Negra and Liberola, one of the SPAs belonging to the Natura 2000 network. This means that it should be protected under the Birds Directive. More than 280 hectares of irrigated land have been ploughed despite the fact that the agriculture department of the regional government of Aragón had issued a permit to plough just 140 hectares. According to various local media reports, these 140 hectares were ploughed, facilities were built and water abstracted without an environmental impact statement or any prior notice whatsoever.

It has emerged that the owner of the farm concerned was the former mayor of Caspe, who appears to have established his farming operation taking no account of the protected status of the area of land he wished to cultivate. The former mayor ignored the warnings given by the Environmental Protection Agency and agricultural experts and went ahead with the construction of buildings without a permit, extracting aggregates and making all kinds of aggressive changes to the environment, causing incalculable harm to the environment and the plant and animal species that are contained within it. This clear infringement represents another failure to comply with Directive 2009/147/EC as mentioned above, and is another instance of damage caused in Special Protection Areas. The relevant authorities must act as swiftly as possible to avoid this kind of environmental damage, since it is likely to be irreversible.

Does the Commission have any information about the environmental impact statement and the authorisation to plough an additional 140 hectares of land?

Does it believe that the relevant authorities have acted quickly enough, considering that the Herradura site is located in an area belonging to the Natura 2000 network?

Does it envisage taking any kind of action against the regional government of Aragón for the infringement that this case represents?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2013)

The Commission is not aware of the situation described by the Honourable Member and it does not possess information about the environmental impact statement or the authorisation to plough 140 additional hectares in Paraje de la Herradura.

In accordance with Article 6.3 of the Habitats Directive any plan or project likely to have a significant effect on a Natura 2000 site must be subject to an appropriate assessment in view of the sites' conservation objectives. The responsibility to ensure compliance with the Habitats Directive ([1]) lies primarily with Member States.

The Commission will seek clarification from the Spanish authorities on the issues raised by the Honourable Member, in order to ensure compliance with the provisions of the Habitats Directive.

([1]) Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora. (OJ L 206, 22.7.1992).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004533/13
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: European Report on Development 2013

The Commission recently published the European Report on Development 2013, entitled 'Post 2015: Global Action for an Inclusive and Sustainable Future'. This report stresses that strong international collective action is required in order to drive forward the EU's international development agenda. How does the Commission intend to implement the findings and recommendations of this report?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(26 June 2013)

The European Report on Development (ERD) is an independent report ([1]). The 4th report 'Post-2015: Global Action for an Inclusive and Sustainable Future' was prepared by a team of researchers from three research centres: ECDPM ([2]), DIE ([3]) and ODI ([4]). Responsibility for its content lies entirely with the authors and the Commission is not bound to implement its findings and recommendations.

The report argues that strong international collective action through global public policies should be a core element of the new post-2015 framework, as it is essential to establish an international environment that is conducive to development, to eradicate global poverty and to achieve the vision of the Millennium Declaration. It therefore calls on the international community as a whole to step up to the challenge.

The Commission considers the report to be an important, informative and valuable contribution. It already has, and will continue to, feed into its reflections on the post-2015 framework. There is significant common ground between the report and the communication 'A decent life for all: Ending poverty and giving the world a sustainable future', adopted on 27 February 2013 ([5]), and the Council Conclusions that set out an EU position on the overarching post-2015 agenda.

The Commission fully supports the UN-led, multi-stakeholder process that will lead to a post-2015 framework. In this context, it considers research initiatives such as the ERD 2013 to be an important resource and is therefore organising and supporting a series of events to stimulate the international debate around the findings of the report.

([1]) For further information about the European Report on Development initiative: http://www.erd-report.eu/
([2]) European Centre for Development Policy Management.
([3]) Deutsches Institut für Entwickslungpolitik.
([4]) Overseas Development Institute.
([5]) COM(2013) 92 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004534/13
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: Hourly labour costs in the EU

In 2012, average labour costs in the internal market were estimated at EUR 23.4 per hour in the 27 Member States and EUR 28.0 per hour in the euro area. This average masks the significant differences between individual Member States, with hourly labour costs ranging from EUR 3.7 in Bulgaria to EUR 39.0 in Sweden. Is the Commission concerned about these differences? Does the Commission have an action plan to address this imbalance, in order to ensure greater parity in hourly labour costs across the single market?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2013)

Yes, the Commission is deeply concerned about the differences in wages across Member States.

Nevertheless, as these differences reveal unexploited market opportunities there remains much room for improvement in areas such as skills and education, technological innovation, and market efficiency.

More particularly, the Europe 2020 strategy is designed to bring about a gradual upward convergence across the European Union by promoting smart, sustainable and inclusive growth.

The strategy covers a range of measures to boost productivity in all Member States, including improving skill levels and education (including life-long learning), boosting research and innovation, making more use of smart networks and the digital economy, modernising industry and achieving greater energy and resource efficiency.

Moreover, in April 2012 the Commission launched also the Employment Package which proposes a coherent package in support of smart, sustainable and inclusive growth. More particularly, with respect to wages it proposes measures to boost 'take home' pay, modernise wage-setting systems to align wages with productivity developments, encourage decent and sustainable wages and make job transitions pay.

Finally, the Commission examines also developments in wages and productivity in the Member States as part of the process for preventing and ultimately correcting macroeconomic imbalances. Information about this procedure can be obtained from the website of the directorate General for Economic and Financial Affairs of the European Commission.

(Slovenska različica)

Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-004535/13
za Komisijo
Mojca Kleva Kekuš (S&D)
(23. april 2013)

Zadeva: Konvencija Sveta Evrope o preprečevanju nasilja nad ženskami in nasilja v družini ter boju proti njima

Preprečevanje nasilja nad ženskami ni zgolj problematika držav članic EU, temveč je splošna težava, ki vsak dan zadeva na milijone žensk. Statistični podatki EU kažejo, da je približno 45 % vseh žensk žrtev nasilja. Petina teh žensk se sooča z nasiljem v lastni družini, več kot ena od desetih pa je tarča spolnega nasilja, ki vključuje uporabo sile.

Ne smemo pozabiti, da nasilje izkrivlja vlogo žensk v družbi in vpliva na njihov dostop do zaposlitve, ekonomske neodvisnosti in sodelovanja v javnem in političnem življenju.

Konvencija Sveta Evrope o preprečevanju nasilja nad ženskami in nasilja v družini ter boju proti njima ([1]) je korak v pravo smer, saj je prvi pravno zavezujoči instrument EU, ki od vlad zahteva, da preprečijo, odpravijo in kaznujejo zločin nasilja nad ženskami. Konvencijo so doslej ratificirale le tri države.

S katerimi ukrepi namerava Komisija spodbuditi države članice, da bi čim prej ukrepale in ratificirale konvencijo?

Odgovor Viviane Reding v imenu Komisije
(21. junij 2013)

Komisija je zavezana odločnemu političnemu odzivu v boju proti vsem oblikam nasilja nad ženskami. O tej zavezanosti pričajo zlasti akcijski načrt izvajanja stockholmskega programa, Listina žensk in strategija za enakost žensk in moških 2010–2015 ter sprejetje svežnja zakonodajnih predlogov za zaščito žrtev, vključno z evropsko odredbo o zaščiti.

Komisija v vseh svojih dejavnostih, povezanih z odpravo nasilja nad ženskami, države članice poziva, naj posamično ratificirajo to konvencijo Sveta Evrope.

([1]) http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/standardsetting/convention-violence

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004535/13
to the Commission
Mojca Kleva Kekuš (S&D)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence

The prevention of violence against women is not only an issue for EU Member States; it is a global issue that affects millions of women on a daily basis. EU statistics show that approximately 45% of all women are victims of violence. One fifth of these women are affected by violence within their own families and more that one in ten women are victims of sexual violence involving the use of force.

We should not forget that violence manipulates the role of women in society and influences their access to employment, economic independence, and participation in public and political life.

The Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence ([1]) is a step in the right direction, as it is the first legally binding EU instrument which requires governments to prevent, stop, and sanction the crime of violence against women. However, until now, only 3 countries have ratified the Convention.

What kind of measures will the Commission implement to encourage Member States to take action and ratify the Convention as soon as possible?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(21 June 2013)

The Commission is committed to a strong policy response to combat all forms of violence against women. This commitment is shown, in particular, in the action plan implementing the Stockholm Programme, the Women's Charter and the strategy for Equality between Women and Men 2010-2015 and the adoption of legislative proposals such as the European Protection Order and the Victims' Package.

In all its activities related to the elimination of violence against women, the Commission calls on the Member states to ratify individually this Council of Europe Convention.

([1]) http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/standardsetting/convention-violence.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004536/13
alla Commissione
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(23 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Neutralità di Internet

In un comunicato stampa pubblicato il 23 marzo 2013, la Commissione europea ha lanciato il suo partenariato Startup Europa per incoraggiare e ispirare gli imprenditori europei, a ottenere successi analoghi a quelli dei fondatori di Skype e Spotify.

Nella sua risoluzione dell'11 novembre 2012 sul completamento del Mercato unico digitale (P7_TA (2012) 0468), il Parlamento ha sottolineato che la salvaguardia di Internet aperta e neutrale è un volano importante per la crescita economica, la creazione di posti di lavoro, l'innovazione e la competitività europea.

1. Come può la Commissione cercare di promuovere e incoraggiare gli imprenditori europei (specificatamente: quelli che sviluppano servizi innovativi come Skype) mentre nel contempo non fa nulla per impedire i noti abusi noti contro la neutralità della rete, consentendo di fatto alle aziende di telecomunicazioni di bloccare arbitrariamente questi stessi servizi, a loro discrezione, spesso per scopi anticoncorrenziali? (Ciò è stato dimostrato con l'indagine intrapresa dall'Organismo dei regolatori europei delle comunicazioni elettroniche (BEREC).

2. Come può la Commissione asserire che il mercato online è protetto allorché i consumatori avranno la scelta comparativa tra «champagne» e «vino spumante»? Che scelta ha un'impresa startup se non può entrare nel mercato? L'unica scelta sembra essere lo champagne di un avvocato specialista della concorrenza o uscire dal mercato.

3. La Commissione come concilia queste prassi antitetiche di promuovere aziende come Skype e Spotify quali esempi di successo per gli operatori UE e di permettere agli operatori di telecomunicazioni di bloccare loro l'accesso al mercato?

4. La Commissione sta tenendo conto della risoluzione del 15 novembre 2012 sulla «Strategia della libertà digitale nella politica estera dell'UE», in cui il Parlamento ha sottolineato il proprio forte sostegno al principio di neutralità della rete e ha invitato la Commissione e il Consiglio a promuovere e mantenere standard elevati di libertà digitale nell'UE, in particolare, codificando il principio di neutralità della rete con un regolamento adeguato?

Risposta di Neelie Kroes a nome della Commissione
(26 giugno 2013)

La Commissione supporta fermamente il principio di neutralità della rete, che ha ribadito in due discorsi al Parlamento europeo il 30 maggio e il 4 giugno 2013. La Commissione tiene pienamente conto di tutte le risoluzioni del Parlamento europeo, incluse quelle che la invitano a introdurre il principio di neutralità di internet all'interno del diritto europeo.

La Commissione sta elaborando proposte sul mercato unico delle telecomunicazioni necessarie per il funzionamento del mercato unico digitale e farà in modo che tutti gli interessati possano contare sulla certezza del diritto. La Commissione sta valutando la possibilità di includere in queste proposte disposizioni sulla neutralità di internet. Ciò significa che non dovrebbe essere consentito nessun blocco discriminatorio e nessuna restrizione della concorrenza tra diversi servizi. Le prossime proposte mirano altresì a promuovere l'accesso ai mercati digitali da parte di imprese in fase di avvio.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004536/13
to the Commission
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: Internet neutrality

In a press release published on 23 March 2013, the Commission launched its Startup Europe Partnership to encourage and inspire EU entrepreneurs to achieve successes similar to those of the founders of Skype and Spotify.

In its resolution of 11 November 2012 on completing the Digital Single Market (P7_TA(2012)0468), Parliament emphasised that the safeguarding of an open and neutral Internet is an important driver for economic growth, job creation, innovation and EU competitiveness.

1. How can the Commission seek to promote and encourage EU entrepreneurs (specifically those developing innovative services such as Skype) while at the same time doing nothing to prevent known abuses of Internet neutrality, effectively allowing telecommunications companies to arbitrarily block these very services at their discretion, often for anticompetitive purposes? This has been shown with the investigation undertaken by the Body of European Regulators of Electronic Communications (BEREC).

2. How can the Commission say that the online market is protected when consumers will have the comparative choice between 'champagne' and 'sparkling wine'? What choice does a start-up company have if it cannot get into the market? The only choice appears to be between a competition lawyer's 'champagne' or going out of business.

3. How does the Commission reconcile these opposing practices of promoting businesses like Skype and Spotify as examples of success for EU entrepreneurs, while at the same time allowing telecommunications companies to block their access to the market?

4. Is the Commission taking into account Parliament's resolution of 15 November 2012 on a Digital Freedom Strategy in EU Foreign Policy, in which it stressed its strong support for the principle of Internet neutrality and called on the Commission and Council 'to promote and preserve high standards of digital freedom in the EU, in particular by codifying the principle of net neutrality by means of appropriate regulation'?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(26 June 2013)

The Commission is strongly supporting the net neutrality principle. This was emphasised again in two speeches delivered on 30 May and 4 June 2013 at the European Parliament. The Commission takes full account of all the resolutions of the European Parliament, including those calling on the Commission to enshrine the net neutrality principle into European law.

The Commission is currently preparing proposals on the single market for telecommunications which are necessary for the functioning of the Digital Single Market and will provide regulatory certainty for all stakeholders. The Commission is analysing the possibility to include in these proposals provisions on net neutrality. This means that no discriminatory blocking or throttling of competing services should be allowed. The upcoming proposals also aim at promoting access to digital markets by start-up entrepreneurs.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004537/13
to the Commission
Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: The Temporary Agency Work Directive (2008/104/EC)

I have received a letter from a London constituent who, as a temporary worker, has raised concerns regarding EU legislation. My constituent has successfully worked on a temporary contract for the past 19 years, with his employer requiring temporary staff in order to respond flexibly to client requests, but has now been told that his employment will be suspended because of the Temporary Agency Work Directive (2008/104/EC).

While I believe in the principle of protecting employees, current EU legislation creates the undesirable situation where a temporary worker may be asked, as in the case of my constituent, to leave for an indefinite period as a means for a struggling business to circumvent cumbersome EU employment rules.

Could the Commission explain to my constituent why EU-mandated employment laws are preventing him from working, and outline what derogations are available to temporary workers who wish to continue working in a temporary capacity?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(21 June 2013)

The Commission would draw the Honourable Member's attention to the fact that among the objectives of Directive 2008/104/EC ([1]) on temporary agency work, which is fully applicable since December 2011, is to establish a suitable framework for temporary agency work with a view in particular to contributing to job creation and the protection of temporary agency workers.

Neither the directive on temporary agency work nor any other EU employment legislation has the aim or the effect of discouraging or preventing people from working. Furthermore, nothing in the directive prevents temporary workers from continuing to work in a temporary capacity.

The directive takes the diversity of national systems and practice into account by allowing the Member States to derogate under strict conditions from certain of its provisions, notably the principle of equal treatment. In the United Kingdom, legislation transposing the directive was adopted in January 2010 and entered into force on 1 October 2011 ([2]). It provides for equal treatment after the completion of a 12-week qualifying period in a given job.

If the Honourable Member could send a more detailed description of her constituent's personal situation, the Commission will reply in greater depth.

([1]) Directive 2008/104/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 November 2008 on temporary agency work, OJ L 327, 5.12.2008, p. 9.
([2]) Directive 2008/104/EC was transposed into law in Great Britain by the Agency Workers Regulations 2010 (SI 2010/93).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004538/13
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(23 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Possibili finanziamenti per la valorizzazione dell'altopiano di Campello di Itri (Latina)

L'altopiano di Campello di Itri (Latina), nel gruppo montuoso degli Aurunci, è uno dei rari presidi rurali protetti del Lazio. Nell'area, che possiede una sua specificità nel sistema culturale-paesaggistico e agro-pastorale, è prevista la realizzazione di un progetto di sviluppo territoriale integrato finalizzato a una sinergia di tipo socio-economico che consenta di valorizzare l'ambiente naturale, l'agricoltura sostenibile, il turismo e la cultura, con ricadute anche economiche e occupazionali sull'intero territorio.

Il progetto ha dunque un triplice obiettivo: ambientale, paesaggistico e occupazionale.

Per quanto riguarda il ruolo ambientale, si intende far fronte alla stabilizzazione dei fronti collinari che presentano fragili coperture vegetali, alla fertilità compromessa a causa degli incendi e del pascolo irrazionale, nonché alla minaccia idrogeologica che incombe su campagne e abitazioni (ad esempio attraverso la sistemazione degli argini del Rio di Itri in corrispondenza del centro abitato, che è ad alta probabilità di inondazione).

In riferimento al ruolo paesaggistico e culturale, il progetto è dedicato alla fruibilità e all'ospitalità di tutti i luoghi del Parco naturale degli Aurunci, oltre che all'accesso agli stessi, nonché alla ricostruzione del paesaggio rurale anche per quanto concerne il suo patrimonio archeologico e naturale (colonia preitalica di popolazione Osca).

Per quanto attiene al ruolo economico gli obiettivi sono: la valorizzazione delle produzioni tradizionali sostenibili e biologiche, anche legate alla pastorizia (bovini nascenti dal ceppo Podolico, capre autoctone), la crescita della diversificazione e dell'occupazione stabile (cooperazione e servizi alle imprese e al territorio) nonché, infine, lo sviluppo del turismo sostenibile.

Alla luce delle osservazioni sopraesposte, può la Commissione fornire un quadro dei finanziamenti cui il Comune di Itri potrebbe accedere per:

1. promuovere iniziative imprenditoriali legate alle attività agro-silvo-pastorali (o agricole-zootecniche), anche per la valorizzazione di produzioni tipiche;

2. promuovere attività e progetti che rientrano nel settore della cultura e del turismo sostenibile in un'ottica di sviluppo di un'offerta turistica diversificata e di qualità in grado di valorizzare il patrimonio naturale, culturale e archeologico;

3. promuovere attività imprenditoriali, con particolare riferimento alle PMI e

4. promuovere attività di stabilizzazione orografica e idrogeologica?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(17 giugno 2013)

Il Programma di Sviluppo Rurale (PSR) del Lazio per il periodo 2007-2013 prevede il cofinanziamento delle infrastrutture connesse allo sviluppo e all'adeguamento dell'agricoltura e della silvicoltura nonché la concessione di investimenti a sostegno della valorizzazione dei prodotti locali nell'ambito di sistemi di qualità. Nell'asse III il PSR promuove inoltre la diversificazione in attività non agricole, tra cui il turismo rurale, il rinnovamento dei villaggi rurali e la tutela del patrimonio rurale.

Nell'ambito dell'asse II «Ambiente e prevenzione dei rischi» del Programma Operativo Regionale del Fondo Europeo di Sviluppo Regionale 2007/2013 — Lazio il FESR partecipa al cofinanziamento di progetti relativi alla tutela e alla fruizione del patrimonio naturale e culturale della regione in questione nonché all'ambiente e alla prevenzione dei rischi. All'asse I del programma «Ricerca, innovazione e rafforzamento della base produttiva» fanno infine capo finanziamenti per progetti destinati specificatamente alle imprese.

In base al principio di gestione condivisa applicato alla gestione della politica di coesione spetta alle autorità nazionali selezionare e attuare i diversi progetti. Per maggiori informazioni la Commissione suggerisce pertanto all'onorevole parlamentare di contattare direttamente l'autorità che gestisce il programma:

Autorità di gestione del programma operativo regionale della Regione Lazio 2007-2013
Autorità di gestione del programma di sviluppo rurale della Regione Lazio 2007-2013
Via R. R. Garibaldi, 7
00145 Roma
adgcomplazio@regione.lazio.it
roberto.ottaviani@regione.lazio.it

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004538/13
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: Possible funding to develop the Campello plateau in Itri (Latina)

The Campello plateau in Itri (Latina), in the Aurunci mountain range, is one of the few protected rural defences in Lazio. An integrated land development project is planned in the area, which has its own particular culture, landscape and agro-pastoral system, so as to create a socioeconomic synergy that facilitates the development of the natural environment, sustainable agriculture, tourism and culture, and which also has an economic and employment-related impact on the entire region.

The project therefore targets three areas: the environment, the landscape and jobs.

With regard to the project's environmental role, the aim is to address the stabilisation of the hilly areas, which have sparse plant cover, the fertility of the land, which has been compromised by fires and irrational grazing, and the hydrogeological threat to the countryside and homes (for example as a result of the Rio d'Itri embankments being located in the residential area, which is at great risk of flooding).

As regards its landscape and cultural role, the project is dedicated to ensuring that every part of the Aurunci nature park is accessible, usable and welcoming to visitors, and to ensuring the redevelopment of the rural landscape, including with regard to its archaeological and natural heritage (as a pre-Roman colony inhabited by the Oscans).

With regard to the project's economic role, the objectives are: to raise the profile of sustainable and organic traditional products, including those linked to pasture farming (Podolica cattle, native goats), to increase diversification and stable employment (cooperation and services for businesses and the region) and, lastly, to develop sustainable tourism.

In view of the comments made above, can the Commission provide details of the funding that the municipality of Itri could access in order to:

1. promote entrepreneurial initiatives linked to agro-silvo-pastoral (or agricultural-zootechnical) activities, including with the aim of enhancing local products;

2. promote activities and projects in the culture and sustainable tourism sector with a view to developing diversified, quality tourism services that can enhance the natural, cultural and archaeological heritage;

3. promote entrepreneurial activities, with particular reference to SMEs, and

4. promote orographic and hydrogeological stabilisation activities?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2013)

The 2007-2013 Lazio Rural Development Programme (RDP) can co-finance infrastructure related to the development and adaptation of agriculture and silviculture as well as supporting investment in the promotion of local products as part of quality schemes. In addition, under Axis 3, the RDP supports the diversification into non-agricultural activities, including rural tourism, rural village renewal, and the conservation of the rural heritage.

In the framework of priority II 'Environment and risk prevention' of the 2007-2013 Lazio European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) Programme, the ERDF can co-finance projects related to the protection and exploitation of the natural and cultural heritage of the region as well as environment and risk prevention.. Moreover, priority I of the programme 'Research, Innovation and strengthening of the productive basis' provides co-funding for specific business projects.

However, in line with the shared management principle used for the administration of cohesion policy, project selection and implementation is the responsibility of national authorities. For more information, the Commission therefore suggests that the Honourable Member contact directly the managing authorities of the programmes:

Autorità di gestione del programma operativo regionale della Regione Lazio 2007-2013
Autorità di gestione del programma di sviluppo rurale della Regione Lazio 2007-2013
Via R. R. Garibaldi, 7
00145 Roma
adgcomplazio@regione.lazio.it
roberto.ottaviani@regione.lazio.it

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení P-004540/13
Komisi
Richard Falbr (S&D)
(23. dubna 2013)

Předmět: Finanční oprava v programu ROP Severozápad (ČR) – pokračující nečinnost národních orgánů ve věci řízení o finanční opravě v programu ROP Severozápad (Dopis Regio DGA1.C.4/PH/PJkfD)2012)1671651 ze dne 31.1.2013)

Komise upozornila české národní orgány na zahájení řízení, které by mohlo vést k finanční opravě v Regionálním operačním programu Severozápad. Finanční oprava je navržena z důvodu nedostatků v řídícím a kontrolním systému programu, zejména však v činnosti Auditního orgánu (Ministerstvo financí ČR). Navzdory těmto zjištěním uvedeným v dopise DG Regio požaduje Ministerstvo financí ČR, aby navrženou finanční opravu zaplatily v plné výši kraje Ústecký a Karlovarský, které v této kauze vystupují pouze jako jedni z příjemců. Úhrada požadované korekce by byla pro oba kraje likvidační a paralyzovala by jejich činnost na dlouhé období.

V ROP Severozápad byla zavedena požadovaná opravná opatření a požadovaná zlepšení v postupech pro výběr projektů. Policie ČR ukončila vyšetřování projektů ROP Severozápad s tím, že nebyl spáchán trestný čin. Současně řada příjemců upozornila na mylné informace, na jejichž základě byla finanční oprava stanovena. Ministerstvo financí ČR má tak možnost prokázat, že skutečný rozsah nesrovnalostí je menší, než jak jej vyhodnotila Komise, a zajistit tak pokračování programu. Bohužel, ze strany Ministerstva financí ČR není vidět sebemenší snaha o nápravu situace, na jejímž zavinění má podstatný podíl. Současný stav, kdy nejsou propláceny dotace na realizované projekty, má mimořádně negativní vliv na příjemce (obce, města), kteří se ničeho nedopustili.

Dovoluji si proto položit následující otázky:

1. Je Komise informována o tom, že neochota Ministerstva financí ČR k jednání s kraji a prodlužování pozastavení programu přináší příjemcům obrovské finanční ztráty v neproplacených dotacích, čímž je narušena podpora vyváženého rozvoje, zejména v případě strukturálně postižených regionů, jako jedné ze zásad regionální politiky Evropské unie?

2. Jak konkrétně bude Komise postupovat, aby vinou nečinnosti Ministerstva financí ČR nedošlo k předčasnému ukončení programu ROP Severozápad?

Odpověď pana Hahna jménem Komise
(29. května 2013)

Podle zásady sdíleného řízení je to členský stát, který odpovídá za rozhodnutí, jakým způsobem bude v případě navržených korekcí na vnitrostátní úrovni postupovat. Komise samozřejmě přikládá velký význam tomu, aby program hladce pokračoval. U provádění programů je nicméně nutná dostatečná záruka, pokud jde o legalitu a správnost veškerých minulých i budoucích výdajů.

Nedostatky, které Komise zjistila u ROP Severozápad, se týkaly některých specifických otázek souvisejících s programem na úrovni řídícího orgánu, například nesrovnalostí ve výběru operací a při prvostupňových kontrolách, které vyplynuly z auditu.

V roce 2012 navíc Komise zjistila určité horizontální nedostatky u řídicích a kontrolních systémů pro globální provádění strukturálních fondů v České republice, týkající se například nezávislosti pověřených auditních subjektů, nedostatečného vedení a dozoru auditního orgánu pověřených auditních subjektů, prvostupňových kontrol prováděných řídícími orgány a systému nápravy nesrovnalostí. Orgány České republiky souhlasily s akčním plánem na zkvalitnění celkového systému a v roce 2012 byly uspokojivě vyřešeny zásadní problémy.

Komise zaslala orgánům České republiky dopis o svém konečném postoji, který vzešel z konkrétních zjištění auditu, a navrhla konkrétní nápravná opatření zahrnující i finanční korekce. Orgánům České republiky byla poskytnuta možnost vyjádřit svůj postoj. Komise dosud neobdržela odpověď, neboť lhůta ještě neuplynula.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004540/13
to the Commission
Richard Falbr (S&D)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: Financial correction in the Severozápad Regional Operation Programme (ROP) — ongoing failure of national authorities to act regarding financial correction procedure in the Severozápad ROP (Letter Regio DGA1.C.4/PH/PJkfD)2012)1671651 of 31 January 2013)

The Commission has warned the Czech national authorities that a procedure is being launched that could lead to a financial correction being applied to the Severozápad ROP. The financial correction was proposed in response to failings in the management and control system, and particularly in the actions of the audit authority (Czech Ministry of Finance). These are the facts as laid out in DG Regio's letter. In spite of this, the Czech Ministry of Finance is insisting that the Ústecký and Karlovarský regions, which were two of the beneficiaries in this case, pay the full amount of the financial correction themselves. Paying the correction would bankrupt both regions and paralyse their operations for long to come.

The corrective action demanded in the Severozápad ROP case has been implemented, and the required improvements in the project selection procedure have been made. Czech police have ended their investigation of Severozápad ROP projects and concluded that no crime was committed. Many beneficiaries have now pointed out the flawed nature of the information that led to the financial correction being imposed. The Czech Ministry of Finance could demonstrate that the true extent of the irregularities is smaller than the Commission assessed it to be, and in doing so ensure the programme's survival. However, the Ministry has made not the slightest effort to correct this situation for which it is, in large part, to blame. The current state of affairs, whereby subsidies are not being paid for ongoing projects, is having an exceptionally harmful impact on beneficiaries (towns and municipalities) that have done nothing wrong.

I therefore put the following questions to the Commission:

1. Is the Commission aware that the Czech Ministry of Finance's unwillingness to negotiate with the regions and the prolongation of the programme's suspension is causing beneficiaries to incur huge losses in unpaid subsidies? This is undermining support for sustainable development — particularly in structurally disadvantaged regions — as a principle of the EU's regional policy.

2. What specific steps will the Commission take to ensure that the Severozápad ROP doesnot come to a premature end as a result of the Czech Ministry of Finance's inaction?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(29 May 2013)

Under the shared management principle, it is the responsibility of the Member State to decide how the proposed corrections will be settled at national level. The smooth continuation of the programme is of course in the interest of the Commission. Nevertheless, programmes must be implemented with sufficient assurance regarding the legality and regularity of all past and future expenditure.

The deficiencies discovered by the Commission regarding the North-West programme were linked to certain programme-specific issues at the managing authority level, such as deficiencies in the selection of operations and management verifications, identified following audit work.

Furthermore, in 2012, the Commission found certain horizontal deficiencies in the management and control systems of the overall implementation of the Structural Funds in the Czech Republic, including the independence of delegated audit bodies (DABs), insufficient guidance and supervision by the audit authority of the DABs, management verifications carried out by managing authorities and the system for the treatment of irregularities. An action plan was agreed with the Czech authorities to improve the overall system and the main issues were satisfactorily addressed in 2012.

The Commission sent its final position letter based on concrete audit findings to the Czech authorities and proposed specific corrective measures including financial corrections. The Czech authorities were given the possibility to express their opinion. The Commission has not yet received a reply, as the deadline to respond has not yet expired.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004541/13
a la Comisión
Josefa Andrés Barea (S&D)
(23 de abril de 2013)

Asunto: Preferentes de Bankia, tras la publicación del informe de la CNMV

Cada semana los pequeños inversores de preferentes españoles reciben una nueva noticia y un nuevo sobresalto. Esta semana la prensa ha publicado que la CNMV (Comisión Nacional del Mercado de Valores) conocía desde hace tiempo que el modo en el que la entidad bancaria. Bankia colocaba preferentes a los pequeños inversores era fraudulenta, favoreciendo claramente a unos a costa de inflar los precios a otros.

Ese informe, oficial a todas luces, nunca fue hecho público. Se desconoce quién y cómo lo retuvo, pero lo cierto es que esta entidad conocía el delito y no lo denunció.

El Fiscal General del Estado, Eduardo Torres-Dulce, ha anunciado ya que habrá diligencias judiciales.

En este contexto, el Gobierno español sigue intentando negociar y plasmar su plan para que los inversores se deshagan de las preferentes con porcentajes de quitas que oscilarán entre un 14 % y un 70 %. El Gobierno español afirma que es la Comisión Europea la que obliga a los inversores a costear una parte de las pérdidas.

Pero ahora y cada día más es posible que se demuestre que Bankia delinquió y vendió fraudulentamente y con precios inflados estos productos híbridos a pequeños inversores.

¿Cambiaría la posición de la Comisión con respecto a la exigencia de que los pequeños inversores asuman parte de las pérdidas de sus inversiones por el hecho de que la Fiscalía General del Estado tome medidas judiciales contra Bankia?

Respuesta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión
(26 de junio de 2013)

La Comisión aprecia su preocupación por los titulares de participaciones preferentes en Bankia.

En estos últimos años la Comisión ha reforzado el marco de medidas legales encaminadas a incrementar la protección de los consumidores en relación con la venta de productos de inversión. La Directiva 2004/39/CE, relativa a los mercados de instrumentos financieros (DMIF), regula la prestación de servicios de inversión por las entidades de crédito en relación con instrumentos financieros, entre los que se encuentran las participaciones preferentes. Compete a la Comisión vigilar que los Estados miembros incorporen correctamente la legislación de la UE en sus ordenamientos nacionales, lo que España hizo en el caso de la DMIF. Compete a las autoridades y órganos jurisdiccionales nacionales valorar si una venta concreta de participaciones preferentes por una entidad de crédito determinada cumple esa normativa.

La Comisión adoptó en fecha reciente varias propuestas con el fin de reforzar la protección de los inversores; una de ellas fue la propuesta de revisión del marco DMIF.

Por añadidura, el Memorando de Entendimiento sobre condiciones de Política Sectorial Financiera firmado en julio de 2012 por la Comisión en nombre de la FEEF, el BCE y el Reino de España, establece algunas condiciones para reforzar la protección de los consumidores y mejorar el procedimiento de venta de instrumentos no cubiertos por el Fondo de Garantía de Depósitos a clientes minoristas, condiciones que las autoridades españolas han incorporado al marco jurídico vigente.

Por otra parte, el Memorándum de Entendimiento subraya la importancia de un reparto adecuado de la carga. Todas las medidas de ayudas estatales en favor de las entidades de crédito tenían que reducir al mínimo el coste para los contribuyentes. Esto significa que los titulares de capital híbrido, incluidas las participaciones preferentes, tenían que soportar parte de las pérdidas sufridas por esas entidades de acuerdo con los planes de reestructuración aprobados por la Comisión.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004541/13
to the Commission
Josefa Andrés Barea (S&D)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: Bankia preferred shares following the publication of the CNMV report

Another week, another nasty surprise for Spanish small investors in preferred shares. It has been in the news this week that the Spanish National Securities Market Commission (CNMV) has known for a long time that the way in which Bankia was presenting preferred shares to small investors was fraudulent, clearly favouring some at the expense of inflating the price of others.

This report was clearly official, but was never made public. It is not known who withheld it and how, but what is certain is that the CNMV knew of this crime and did not report it.

The Attorney General, Eduardo Torres-Dulce, has now announced that legal action will be taken.

Against this backdrop, the Spanish Government is still attempting to negotiate and set out its plan for the investors to be rid of the preferred shares, with write-downs of between 14% and 70%. The Spanish Government says it is the Commission that is obliging investors to bear part of the losses.

However, now — more and more each day — it is clear that Bankia has broken the law, fraudulently selling these hybrid products to small investors at inflated prices.

Does the Attorney General starting proceedings against Bankia change the Commission's position on requiring small investors to shoulder part of the losses on their investments?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(26 June 2013)

The Commission appreciates your concern about the situation of the holders of preference shares of Bankia.

During the last years the Commission has reinforced the legal framework to enhance consumer protection as regards the sale of investment products. The Markets in Financial Instruments Directive 2004/39/EC (MiFID), regulates the provision of investment services by credit institutions in relation to financial instruments, including preference shares. The Commission is responsible for monitoring the correct transposition by the MS of EU legislation, which in the case of Spain and the MiFID, has been done correctly. It is the competence of national authorities and courts to appreciate whether any specific sale of preference shares by a credit institution complies with this framework.

The Commission has recently adopted several proposals in order to strengthen investor protection, like the proposal for a review of the MiFID framework.

In addition to this, the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on Financial Sector Policy conditions signed in July 2012 the Commission on behalf of the EFSF, the ECB and the Kingdom of Spain, includes some conditions aiming at enhancing consumer protection in order to improve the process for the sale of any instruments not covered by the deposit guarantee scheme to retail clients, that have been incorporated by the Spanish authorities to the legal framework in place.

On the other hand, the MoU underscores the importance of an adequate burden-sharing. All measures envisaged for state aid credit institutions had to minimise the cost on taxpayers. That means that hybrid capital, including preference shares had to bear part of losses identified in these banks according to the restructuring plans approved by the Commission.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004542/13
to the Commission
Marian Harkin (ALDE)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: Roaming charges in Europe

In addition to asking the Commission if there are any proposals to progress the further reduction or abolition of roaming charges in Europe, could the Commission indicate if there are any proposals to deal with charges incurred when inadvertently roaming in areas, such as at the Republic of Ireland/Northern Ireland border, where people cross the border on a regular basis?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(7 June 2013)

The new Roaming Regulation contains additional obligations on roaming providers to address the occurrence of involuntary roaming and to monitor and to inform customers. National Regulatory Authorities (NRA) are responsible for monitoring this phenomenon and take appropriate steps to mitigate it. In this particular case the two competent authorities are the UK regulator Ofcom (Riverside House, 2a Southwark Bridge Road, London, SE1 9HA, www.ofcom.org.uk) and the Irish regulator Comreg (Abbey Court, Irish Life Centre Lower Abbey Street, Dublin 1, www.comreg.ie). According to data gathered by NRAs, inadvertent roaming was not identified as a significant problem, and only a few customers were reported as adversely affected. Information gathered by regulators indicate that providers have put in place a number of mechanisms to deal with the issue of inadvertent roaming. For instance they are providing relevant information on their websites or where a particular issue has been identified, they have generally taken additional steps to ensure customers are aware of the issue. In some cases operators offer specific bespoke tariffs for neighbouring countries or have developed network coverage in border areas to tackle the problem.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004543/13
à la Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(23 avril 2013)

Objet: Rationalisation et efficacité des instruments de défense européens au service du citoyen

La crise budgétaire que traverse aujourd'hui la plupart des pays membres de l'Union européenne entraîne de nombreuses coupes budgétaires et les budgets de la défense sont les premiers à être touchés. Face à la réduction constante des budgets de défense des pays européens, il est essentiel de changer d'attitude et de mettre en place des instruments nouveaux afin de donner une nouvelle impulsion à l'Europe de la défense. Une Europe puissante sur les plans économique et diplomatique ne peut fonctionner qu'avec une Europe de la défense forte et réactive.

Actuellement les opérations militaires menées dans le cadre de la politique de sécurité et de défense commune ne sont pas prises en charge par le budget de l'Union mais sont financées par les contributions des États membres. Quelques mécanismes européens de financement et de gestion des ressources ont toutefois été mis en place. Il existe par exemple le mécanisme Athena, créé en 2004, gérant le financement des coûts communs nécessaires à la mise en œuvre des opérations de l'Union ayant des implications militaires ou dans le domaine de la défense.

Néanmoins, un manque de réactivité de l'Union européenne subsiste concernant la gestion des crises et les opérations militaires d'urgence. Il pourrait ainsi être intéressant de rassembler des fonds au niveau européen afin de gérer l'ensemble des financements des opérations militaires de l'Union. La mise en place d'un mécanisme de fonds européen de défense et de sécurité ainsi que de gestion de crises permettrait par exemple de disposer d'une facilité permanente de financement pour les opérations militaires de l'Union et donnerait à cette dernière la capacité de réagir de manière beaucoup plus réactive face aux différentes crises militaires et/ou diplomatiques auxquelles l'Union devrait apporter une réponse.

Le mécanisme de coopération renforcée pourrait s'appliquer à l'instauration de ce fonds européen de sécurité et de défense. Ainsi ne participeraient au financement et ne bénéficieraient de ce mécanisme que les pays qui le désirent.

1. Face à la réduction actuelle des budgets nationaux de défense, la Commission prévoit-elle de mettre en place de nouveaux mécanismes afin de préserver la défense européenne, essentielle à une Union européenne puissante sur la scène internationale?

2. La Commission envisagerait-elle la mise en place d'un Fonds européen de sécurité et de défense, basé sur le mécanisme de coopération renforcée, qui permettrait de rendre plus facile et plus réactif le financement d'opérations militaires de l'Union et notamment d'opérations d'urgence ou de gestion de crises?

Réponse donnée par Mme Ashton, haute représentante/vice-présidente, au nom de la Commission
(7 juin 2013)

Conformément à l'article 42, paragraphe 1, les missions de la politique de sécurité et de défense commune (PSDC) doivent être accomplies en mettant à profit les capacités des États membres. En 2004, le Conseil a adopté le mécanisme Athena qui sert à gérer les coûts communs des opérations militaires de l'Union qui relèvent de la PSDC. Toute décision visant à élargir le champ d'application des coûts communs et à modifier le mécanisme Athena sera prise par le Conseil. La prochaine révision du mécanisme Athena est prévue pour 2014.

La Commission n'est pas en mesure de prévoir le recours à la coopération renforcée dans le domaine du financement des opérations militaires de l'Union qui ne sont pas couvertes par le budget de l'UE. Conformément à la procédure définie à l'article 329 du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne, la demande des États membres désireux d'instaurer une coopération renforcée devrait être transmise à la haute représentante (HR) de l'Union pour les affaires étrangères et la politique de sécurité ainsi qu'à la Commission. La HR devrait évaluer si la proposition est en phase avec la politique étrangère et de sécurité commune (PESC) et la Commission devrait émettre un avis quant à la cohérence ou non de la proposition par rapport aux autres politiques de l'Union.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004543/13
to the Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: Rationalisation and efficiency of European defence instruments for the benefit of citizens

The budgetary crisis currently affecting the majority of EU Member States has led to many budgets being slashed, and defence budgets have been first in line. In view of these ongoing defence cuts in the Member States, it is vitally important to change our attitude and to establish new instruments in order to lend fresh impetus to the European defence structure. An economically and diplomatically powerful Europe will only be possible with a strong and responsive European defence.

The military operations carried out under the common security and defence policy are currently funded from Member State contributions rather than the EU budget. A number of European funding and resource management mechanisms have been put in place, however; for example, the Athena mechanism was established in 2004 to administer the financing of common costs of EU operations having military or defence implications.

Nevertheless, the EU remains slow to respond when managing crises and urgent military operations. It may therefore be a good idea to pool all funding for EU military operations so that it can be managed at European level. For example, the establishment of a European security and defence and crisis management mechanism would provide the EU with a permanent funding facility for its military operations, and ensure that it was capable of responding much more rapidly to the various military and/or diplomatic crises with which it is faced.

The enhanced cooperation mechanism could be used to establish this European security and defence fund, so that the only countries involved would be those that wished to provide funding and benefit from the mechanism.

1. In view of the current cuts to national defence budgets, is the Commission planning to establish new mechanisms to protect the European defence structure, which is a crucial aspect of an internationally powerful European Union?

2. Is the Commission planning to use the enhanced cooperation mechanism to introduce a European security and defence fund which would allow the EU to fund its military operations, and in particular its emergency or crisis management operations, more easily and more responsively?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(7 June 2013)

In accordance with Article 42(1), the tasks of the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) are to be undertaken using the capabilities of the Member States. In 2004 the Council agreed the Athena mechanism that manages the common costs of the EU military CSDP operations. Any decision to extend the scope of common costs and modify the Athena will be taken by the Council. The next review of the Athena mechanism is planned for 2014.

The Commission is not in a position to plan the use of enhanced cooperation in the field of financing of the EU military operations which are outside the EU budget. In accordance with the procedure laid out in Article 329 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the request of the Member States wishing to establish an enhanced cooperation should be forwarded to the High Representative (HR) of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy and to the Commission. The HR should assess whether the proposal is consistent with the Union's Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), and the Commission should give an opinion whether it is consistent with other Union policies.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004544/13
à la Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(23 avril 2013)

Objet: Pertinence de l'échelon européen pour la réglementation du secteur numérique

Internet et la multiplication des réseaux numériques, du fait de leurs caractéristiques propres, telles que l'interconnexion transfrontalière ou leur volatilité, remettent en cause la pertinence de l'échelon national pour appréhender le secteur numérique et ses enjeux. Il semblerait, en effet, que le secteur du numérique se joue de l'impôt et exploite la concurrence fiscale existante entre les États membres de l'Union européenne. La gratuité étant le modèle dominant sur Internet et le numérique étant une donnée très volatile, il parait très aisé d'échapper à l'impôt pour les acteurs numériques. Ce secteur défierait par ailleurs les règles de droit. Internet étant une donnée globale et non géographique, seules quelques règles nationales sont adoptées par chaque État. Néanmoins, leur manque de coordination entraînerait des conflits de juridiction, voire des espaces de non-droit.

L'Union européenne semble alors être le seul acteur capable d'appréhender ce phénomène transfrontalier et volatile. L'Union a déjà bien identifié le numérique comme un élément majeur de la stratégie Europe 2020 et, dans sa «stratégie numérique pour l'Europe», la Commission européenne a d'ailleurs, d'ores et déjà, établi un Agenda numérique européen visant à développer une économie autour des usages du numérique. Par ailleurs, l'Agence européenne chargée de la sécurité des réseaux et de l'information permet actuellement une coordination des mesures prises par la Commission et les pays de l'Union, notamment en vue de sécuriser leurs réseaux et les systèmes d'information.

Néanmoins, cela semble insuffisant pour appréhender l'ensemble des enjeux portés par le numérique: la protection des données personnelles, la remise en cause de la diversité culturelle, la question de la juste rémunération de la création, l'évasion fiscale, etc.

1. Après avoir constaté la pertinence de l'échelon européen pour une législation relative à ce secteur, la Commission peut-elle indiquer si elle envisage d'approfondir sa politique numérique afin notamment d'appréhender de manière plus globale l'ensemble des enjeux liés à cette révolution numérique?

2. Par ailleurs, afin de mieux réglementer et gérer le secteur du numérique, il serait souhaitable que l'Europe soit en interaction avec le reste du monde, notamment en ce qui concerne la protection des données personnelles. La Commission envisage-t-elle la possibilité de signer des accords avec d'autres pays ou régions du monde à ce sujet afin de mieux intégrer les futures politiques européennes à une gestion globale du secteur numérique?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Kroes au nom de la Commission
(14 juin 2013)

La Commission partage l'avis de l'Honorable Parlementaire selon lequel la question de la dimension transfrontalière de l'internet et des réseaux numériques doit être traitée à l'échelon de l'UE. Ce point ressort de la stratégie numérique pour l'Europe, qui fait l'objet d'un réexamen périodique. Ladite stratégie prend déjà dûment en considération les questions mentionnées par l'Honorable Parlementaire.

En janvier 2012, la Commission a proposé une réforme de la réglementation de l'UE en matière de protection des données, en vue de renforcer le respect de la vie privée en ligne et de stimuler l'économie numérique de l'Europe. À cet égard, la Commission attache une grande importance au dialogue avec les pays tiers, afin de faciliter les transferts de données, tout en garantissant la continuité de la protection des personnes concernées au sein de l'UE lorsque les données à caractère personnel les concernant sont transférées en dehors de l'UE.

Comme elle l'indique dans sa communication de décembre 2012 «sur le contenu dans le marché unique numérique», la Commission suit deux pistes d'action en parallèle visant à s'assurer que le cadre de l'UE en matière de droit d'auteur demeure adapté à l'environnement numérique: un dialogue entre les parties concernées, intitulé «Des licences pour l'Europe» et la révision éventuelle du cadre juridique.

À la suite du plan d'action de décembre 2012 visant à renforcer la lutte contre la fraude et l'évasion fiscales, la Commission souhaite contribuer aux travaux relatifs à la fiscalité menés dans des enceintes internationales telles que l'OCDE, afin de remédier à la complexité de l'imposition du commerce électronique en définissant des normes internationales appropriées.

Outre ces initiatives en cours, et suite à l'invitation formulée par le Conseil européen de printemps à présenter des mesures concrètes pour un marché unique des TIC, les services de la Commission travaillent actuellement sur un ensemble de propositions qu'elle soumettra au Conseil européen en octobre afin qu'il en approuve les principes.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004544/13
to the Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: Importance of action at European level for the regulation of the digital sector

The Internet and the multiplicity of digital networks have specific features, such as their cross-border connections and volatility, which cast doubt on the importance of action taken at national level to deal with the digital sector and its challenges. The digital sector appears to be defying taxation and exploiting tax competition between the EU Member States. Free-of-charge services are the dominant model on the Internet, and the fact that digital sector is so volatile makes it very easy for players in the digital market to evade tax. This sector is resisting the imposition of legal rules. Since the Internet is a global phenomenon without geographical boundaries, only a small number of rules have been adopted at national level by the Member States. Nevertheless, a failure to coordinate these rules means conflicts of jurisdiction and even legal vacuums.

The European Union thus appears to be the only actor capable of dealing with this volatile and cross-border phenomenon. The EU has in fact identified the digital sector as a key pillar of its Europe 2020 strategy, and the Commission has already published a European Digital Agenda, aimed at developing an economy based on digital technologies, under its digital strategy for Europe. In addition, measures taken by the Commission and the Member States, particularly those aimed at securing their networks and information systems, can now be coordinated through the European Network and Information Security Agency.

Nevertheless, these measures do not appear sufficient to deal with all the challenges associated with the digital sector, such as personal data protection, the threat to cultural diversity, the issue of fair pay for creators and tax evasion.

1. Having noted the importance of action at European level for legislation relating to this sector, can the Commission state whether it intends to develop its digital policy further, in particular in order to gain a more comprehensive understanding of all of the challenges posed by the digital revolution?

2. In order to ensure better regulation and management of the digital sector, it would be a good idea for Europe to engage in dialogue with the rest of the world, in particular on the matter of personal data protection. Is the Commission considering the possibility of signing agreements with other countries or regions of the world on this subject in order to ensure that future European policies are better integrated into the global management of the digital sector?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(14 June 2013)

The Commission shares the Honourable Member's view that the EU level is key to addressing the cross-border dimension of the Internet and digital networks. This is reflected in the European Digital Agenda, which is reviewed regularly. Issues mentioned by the Honourable Member are already given due consideration in this strategy.

In January 2012, the Commission proposed a reform of the EU's data protection rules, to strengthen online privacy rights and boost Europe's digital economy. In this regard, the Commission attaches high importance to dialogue with third countries, in order to facilitate data transfers while guarantying the continuity of the protection of EU data subjects when their personal information is transferred outside the EU.

As set out in the December 2012 Communication 'on Content in the Digital Single Market', the Commission is pursuing two parallel tracks of action to make sure EU's copyright framework stays fit for purpose in the digital environment: a stakeholder dialogue 'Licences for Europe' and the possible review of the legal framework.

Following the December 2012 action plan to strengthen the fight against tax fraud and tax evasion, the Commission is willing to contribute to work in international tax fora such as the OECD to address the complexities of taxing electronic commerce by developing appropriate international standards.

In addition to these ongoing initiatives, following the call by the Spring European Council to come forward with concrete measures for a Single ICT Market, the Commission services are currently working on a set of proposals with a view to seek the endorsement of its principles by the European Council in October.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004545/13
aan de Commissie (Vicevoorzitter / Hoge Vertegenwoordiger)
Peter van Dalen (ECR)
(23 april 2013)

Betreft: VP/HR — Twee bisschoppen ontvoerd in Syrië

Volgens Syrische staatsmedia zijn op maandag 22 april 2013 twee bisschoppen ontvoerd in de provincie Aleppo. De Syrisch Orthodoxe en Grieks Orthodoxe Aartsbisschoppen van Aleppo, Yohanna Ibrahim en Paul Yazigi zouden in het dorp Kfar Dael zijn ontvoerd. Ze waren onderweg van Aleppo naar de grensovergang met Turkije, Bab al Hawa en deden humanitair werk.

1. Is de Hoge Vertegenwoordiger bekend met dit bericht?

2. Is de Hoge Vertegenwoordiger het met mij eens dat, indien bevestigd, dit een zeer gevaarlijke ontwikkeling is in een voortdurend escalerend conflict, dat de verschillende gemeenschappen van Syrië nog verder tegen elkaar kan opzetten en minderheidsgroepen zoals de christenen ernstig in de verdrukking kan doen geraken?

3. Volgens Syrische staatsmedia zijn de bisschoppen door rebellen ontvoerd. Is de Hoge Vertegenwoordiger bereid de Syrische Nationale Raad te vragen in deze ontvoeringszaak te bemiddelen, teneinde de bisschoppen vrij te krijgen?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(31 mei 2013)

De hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter is bezorgd om het lot van de twee bisschoppen en heeft in een verklaring van 26 april 2013 ([1]) hun onmiddellijke vrijlating gevraagd.

([1]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/136947.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004545/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Peter van Dalen (ECR)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Two bishops kidnapped in Syria

Syria's state media reported on Monday, 22 April 2013 that two bishops were kidnapped in the province of Aleppo. The Syriac Orthodox and Greek Orthodox Archbishops of Aleppo, Yohanna Ibrahim and Paul Yazigi, were kidnapped in the village of Kfar Dael. They were on their way from Aleppo to the Bab al Hawa border crossing with Turkey and were doing humanitarian work.

1. Is the High Representative aware of this report?

2. Does she agree with me that, if confirmed, this incident marks a very dangerous development in an ever-escalating conflict which may set the various communities in Syria even more against each other and may lead to severe repressive measures against minority groups such as Christians?

3. According to Syria's state media, the bishops were kidnapped by rebels. Is the High Representative willing to ask the Syrian National Council to intervene in this kidnapping incident, with the aim of securing the bishops' release?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(31 May 2013)

The HR/VP is concerned with the continuing fate of the two bishops and has called for their immediate release in a statement dated 26 April 2013 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/136947.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-004546/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(23 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Il Primo Ministro Erdogan ha in programma una visita a Gaza, nonostante l'opposizione degli Stati Uniti e del Presidente dell'Autorità nazionale palestinese Mahmoud Abbas

Secondo il giornale Asharq al-Awsat, il Primo Ministro turco Recep Tayyip Erdogan ha in programma una visita nella Striscia di Gaza nel terzo anniversario dell'incidente della Mavi Marmara. Erdogan ha in programma di visitare il Presidente dell'Autorità nazionale palestinese Mahmoud Abbas a Ramallah e i leader di Hamas a Gaza, nonostante gli sforzi dell'Amministrazione degli Stati Uniti e del Presidente Abbas per indurlo a cancellare la visita o posporla.

Un funzionario dell'Autorità palestinese (AP) a Ramallah ha dichiarato che lo scopo della visita a Istanbul del Presidente Abbas, lo scorso fine settimana, era di convincere Erdogan a cancellare o posporre la sua visita fino a quando i palestinesi avranno raggiunto l'unità nazionale. «La AP è convinta che la visita di Erdogan a Gaza renderebbe più profonde le divisioni palestinesi», ha asserito Azzam al-Ahmed, Membro del Comitato centrale di Fatah.

Il 7 aprile 2013 nel corso della sua recente visita in Turchia, il Segretario di Stato USA John Kerry ha chiesto al Primo Ministro Erdogan di ritardare la sua visita a Gaza, per non turbare i colloqui di pace in Medio Oriente. «Abbiamo stimato che il calendario della visita è davvero critico rispetto al processo di pace che stiamo cercando di mettere in campo e rispetto al quale ci piacerebbe vedere le parti iniziare con la minore distrazione esterna possibile», ha dichiarato il Segretario di Stato Kerry.

Washington teme inoltre che la visita possa compromettere il ripristino delle relazioni tra Israele e la Turchia, iniziato a marzo a seguito delle scuse di Israele per l'incidente della Mavi Marmara.

1. Qual è la posizione della Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante sul programma di visita alla Striscia di Gaza del Primo Ministro turco a fine maggio?

2. La Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante discuterà la questione con il Primo Ministro turco chiedendogli di cancellare o posporre la sua visita onde preservare il processo di pace in Medio Oriente e permettere la normalizzazione delle relazioni israelo-turche?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(27 maggio 2013)

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente non intende formulare commenti in merito alle visite ufficiali programmate da rappresentanti di altri Stati, governi o istituzioni, né in merito alle loro decisioni di incontrare le personalità che desiderano. L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente accoglie con favore il riavvicinamento in corso tra Turchia e Israele e si augura che esso proseguirà e si consoliderà, nell'interesse di entrambi i paesi e dell'intera regione.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004546/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Prime Minister Erdoğan plans to visit Gaza despite opposition from the US and from the President of the Palestinian National Authority, Mahmoud Abbas

According to the newspaper *Asharq al-Awsat*, the Turkish Prime Minister, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, has scheduled a visit to the Gaza Strip on the third anniversary of the Mavi Marmara incident. Erdoğan plans to meet the President of the Palestinian National Authority, Mahmoud Abbas, in Ramallah, as well as Hamas leaders in Gaza, despite efforts by the US administration and President Abbas to have the visit cancelled or postponed.

An official of the Palestinian Authority (PA) in Ramallah has said that the purpose of President Abbas' visit to Istanbul last weekend was to convince Mr Erdoğan to cancel or postpone his visit until such time as Palestinians have achieved national unity. 'The PA believes that Erdoğan's visit to Gaza would deepen Palestinian divisions', said Azzam al-Ahmed, a member of the Fatah Central Committee.

On 7 April 2013, in the course of his recent visit to Turkey, US Secretary of State John Kerry asked Prime Minister Erdoğan to delay his visit in Gaza so as not to disturb the Middle East peace talks. 'We thought that the timing of it is really critical with respect to the peace process we are trying to get off the ground and that we would like to see the parties begin with as little outside distraction as possible', stated Mr Kerry.

Washington also fears that the visit could spoil the restoration of ties between Israel and Turkey, which began in March following Israel's apology for the Mavi Marmara incident.

1. What is the position of the Vice-President/High Representative regarding the Turkish Prime Minister's planned visit to the Gaza Strip in late May?

2. Is the Vice-President/High Representative going to discuss this issue with the Turkish Prime Minister and ask him to cancel or postpone his visit, in the interests of preserving the Middle East peace process and normalising Israeli-Turkish ties?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(27 May 2013)

The HR/VP has no comment to make on the proposed official visits of other statesmen and women nor on their decisions on whom they wish to meet. She welcomes the current Turkish-Israel rapprochement and hopes that this will be sustained, in the interests of both countries and the region as a whole.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004547/13
to the Commission
Alyn Smith (Verts/ALE)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: Illegal bird hunting in Cyprus

According to the Birds Directive (2009/147/EC), the hunting of migratory birds in Cyprus is illegal, but the practice currently continues unabated.

It is estimated that up to 3 million rare birds are killed each year. Hunting often involves the use of nets and sticks; a particularly non-selective method which is specifically banned under the directive. The survival of several species of bird is threatened by this illegal hunting.

Issues relating to the implementation of this directive have been raised before, by both myself and others, though little action appears to have yet been taken.

Could the Commission outline what measures it is taking, as well as those measures, if any, which have already been implemented, to put a stop to this illegal practice?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(3 June 2013)

The Honourable Member is referred to the Commission's reply to Question E-10637/2012 on the same issue.

Furthermore, the Commission has received reports with monitoring data showing persisting high levels of bird trapping in autumn 2012 but also an improvement in winter 2012-2013 with a significant decrease of mist net use. On that basis it will re-iterate to the Cypriot authorities the need to step up their enforcement efforts. Furthermore the Commission has been informed of a recently launched initiative in Cyprus bringing together competent authorities, NGOs and stakeholders with a view to developing a strategic action plan for tackling illegal bird trapping.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004548/13
to the Commission
Julie Girling (ECR)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: Eggs — follow-up to Written Question E-001299/2013

In its answer to Written Question E-001299/2013, the Commission talks about an interim period after which the Ukrainian authorities must apply measures equivalent to those of the EU, including animal welfare measures, under the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement (DCFTA). Could the Commission clarify the exact length of this 'interim period'?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2013)

The draft EU-Ukraine Association Agreement, including its Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area (DCFTA) does not indicate the length of the interim period during which the Ukrainian authorities have to approximate the EU legislation on animal welfare. Not later than three months after entry into force of the Agreement, Ukraine will submit a comprehensive strategy for the implementation of the Sanitary-Phytosanitary Chapter. The comprehensive strategy will indicate priority areas that relate to measures facilitating trade in one specific commodity or group of commodities.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004549/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Claude Moraes (S&D)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Chronic hunger in Bangladesh

Could the Vice-President/High Representative give details on the success and effects of the European External Action Service's (EEAS) project in Bangladesh, which ran from 2007-2011, as well as provide details on what further action the EEAS is preparing to take following on from this project?

Furthermore, could the Vice-President/High Representative give details on how the work of the EEAS compliments or integrates with the work of development agencies already operating in Bangladesh, as well as provide details on how the EEAS works with these NGOs to achieve development objectives?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2013)

The EU project 'Vulnerable Group Development for Ultra-Poor' was funded with EUR 20 million from the 2005 Food Security budget line. It was implemented from 2007-2011 in partnership with the Ministry of Women and Children's Affairs and four local non-governmental organisations (NGOs).

The objective was to contribute to the reduction in severe poverty and food insecurity in Bangladesh by enhancing the capacity of 80 000 extremely poor women-headed households. It had the following impact:

— 80 000 women received training and productive assets to set up income-generating activities;

— enhanced empowerment on social issues and rights, disaster management and nutrition;

— over 3 000 women's groups were formed by the NGOs and were temporarily granted cash subsistence allowances.

After a positive evaluation of the project and some valuable lessons learnt, a new joint project 'Food and Livelihood Security' with EUR 24 million in EU funding for 80 000 women-headed households and very poor croppers has been implemented since 2012.

Other follow-up projects aim at making agriculture and market systems work for landless, marginal and smallholder farmers, and address under-nutrition in young children and women.

In 2012 the EU approved a Food Security Programme for an amount of EUR 38 million aiming at graduation from ultra-poverty for nearly 325 000 vulnerable and women-headed households, while ensuring reliable physical access to markets and service providers.

Development activities undertaken by the EU in Bangladesh are closely coordinated with other development agencies active in the country. The EU also regularly launches calls for proposals for NGOs active in the area of food and nutrition security.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004550/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Claude Moraes (S&D)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Bangladesh elections

Has the EU been invited to monitor the next Bangladesh elections, due to be held by January 2014? Could the Vice-President/High Representative also give details on how the EUR 10 million that the EU has pledged for election management will be spent, in order to ensure that the forthcoming elections are peaceful, and that the results accurately reflect the voting choices of the electorate?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2013)

The Government of Bangladesh has stated that it would welcome an EU observation mission and such a mission has already been included in this year's financial planning. The HR/VP's spokesman has issued a statement expressing concern at the escalating violence in Bangladesh and referring to the HR/VP's appeal to political parties to engage in constructive discussions, at the earliest opportunity, on the practical arrangements for the elections, which must be credible, transparent and fully representative. She has written to the Foreign Minister in the same vein.

The project on strengthening election management is expected to reinforce the Bangladesh Election Commission's (BEC) planning and training capacities and to support its activities, including the preparation and dissemination of an updated voter list including photographs; provision of technical advice on boundary limitation; training of election officials; preparation of codes of conduct for the media, political parties and BEC staff; and enhancing voter education generally.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004553/13
to the Commission
Claude Moraes (S&D)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: European business corporate social responsibility (CSR) in third countries

Why, in the Commission's action plan on corporate social responsibility published in 2011, do most of the commitments for future action only apply to business conducted within the EU?

Given the overseas business interests of many EU companies:

1. Could the Commission indicate whether it has plans to publish proposals for EU companies operating in third countries, similar to those it has forwarded to Parliament and the Council for CSR within the single market?

2. Does the Commission support the idea of the creation of an award scheme for CSR conduct of European companies operating outside the single market, similar to the one proposed for companies operating inside the EU?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(3 June 2013)

According to the new definition outlined in the Commission's Communication of 2011 on CSR ([1]) the understanding of CSR is quite broad as 'the responsibility of enterprises for their impacts on society', irrespectively if they operate inside or outside the EU.

1. The Commission's approach on CSR is consistent with guidelines and principles agreed at global level, including the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, ISO 26 000 Guidance Standard and the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises. This should help to ensure that enterprises face similar expectations whether they operate within the EU or elsewhere.

The Commission has deliberately chosen to keep a non-prescriptive approach to CSR. The focus is on already existing, internationally recognised, CSR guidelines and principles.

2. The overall objective of the European award scheme for Corporate Social responsibility (CSR) is to give higher visibility to excellent practice in the field of CSR in the EU Member States and to share such practice across the EU. It is not about judging enterprises' behaviour as 'right or wrong' as CSR is above all a voluntary initiative which goes beyond legal compliance.

The common theme for the award schemes is 'Corporate social responsibility: Partnership, Innovation and Impact'. The national awards should focus on partnerships between an enterprise and at least one other non-business stakeholder (for example, a group of customers, a non-governmental organisation, or a public authority). It is not excluded that these partnerships take an external dimension. The Commission has no intention to create a separate award scheme with a focus only on this external dimension.

([1]) COM(2011) 681 final.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-004555/13
Komisijai
Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE)
(2013 m. balandžio 23 d.)

Tema: ES pagrindinių teisių chartijos pažeidimas

Nuo 1999 m. Lenkijoje buvo uždaryta 50 proc. lietuviškų mokyklų, likusioms nuolat trūksta finansavimo ir vadovėlių gimtąja kalba. Mokytojų vadovo, pratybų sąsiuvinių nėra, beveik visus dalykus vaikai priversti mokytis iš vadovėlių lenkų kalba, o per pamokas atsakinėti lietuviškai. Taigi tautinių mažumų mokyklose, kur turėtų būti mokoma gimtąja kalba, dauguma pamokų dėstoma dviem kalbomis. Nuo 1999 m. iki 2011 m. iš 12 tuomet veikusių mokyklų uždarytos 5, vienoje panaikintos lietuviškos klasės, viena veikia, nes yra iki 40 proc. išlaikoma steigėjos – Lietuvos valstybės, artimiausiu metu ketinama uždaryti dar tris. Taigi, iš 12 lietuvių tautinės mažumos mokyklų Lenkijos vyriausybė paliks tik tris, o uždaromų mokyklų mokiniai bus perkeliami į lenkiškas mokyklas.

Pagarba mažumoms priklausančių asmenų teisėms yra viena iš pagrindinių vertybių, kuriomis pagrįsta ES, kaip įtvirtinta ES Sutarties 2 straipsnyje. Europos Sąjungos pagrindinių teisių chartijos 21 straipsnis draudžia diskriminaciją, be kita ko, tautiniu ir kalbos pagrindu.

Ar Komisija nemano, kad šios ilgalaikės tendencijos, kurios priverstinai mažina lietuvių tautinės mažumos, kuriai priklauso ne atsikėlėliai, o autochtonai, bendruomenę, naikina galimybes lietuvių tautybės vaikams gauti išsilavinimą gimtąja kalba, pažeidžia ne tik Europos Tarybos tautinių mažumų apsaugos pagrindų konvencijos nuostatas, bet taip pat ir ES teisę, visų pirma ES sutartį ir Pagrindinių teisių chartiją?

A. Vassiliou atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2013 m. birželio 12 d.)

Komisija primena, kad pagal Sutarties dėl Europos Sąjungos veikimo 165 straipsnį už mokymo turinį ir švietimo sistemų organizavimą visų pirma yra atsakingos valstybės narės. Tai reiškia, kad su švietimu mažumų kalbomis susiję klausimai priklauso nacionalinių valdžios institucijų kompetencijai, todėl turėtų būti sprendžiami nacionaliniu lygmeniu. Dėl šios priežasties Europos Sąjungos pagrindinių teisių chartijos nuostatos šiuo atveju netaikomos, nes jos valstybėms narėms galioja tik tuo atveju, kai jos įgyvendina ES teisės teisę (Chartijos 51 straipsnis). Be to, Komisija neturi įgaliojimų teikti pastabų dėl to, kaip viena ar kita valstybė narė laikosi įsipareigojimų pagal Europos Tarybos tautinių mažumų apsaugos pagrindų konvenciją, o pagal Sutarties dėl Europos Sąjungos veikimo 258 straipsniu Komisijai suteiktus įgaliojimus ji taip pat negali vertinti, kaip užtikrinama, kad būtų laikomasi Europos Sąjungos sutarties 2 straipsnyje minimų vertybių.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004555/13
to the Commission
Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: Violation of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union

Since 1999 50% of Lithuanian schools in Poland have been closed and the remaining ones constantly lack funding and textbooks in the native language. There are no teachers' guides or exercise books and children are forced to learn almost all subjects from textbooks in Polish and to respond in Lithuanian during lessons. The majority of lessons in ethnic minority schools, where teaching should be carried out in the native language, are therefore given in two languages. From 1999 to 2011, five of the 12 schools that had been running were closed, in one Lithuanian classes were stopped, one is in operation because it is supported by its founder — the Lithuanian state — by up to 40%, and there are plans to close another three in the near future. Thus, of the 12 Lithuanian ethnic minority schools the Polish Government will leave only three, while pupils from the closed schools will be transferred to Polish schools.

Respect for the rights of people belonging to minorities is one of the fundamental values on which the EU is based, as enshrined in Article 2 of the EU Treaty. Article 21 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union prohibits discrimination, above all on grounds of ethnic origin and language.

Does the Commission not feel that these long-term trends which forcibly reduce the Lithuanian ethnic minority's community, made up of indigenous people not incomers, destroy opportunities for children of Lithuanian nationality to receive an education in their native language, and violate not just the provisions of the framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities of the Council of Europe but also EC law, above all the EU Treaty and the Charter of Fundamental Rights?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2013)

The Commission recalls that, pursuant to Article 165 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), Member States are primarily responsible for the content of the teaching and the organisation of their education systems. It follows that matters concerning education in minority languages fall within the competence of national authorities and should therefore be addressed at national level. Consequently, the provisions of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union are not applicable in the present case, given that they are only addressed to Member States when they are implementing EC law (Article 51 of the Charter). Moreover, the Commission has no authority to comment on the compliance by a certain Member State with its obligations under the Council of Europe's Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, nor does it fall within the scope of the powers conferred on it by Article 258 TFEU to assess the respect of the values mentioned in Article 2 of the Treaty on the European Union.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-004556/13
till kommissionen
Mikael Gustafsson (GUE/NGL)
(23 april 2013)

Angående: Israels behandling av palestinska barn

FN:s barnfond Unicef kritiserar i en nyligen publicerad rapport Israels behandling av fängslade palestinska barn. I korthet handlar kritiken om ett ”utbrett, systematiskt och institutionaliserat” våld.

Barn hämtas i sina hem mitt i natten av tungt beväpnade soldater, bakbinds och förses med ögonbindlar, förs bort till en polisstation, berövas mat och vatten och utsätts för förhör under fysiskt och psykiskt våld och utan närvaro av advokat eller anhöriga. Många tvingas på detta sätt att skriva på ett ”erkännande” där texten är på hebreiska, ett språk de palestinska barnen inte förstår.

Unicef konstaterar att ”advokater, människorättsorganisationer, FN-experter och kommittéer” sedan åtskilliga år har påpekat missförhållandena utan att någonting har hänt. Unicef publicerar också en lista på 38 rekommendationer som skulle kunna förbättra situationen. Bland punkterna finns att arresteringar ska ske dagtid, att information ska ges om anledningen, att handfängsel och ögonbindlar inte får användas och att förhör ska ske i närvaro av advokat eller anhörig.

Utifrån denna skrämmande Unicef-rapport ombes kommissionen svara på följande frågor:

1. Avser kommissionen att protestera kraftfullt mot Israels behandling av palestinska barn?

2. Avser kommissionen att kräva att Israel följer de 38 rekommendationerna som Unicef lagt fram?

3. Avser kommissionen att tills vidare häva handelsavtalet med Israel eftersom det nu är uppenbart att Israel genom denna behandling av barn grovt bryter mot de mänskliga rättigheterna och barnkonventionen?

Svar från den höga representanten/vice ordföranden Catherine Ashton på kommissionens vägnar
(20 juni 2013)

EU har flera gånger uttryckt sin oro över behandlingen av palestinska barn i det israeliska rättssystemet. Enligt gemenskapspolitikens lägesrapport för 2013 om Israel, satt 21 barn under 16 år och 156 mellan 16 och 18 i häkte i slutet av 2012.

Trots att höjningen av myndighetsåldern från 16 till 18 i den militärlag som var tillämplig för Palestina i september 2011 är en välkommen utveckling, finns det fortfarande skäl till oro vad gäller situationen för barnen när dessa grips och häktas, särskilt att barnen i de flesta fall inte biträds av en advokat och förälder under förhöret. De palestinska minderåriga åtnjuter inte samma skyddsnivå som Israels ungdomslag ger eller som krävs i den internationella lagstiftningen. Den nya militärorden (nr 1685) som minskar den tidsperiod under vilken de kvarhållna barnen måste ställas inför militärdomstol från åtta till fyra dagar, ger inte tillräckligt skydd för barn som är mest sårbara under de första 48 timmarna i häkte.

EU har flera gånger gett uttryck för sin oro om dessa förfaranden inom ramen för sin vanliga politiska dialog och dialog om mänskliga rättigheter med Israel. Den har förklarat, senast vid mötet i associeringsrådet EU-Israel i juli 2012, att varje framtida uppgradering i relationerna måste vara baserad på båda parternas delade värden, inklusive demokrati och respekt för mänskliga rättigheter. EU välkomnar Israels positiva svar på den rapport som Unicef offentliggjorde den 6 mars 2013 ”Children in Israeli detention – observations and recommendations”, och uttalandena från dess utrikesministerium om att Israel kommer att studera slutsatserna i rapporten och kommer att arbeta för att genomföra dem genom ett pågående samarbete med Unicef.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004556/13
to the Commission
Mikael Gustafsson (GUE/NGL)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: Israel's treatment of Palestinian children

In a report published recently, the United Nations Children's Fund Unicef criticises Israel's treatment of detained Palestinian children. In short, the criticism concerns 'widespread, systematic and institutionalised' abuse.

Children are taken from their homes in the middle of the night by heavily armed soldiers, are hand-tied and blindfolded and taken to a police station. They are denied food and water and subjected to interrogation, during which they suffer physical and mental abuse, without the presence of a lawyer or family members. Many are forced in this way to sign a 'confession', the text of which is in Hebrew, a language that the Palestinian children do not understand.

Unicef states that 'lawyers, human rights organisations, United Nations experts and treaty bodies' have been drawing attention to this unsatisfactory state of affairs for several years, with nothing having been done about it. Unicef also published a list of 38 recommendations that could improve the situation. The points made include recommendations that arrests should be conducted during daylight, that information should be provided concerning the reasons for the arrest, that the use of hand-tying and blindfolding should be prohibited and that interrogations should take place in the presence of a lawyer or family member.

In light of this frightening Unicef report, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Does the Commission intend to protest in the strongest terms against Israel's treatment of Palestinian children?

2. Does it intend to demand that Israel follow the 38 recommendations put forward by Unicef?

3. Does it intend to suspend the trade agreement with Israel until further notice, as it is now clear that, with this treatment of children, Israel is committing a serious violation of human rights and the Convention on the Rights of the Child?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2013)

The EU has repeatedly voiced its concerns about the treatment of Palestinian children in the Israeli judicial and detention system. As reported in the 2013 ENP Country Progress Report on Israel, by the end of 2012 there were 21 children under 16 years of age and 156 between the age of 16 and 18 in custody.

Although the raising of the majority age from 16 to 18 in the military law applicable to Palestine in September 2011 was a welcome development, concerns remain about insufficient protection of children during arrest and detention, in particular the failure in the majority of cases to permit children to be accompanied by a lawyer and parent during questioning. Palestinian minors do not enjoy the same level of protection as is provided for under Israel's Youth Law or required by international law. The new military order (No.1685), which reduces from eight to four days the time within which detained children must be brought before the military court, does not provide enough protection for children, who are at their most vulnerable in the first 48 hours of detention.

The EU has repeatedly conveyed its concerns about these practices in the framework of its regular political and human rights dialogue with Israel. It has stated, most recently at the July 2012 EU-Israel Association Council, that any future upgrade in relations must be based on the shared values of both parties, including democracy and respect for human rights. The EU welcomes Israel's positive response to the report published by Unicef on 6 March 2013, 'Children in Israeli detention — observations and recommendations', and the statement made by its Ministry of Foreign Affairs that it will study the conclusions of the report and will work to implement them through ongoing cooperation with Unicef.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004557/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(23 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Aplicação da Diretiva 2008/48/CE — contratos de crédito aos consumidores

Em resposta à minha pergunta escrita E-001581/2013, o senhor Comissário Rehn declarou que «em 2013, a Comissão irá apresentar um relatório sobre a aplicação da Diretiva 2008/48/CE e realizar uma campanha de informação numa série de Estados-Membros, sendo a tónica colocada nos direitos de informação aos consumidores, no direito de retratação durante um prazo de 14 dias e no direito de reembolso antecipado.»

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Quando pretende apresentar o relatório?

2. Que contributos recebeu ou recebe para a sua elaboração?

3. Em que Estados-Membros irá realizar a referida campanha?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(6 de junho de 2013)

Tenho o prazer de confirmar ao Senhor Deputado que o relatório sobre a aplicação da Diretiva 2008/48/CE será apresentado ao Conselho e ao Parlamento Europeu em 2013, em conformidade com o artigo 27.° da diretiva. O relatório fornecerá também informações sobre os resultados da aplicação da diretiva. O relatório basear-se-á na análise da Comissão Europeia sobre a aplicação da diretiva, apoiado por dois estudos realizados para a Comissão no que diz respeito ao mercado do crédito ao consumidor e às opções legislativas tomadas pelos Estados-Membros aquando da aplicação da diretiva.

A campanha de informação será lançada em Espanha, na Irlanda e em Malta antes do verão de 2013 e, mais tarde em Chipre.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004557/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: Application of Directive 2008/48/EC — credit agreements for consumers

In response to my Written Question E-001581/2013, Mr Rehn stated that 'in 2013, the Commission will present a Report on the implementation of Directive 2008/48/EC and carry out an information campaign in a number of Member States, with a focus on information rights for consumers, the 14-day right of withdrawal and the early repayment right'.

1. When will the Commission present the report?

2. What contributions to the report have been or are being received?

3. In which Member States will the campaign be carried out?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2013)

I am pleased to confirm to the Honourable Member that the report on the implementation of Directive 2008/48/EC will be submitted to the European Council and to the European Parliament in 2013 in accordance with Article 27 of the directive. The report will also provide information on the outcomes of the implementation of the directive. The report will be based on the European Commission's analysis of the implementation of the directive supported by two studies carried out for the Commission, on the consumer credit market and on the regulatory choices made by the Member States when implementing the directive.

The information campaign will be launched in Spain, Ireland and Malta before summer 2013, and subsequently in Cyprus.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004558/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(23 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Mudança radical na economia — estratégias e medidas a aplicar

Em resposta à minha pergunta escrita E-001588/2013, o senhor Comissário Rehn declarou que «A Comissão pretende fornecer um aconselhamento ainda mais específico e aferível em matéria de estratégias e medidas a aplicar.»

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Em que áreas preferenciais incidirá este aconselhamento?

2. De um ponto de vista prático, como se verificará?

3. Como pretende aumentar a aferibilidade do aconselhamento fornecido pela Comissão?

Resposta dada pelo Comissário Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(7 de junho de 2013)

O processo de supervisão económica à escala da UE no âmbito do «Semestre Europeu» incide sobre questões de política orçamental, financeira, macrofinanceira e de emprego, podendo incluir aconselhamento político no sentido do reforço da concorrência nos mercados de produtos e de serviços (por exemplo, profissões regulamentadas ou construção civil), da redução da carga fiscal sobre a mão-de-obra ou da simplificação da legislação em matéria de emprego. A Comissão apresenta ao Conselho uma proposta de aconselhamento político dirigido aos Estados-Membros e à zona euro.

A Comissão acompanha de perto o seguimento dado ao aconselhamento político ao longo do ano, disponibilizando uma panorâmica geral dos progressos realizados no seu Inquérito Anual sobre o Crescimento ([1]) e avaliando as reformas políticas realizadas por cada Estado-Membro nos documentos de trabalho dos seus serviços que acompanham a proposta de aconselhamento político para o ano seguinte. No quadro da preparação dessa avaliação, a Comissão está em contacto com os Estados-Membros para recolher dados e informações. As recomendações finais são adotadas pelo Conselho, que deve explicar publicamente, por exemplo, no âmbito do diálogo económico com o Parlamento Europeu, o motivo das alterações introduzidas nas propostas da Comissão.

O aconselhamento político da Comissão contém medidas concretas e prazos para a sua execução.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/ags2013_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004558/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: A step change in the economy — policies to be applied

In response to my Written Question E-001588/2013, Mr Rehn stated that 'The Commission aims at formulating even more specific and measurable policy advice'.

1. To which areas will this advice apply?

2. How will this process be checked in practical terms?

3. How will the Commission increase the measurability of its advice?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(7 June 2013)

The EU economic surveillance process under the 'European semester' addresses policy challenges in fiscal, financial, macro-financial and employment policy. This may include policy advice for improving competition in product and services markets (such as regulated professions or construction), further reducing the tax burden on labour or simplifying employment legislation. The Commission makes a proposal for the Council for policy advice to Member States and to the euro area as a whole.

The Commission monitors the implementation of the policy advice throughout the year. A horizontal overview of the progress made is presented in the Commission's Annual Growth Survey ([1]). The assessment of policy reforms in each Member State is included in the Staff Working Documents that accompany the Commission's proposal for policy advice for the following year. In preparation of this assessment, the Commission is contact with Member States, to collect data and information. The final recommendations are adopted by the Council, which is under the responsibility to explain in public, for example in economic dialogue with the European Parliament, the motivation of the changes which it has introduced to the Commission proposals.

The Commission formulates policy advice with concrete measures and deadlines for the policy steps.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/ags2013_en.pdf

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004559/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(23 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: EURES — candidatos e colocações

Em resposta à pergunta escrita E-002063/2013, o Comissário Andor declarou o seguinte: «Espera-se que as alterações venham a multiplicar o número de contactos de clientes (candidatos a emprego e empregadores) e a melhorar os resultados (colocações e recrutamentos em outros países da UE).»

Assim, pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Está em condições de prever em que medida as alterações podem permitir a referida ação multiplicadora? Estimou algum número a este respeito?

2. Como avaliará a melhoria qualitativa dos resultados?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(21 de junho de 2013)

1. O número de contactos de clientes e as colocações e recrutamentos resultantes devem aumentar graças à extensão da rede EURES a novos participantes e à melhor correspondência oferta/procura de empregos daí decorrente.

Ainda não foram feitas estimativas numéricas. Com efeito, o objetivo não consiste em fixar objetivos quantitativos, já que um aumento quantitativo irá depender largamente da flutuação de fatores como a atual situação económica, a evolução da situação no mercado de trabalho, as alterações dos excedentes e défices de qualificações, etc.

2. O ciclo de programação e de acompanhamento que está a ser criado, incluirá indicadores comuns para medir os resultados e os efeitos. Além disso, os Estados-Membros serão convidados a partilhar na rede outras informações disponíveis a nível nacional, em especial com os serviços públicos de emprego, os resultados relativos à mobilidade, incluindo de natureza qualitativa.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004559/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: EURES — jobseekers and placements

In response to Written Question E-002063/2013, Mr Andor stated: 'The changes are expected to increase the number of client contacts (jobseekers and employers) and results (placements and recruitment in other EU countries)'.

1. To what extent will the changes bring about the increases described? Has a numerical estimate of these increases been made?

2. How will the Commission assess the qualitative improvement in the results?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(21 June 2013)

1. The number of client contacts and the resulting placements and recruitments are expected to increase thanks to the extension of the EURES network to new actors and the expanded basis for matching that will follow from that.

No numerical estimates have been made. The objective is in fact not to set numerical targets as the quantitative increase will depend largely on fluctuating factors such as the current economic situation, developments on the labour market, changes in skills surpluses and shortages, etc.

2. The programming and monitoring cycle that is being established will include common indicators to measure outputs and outcomes. Moreover, Member States will be invited to share in the network other information available at national level, in particular with public employment services, on results relating to mobility, including of a qualitative nature.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004560/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(23 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: EURES — candidatos e colocações

Em resposta à minha pergunta escrita E-002063/2013, o senhor Comissário Andor declarou que «A transição para mais atividades de colocação e recrutamento será acompanhada de a) um portal reformulado EURES capaz de operar, em tempo útil, correspondências entre competências e vagas disponíveis».

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

Está em condições de prever quando estará disponível o referido portal?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(21 de junho de 2013)

O portal EURES melhorado e renovado será introduzido ao público de forma gradual, em várias etapas a partir do final do ano 2013 e nos próximos anos, de acordo com um plano de projeto que foi criado em cooperação com a rede EURES.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004560/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: EURES — jobseekers and placements

In response to my Written Question E-002063/2013, Mr Andor stated that 'The shift towards more placement and recruitment activities will be accompanied by (a) a revamped EURES portal to achieve a speedy online matching of skills with vacancies'.

Can the Commission say when this portal will be available?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(21 June 2013)

The revamped and improved EURES portal will be introduced to the public gradually, in several steps, from the end of 2013 and over the coming years, according to a project plan that was established in cooperation with the EURES network.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004561/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(23 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: EURES — ciclo de programação e apresentação de relatórios

Em resposta à minha pergunta escrita E-002063/2013, o senhor Comissário Andor declarou que «Será estabelecido um ciclo de programação e apresentação de relatórios para reforçar o intercâmbio, a nível da UE, de informações relativas a necessidades de recrutamento, iniciativas e ferramentas desenvolvidas para dar resposta às necessidades e projetos de cooperação.»

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

Está em condições de precisar quando será estabelecido o referido ciclo?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(21 de junho de 2013)

O enquadramento para a programação e ciclo de relatórios sobre a EURES referido na resposta à pergunta escrita E-002063/2013 está atualmente a ser desenvolvido pela Comissão, em estreita cooperação com os Estados-Membros. O objetivo da Comissão consiste em iniciar a troca de informações de acordo com este enquadramento a partir do ano civil de 2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004561/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: EURES — programming and reporting cycle

In response to my Written Question E-002063/2013, Mr Andor stated that 'A programming and reporting cycle will be created to reinforce information exchange at EU level on recruitment needs, events and tools developed to address the needs and cooperation projects'.

Can the Commission say when this cycle will be created?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(21 June 2013)

The framework for the programming and reporting cycle on EURES referred to in the response to the Written Question E-002063/2013 is currently being developed by the Commission, in close cooperation with the Member States. The aim of the Commission is to start the exchange of information in accordance with this framework as from calendar year 2014.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004562/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(23 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Infoexclusão da Terceira Idade

Em resposta à minha pergunta escrita E-002710/2013, a senhora Comissária Kroes declarou que «os números sobre a infoinclusão indicam claramente a existência de um fosso entre gerações» e que «a Comissão está de facto particularmente atenta à inclusão no mundo digital dos mais idosos».

Não obstante, a minha pergunta dizia respeito não apenas àqueles que ainda poderão incluir-se mas, sobretudo, aos que se encontram alheados das novas tecnologias e que tendencialmente assim continuarão. Importa, por isso, saber de que forma o acesso aos serviços lhes continuará a ser acessível no futuro.

Assim, pergunto novamente à Comissão:

1. Não crê que se devem acautelar os interesses daqueles que são menos aptos a usar a internet e permitir que o acesso a serviços e a comunicação não lhes seja cortado na prática?

2. Conhece ou estará disposta a avaliar os níveis de infoexclusão na União Europeia e o risco da alienação dos mais idosos da participação ativa no espaço público e na vida social por via daquela rede?

3. Quais as fontes dos dados de que dispõe?

Resposta dada por Neelie Kroes em nome da Comissão
(20 de junho de 2013)

A Comissão concorda que todos os cidadãos devem ter um acesso equitativo a serviços fundamentais da sociedade. A Comissão não dispõe de provas de que haja (ou venha a haver num futuro próximo) cidadãos excluídos dos atuais serviços presenciais («*off-line*»), devido à introdução de versões em linha desses serviços. A garantia da disponibilidade de serviços presenciais no domínio público, ou a prevenção da exclusão dos mesmos, é responsabilidade dos Estados-Membros.

A Comissão, através do Eurostat, acompanha regularmente a evolução da utilização da Internet nos Estados-Membros, inclusivamente pelas pessoas mais velhas, sendo esta uma fonte de informação crucial para a elaboração posterior das políticas. Como referido na resposta à sua pergunta escrita E-002710/2013, a recém-lançada proposta de diretiva relativa à acessibilidade dos sítios Web dos organismos públicos visa eliminar os obstáculos ao mercado interno que reduzem a acessibilidade desses sítios, e a futura Lei Europeia da Acessibilidade, incluindo a respetiva Avaliação de Impacto, dizem diretamente respeito ao acesso aos edifícios, espaços, transportes e outros serviços públicos.

A Comissão espera poder continuar a trabalhar com o Parlamento Europeu e o Conselho sobre esta questão.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004562/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: E-exclusion of the elderly

In response to my Written Question E-002710/2013, Ms Kroes stated that 'Figures on e-Inclusion clearly indicate a generation gap' and 'The Commission does pay a lot of attention to the e-Inclusion of older adults'.

However, my question concerned not only those who may still be able to take part but also those who are excluded from new technologies and are likely to remain so. It is therefore important to know in what way services will continue to be made accessible to them in the future.

1. Does the Commission not agree that the interests of those who are less able to use the Internet should be considered and that their access to services and communication should not be limited in practical terms?

2. Is it aware of, or prepared to evaluate, the levels of information exclusion in the European Union and the risk of excluding the elderly from active participation in the public arena and from social interaction using this network?

3. What are the data sources available to it?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2013)

The Commission agrees all citizens should have equitable access to key services in society. The Commission has no evidence that citizens are excluded from existing off-line services (or will be so in the near future), because of the introduction of online versions of these services. To guarantee the availability of off-line services in the public domain, or preventing increase of exclusion from these, falls under responsibility of the Member States.

The Commission through Eurostat regularly monitors the evolution in Internet use in the Member States including by older people, which is a key source of information for further policy development. As has been mentioned in the reply to your Written Question E-002710/ 2013, the recently launched proposal for a directive on the accessibility of public bodies' websites addresses barriers to the internal market that lead to reduced availability of accessibility of such websites, and the upcoming European Accessibility Act including its Impact Assessment directly concern access to public buildings, spaces, transport and other services.

The Commission is looking forward to continue working with the European Parliament and the Council on this issue.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004563/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(23 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Proteção de dados — notificação de violação de dados pessoais

Em resposta à minha pergunta escrita E-001681/2013, a senhora Comissária Reding declarou que «nos seus esforços para reformar a atual legislação em matéria de proteção de dados, a Comissão Europeia procurou reforçar a segurança do tratamento, propondo a introdução da obrigação pelo responsável pelo tratamento de notificar violações de dados pessoais à autoridade de controlo competente e ao titular dos dados, sempre que a violação de dados pessoais for suscetível de afetar negativamente a proteção dos dados pessoais ou a privacidade do titular dos dados».

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que resultado obteve a proposta da Comissão?

2. Considera que a mesma reforçaria consideravelmente a proteção de dados e, igualmente, a possibilidade de as autoridades competentes e os titulares dos dados violados se defenderem adequadamente e em tempo útil da violação?

Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão
(3 de julho de 2013)

A proposta da Comissão de um regulamento geral de proteção de dados ([1]), que inclui a obrigação de notificar as violações de dados pessoais a que o Senhor Deputado se refere, está atualmente a ser analisada pelo Parlamento Europeu e pelo Conselho.

Atualmente, só existem normas harmonizadas a nível da UE em matéria de notificação de violações de dados pessoais relativamente aos prestadores de serviços de comunicações eletrónicas (nomeadamente, operadores de telecomunicações e prestadores de serviços de internet). Esta obrigação está prevista na diretiva da privacidade eletrónica revista, que foi transposta para a legislação nacional de todos os Estados-Membros.

Tal como descrito na avaliação de impacto da Comissão ([2]), o aumento da transparência do tratamento dos dados relativamente aos particulares, incluindo em caso de violação de dados pessoais, permitirá aos particulares atenuar os efeitos negativos potenciais dessas violações, reforçando simultaneamente os princípios vigentes em matéria de proteção de dados, uma vez que exige que o responsável pelo tratamento ponha em prática medidas técnicas e organizativas adequadas para proteger os dados. Em última análise, esta exigência deverá dar aos particulares maior confiança no universo digital e proporcionar maior segurança jurídica para as empresas.

([1]) COM(2012) 11 final.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/data-protection/document/review2012/sec_2012_72_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004563/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: Data protection — notification of personal data breaches

In answer to my Written Question E-001681/2013, Mrs Reding stated 'In its efforts to reform the current legislation on data protection, the European Commission has sought to strengthen the security of processing by proposing the introduction of an obligation on the controller to notify personal data breaches to the competent supervisory authority and, where the breach is likely to adversely affect the protection of personal data or privacy of the data subject, to the data subject'.

1. What has been the result of the Commission's proposal?

2. Will the proposal significantly improve data protection and the ability of the competent authorities and subjects of breached data to protect themselves adequately and swiftly against such breaches?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(3 July 2013)

The Commission's proposal for a General Data Protection Regulation ([1]) which includes the personal data breach notification obligations you refer to, is currently being discussed by the European Parliament and the Council.

At present, EU-wide harmonised rules on the notification of personal data breaches exist only for providers of electronic communications services (e.g. telecom providers and Internet Service Providers). This obligation is laid down in the revised ePrivacy Directive, which has been implemented into the national law of all Member States.

As described in the Commission's impact assessment ([2]), increasing transparency of data processing vis-à-vis individuals including in case of personal data breaches will enable individuals to mitigate the potential negative effects of personal data breaches while reinforcing existing data protection principles such as the security principle, requiring the data controller to implement appropriate technical and organisational measures to protect the data. Ultimately this should give individuals more trust in the digital environment and provide enhanced legal certainty for business.

([1]) COM(2012) 11 final.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/data-protection/document/review2012/sec_2012_72_en.pdf

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004564/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(23 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Operações com balões de ar quente

Em resposta à minha pergunta escrita E-002305/2013, o senhor Comissário Kalas declarou: «No futuro próximo, as operações com balões de ar quente serão abrangidas por regras harmonizadas a nível da UE, tal como previsto no Regulamento (CE) n.° 216/2008.»

A esta luz, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Pode precisar quando passarão a ser abrangidas?

2. Justifica-se esta harmonização? Por que motivos?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(27 de junho de 2013)

Prevê-se que as regras do transporte aéreo comercial com balões de ar quente, isto é, operações de transporte de passageiros a título oneroso, sejam adotadas no decurso do primeiro semestre de 2014, juntamente com uma alteração ao Regulamento (UE) n.° 965/2012. As consultas com os Estados-Membros sobre a medida proposta estão a chegar ao seu termo. Em ambos os casos, os Estados-Membros disporão de um prazo de três anos para transpor para a legislação nacional as normas da UE.

As razões pelas quais a harmonização é necessária são numerosas e incluem: a promoção de normas que garantam um nível de segurança elevado, tendo em conta os riscos associados a determinados tipos de operações, a garantia de condições equitativas de concorrência leal no setor da aviação da UE e a proteção dos passageiros a bordo e a terceiros no terreno.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004564/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: Hot-air balloon operations

In answer to my written question E-002305/2013, Mr Kalas stated 'In the near future hot-air balloon operations will fall under EU-wide harmonised rules as envisaged by Regulation (EC) No 216/2008'.

1. Can the Commission say when this will happen?

2. Is this harmonisation justified? On what grounds?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2013)

Rules for commercial air transport with hot-air balloons, i.e. operations carrying fare-paying passengers, are expected to be adopted during the first half of 2014 along with an amendment of Regulation (EU) No 965/2012. Consultations with the Members States on the proposed measure are coming to an end. In both cases, Member States will have up to three years to transition from national to EU standards.

The reasons why the harmonisation is necessary are numerous and include: promotion of high safety standards taking into account the risks associated with particular types of operation, ensuring a level playing field for fair competition within the EU aviation industry, protection of passengers on board and third parties on the ground.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004565/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(23 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Restituição de tesouros nacionais

Em resposta à minha pergunta escrita E-002077/2013, o senhor Comissário António Tajani declarou: «A avaliação da aplicação da presente Diretiva (Diretiva 93/7/CEE do Conselho) concluiu que esta precisava de ser revista, por forma a torná-la mais eficaz no que toca à restituição de bens culturais classificados como "tesouros nacionais". Por conseguinte, a Comissão tenciona apresentar uma proposta para a sua revisão. O principal objetivo desta revisão será permitir aos Estados-Membros obterem a restituição ao seu território dos bens culturais classificados como "património nacional", que foram ilicitamente retirados dos seus territórios.»

A esta luz, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Quando tenciona apresentar a referida proposta de revisão?

2. Como pretende aumentar a eficácia das restituições?

3. Que contributos recebeu dos Estados-Membros, das Universidades, das instituições culturais e da sociedade civil a este respeito?

Resposta dada por Antonio Tajani em nome da Comissão
(20 de junho de 2013)

A Comissão adotou, em 30 de maio de 2013, a Proposta de Diretiva do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativa à restituição de bens culturais que tenham saído ilicitamente do território de um Estado-Membro ([1]).

A proposta visa tornar a recuperação mais eficaz, nomeadamente, mediante: i) o alargamento do âmbito de aplicação da diretiva a todos os bens culturais classificados como património nacional na aceção do artigo 36.° do TFUE; ii) a promoção da utilização do Sistema de Informação do Mercado Interno (IMI) para a realização das ações de cooperação administrativa e o intercâmbio de informações entre as autoridades em causa; iii) o prolongamento do prazo até três anos para os procedimentos de restituição e iv) a disposição de que, para efeitos de compensação, e nos casos em que o bem é restituído, recai sobre o possuidor o ónus da prova da diligência devida quando adquiriu o bem cultural.

Para a elaboração da referida proposta, a Comissão analisou muitas contribuições e, especialmente, os relatórios sobre a aplicação da Diretiva 93/7/CEE, relativa à restituição de bens culturais ([2]), as conclusões de um grupo de representantes de autoridades nacionais competentes relativamente à Diretiva 93/7/CEE, criado em 2009 para o efeito, e as respostas à consulta pública lançada em 2011 ([3]).

De um modo geral, as autoridades nacionais concordaram com a necessidade de proceder a uma revisão da Diretiva 93/7/CEE. Os resultados da consulta pública mostraram que os representantes das autoridades e dos organismos públicos eram favoráveis ao melhoramento da eficácia da Diretiva 93/7/CEE no que diz respeito à restituição de bens culturais.

([1]) COM(2013) 311, de 30 de maio de 2013.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/single-market-goods/internal-market-for-products/cultural-goods/
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/single-market-goods/internal-market-for-products/cultural-goods/results_public_consultation_cultural_goods_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004565/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: Return of national treasures

In answer to my written question E-002077/2013, Mr Tajani stated 'The evaluation of the application of this directive 93/7/EEC concluded that it needed to be revised to make it more effective for the return of cultural objects classified as "national treasures". Therefore, the Commission intends to put forward a proposal for its revision. The main goal of this review will be to enable Member States to recover any cultural object identified as a "national treasure" that was unlawfully removed from their territories.'

1. When will the Commission present this proposal?

2. How does it intend to make recovery more effective?

3. What support has it received from Member States, Universities, cultural institutions and civil society?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2013)

The Commission adopted, on 30 May 2013, the proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the return of cultural objects unlawfully removed from the territory of a Member State ([1]).

The proposal aims to make recovery more effective notably by: i) extending its scope to cover all cultural objects classified as national treasures within the meaning of Article 36 of TFEU, ii) requiring the use of the internal market system (IMI) for administrative cooperation and information exchanges between the concerned authorities, iii) extending the time-limit for bringing returns proceedings to three years and iv) stipulating that, for the purpose of compensation in cases where the cultural object is returned, that the possessor has to prove that he exercised due care and attention when he acquired the cultural object.

For the preparation of this proposal, the Commission analysed many contributions, in particular, the reports on the application of Directive 93/7/EEC on the return of cultural goods ([2]), the conclusions of a group of representatives of national authorities in charge of Directive 93/7/EEC set up in 2009 for this purpose and the responses to the public consultation launched in 2011 ([3]).

Generally speaking, national authorities agreed on the need to revise Directive 93/7/EEC. The results of the public consultation showed that the representatives of public authorities and bodies were in favour of improving the effectiveness of Directive 93/7/EEC in returning cultural objects.

([1]) COM(2013)311 of 30 May 2013.
([2]) See at http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/single-market-goods/internal-market-for-products/cultural-goods/
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/single-market-goods/internal-market-for-products/cultural-goods/results_public_consultation_cultural_goods_en.htm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004566/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(23 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Segurança alimentar

Em resposta à minha pergunta escrita E-002053/2013, o senhor Comissário Borg declarou: «Não há riscos para a saúde pública em relação à fraude de carne de cavalo comunicada ao sistema de alerta rápido para os géneros alimentícios e alimentos para animais da Comissão.»

A esta luz, pergunto à Comissão:

Tratando-se este caso, segundo a Comissão, apenas de uma questão de rotulagem e de veracidade da informação prestada aos consumidores, considera que a alimentação dos animais abatidos cuja carne é processada e vendida no espaço da União não inspira cuidados? Isto é, não há risco sério de estes animais, durante a fase de crescimento e engorda prévia ao embate, ingerirem produtos que ponham em causa a saúde dos seres humanos?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(19 de junho de 2013)

São aplicáveis disposições de segurança rigorosas aos alimentos e à alimentação de todos os animais, incluindo os cavalos ([1]). Estas incluem regras de higiene e listas de ingredientes autorizados, incluindo os aditivos. O Regulamento (CE) n.° 767/2009 ([2]),prevê que os alimentos para animais só podem ser colocados no mercado e utilizados se forem seguros.

Além disso, a responsabilidade pela aplicação da legislação relativa à cadeia alimentar é dos Estados-Membros, que devem estabelecer um sistema de controlos oficiais para verificar o cumprimento por parte dos operadores dos requisitos daí decorrentes. A Comissão supervisiona as obrigações de controlo dos Estados-Membros através de auditorias no local. No caso referido, os sistemas de controlos oficiais criados pelos Estados-Membros permitiram identificar violações das regras aplicáveis. Até à data, não há motivos para crer que os sistemas de controlos oficiais criados nos Estados-Membros são ineficazes. O mesmo é válido para os controlos que a Comissão realiza para verificação desses sistemas.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/animalnutrition/index_en.htm
([2]) O Regulamento (CE) n.° 767/2009 do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 13 de julho de 2009, relativo à colocação no mercado e à utilização de alimentos para animais, que altera o Regulamento (CE) n.° 1831/2003 do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho e revoga as Diretivas 79/373/CEE do Conselho, 80/511/CEE da Comissão, 82/471/CEE do Conselho, 83/228/CEE do Conselho, 93/74/CEE do Conselho, 93/113/CE do Conselho e 96/25/CE do Conselho e a Decisão 2004/217/CE da Comissão (JO L 229 de 1.9.2009, p. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004566/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: Food safety

In answer to my written question E-002053/2013, Mr Borg stated 'There are no public health risks in relation to the horsemeat fraud reported to the Commission's Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed'.

The Commission suggests that this situation is merely an issue of labelling and providing accurate information to consumers, however, is not the feed given the slaughtered animals whose meat entered the EU food-chain also of concern? Is there not a serious risk that prior to slaughter these animals may have ingested products that could be harmful to humans?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2013)

Strict safety provisions apply to the feed and feeding of all animals including horses ([1]) . They include hygiene rules and lists of allowed ingredients including additives. Regulation (EC) No 767/2009 ([2]) provides that feed may only be placed on the market and used if it is safe.

Moreover, the responsibility for enforcing food chain legislation lies with Member States, which are required to establish a system of official controls to verify compliance by operators with requirements deriving therefrom. The Commission monitors delivery by the Member States of their control duties, including through on-the-spot audits. In the case referred to, the official controls systems established by the Member States allowed them to identify violations of applicable rules. So far, there is no reason to believe that the official controls systems established in Member States are ineffective. The same goes for the controls the Commission carries out to verify those systems.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/animalnutrition/index_en.htm

([2]) Regulation (EC) No 767/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 July 2009 on the placing on the market and use of feed, amending European Parliament and Council Regulation (EC) No 1831/2003 and repealing Council Directive 79/373/EEC, Commission Directive 80/511/EEC, Council Directives 82/471/EEC, 83/228/EEC, 93/74/EEC, 93/113/EC and 96/25/EC and Commission Decision 2004/217/EC (OJ L 229, 1.9.2009, p. 1).

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004567/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(23 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Combate ao «download» ilegal

Tendo em conta que:

— A sociedade da comunicação e da informação criou uma rede de partilha e «download» de ficheiros sem precedentes, pondo em causa os direitos da propriedade intelectual e, simultaneamente, criando uma imensa comunidade recetora dessa informação;

— Vários Estados-Membros já adotaram leis nacionais para identificar e bloquear a partilha de ficheiros na Internet, tendo como consequência uma possível suspensão do serviço de Internet por um período de um ano, nomeadamente em França e no Reino Unido;

— O Parlamento Europeu, a 4 de julho, chumbou o Acordo ACTA, por considerar que ele poderia constituir uma ameaça aos direitos de privacidade e liberdade dos internautas;

— A questão da pirataria e do «download» ilícito devem ter uma resposta em todo o mundo, uma vez que a ausência de valorização social dos delitos de propriedade intelectual é um fenómeno com características globais;

— O Tribunal de Justiça da União Europeia está a avaliar a legalidade do Acordo ACTA, já assinado pelos 27 Estados-Membros;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Uma vez que há um aumento constante dos «downloads» ilegais e da partilha de ficheiros, que põe em causa os direitos da propriedade intelectual e a existência da própria indústria, que medidas suplementares pensa tomar para reduzir estes atos?

2. Tendo em conta as jurisdições nacionais, quais as melhores soluções para o combate à pirataria em linha?

3. Já dispõe a Comissão de uma proposta alternativa, caso o Tribunal Europeu considere que o Acordo ACTA viola alguns dos princípios fundamentais já mencionados?

Resposta dada por Karel De Gucht em nome da Comissão
(26 de junho de 2013)

A Comissão tem o direito de iniciativa para propor medidas a nível da UE em matéria de propriedade intelectual, nomeadamente medidas contra o descarregamento ilegal e a partilha de ficheiros. Em 5 de dezembro de 2012, a Comissão anunciou várias ações, tanto imediatas como a médio prazo, no âmbito dos direitos de autor e do mercado único digital ([1]). Essas ações incluem o diálogo entre as partes interessadas no âmbito da iniciativa «Licenças para a Europa», a fim de ajudar a encontrar soluções inovadoras para melhorar o acesso legal a conteúdos criativos em linha.

A principal responsabilidade pela aplicação da legislação nacional cabe aos órgãos jurisdicionais nacionais. No entanto, paralelamente, podem ser utilizadas outras vias. Por exemplo, o Observatório Europeu das Infrações aos Direitos de Propriedade Intelectual ([2]) (DPI), debruçou-se recentemente sobre a melhor forma de aumentar a sensibilização do público para o valor dos DPI e, através de um grupo de trabalho específico, constituir um repositório de anteriores campanhas de sensibilização para as autoridades dos Estados-Membros poderem analisar o desenvolvimento de novas campanhas públicas de mensagens.

Atualmente, a Comissão procede à análise dos resultados da sua consulta pública em linha sobre os processos cíveis que têm em vista fazer respeitar os DPI. Está a considerar a possibilidade de publicar uma comunicação que explique se e, em caso afirmativo, de que modo poderia ser adaptada a legislação vigente no que se refere ao respeito dos DPI.

([1]) Para mais informações, ver:
http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-12-950_en.htm
([2]) Para mais informações, ver:
http://oami.europa.eu/ows/rw/pages/OBS/index.en.do

Em 19 de dezembro de 2012, a Comissão decidiu retirar o pedido (datado de 11 de maio de 2012) apresentado ao Tribunal de Justiça Europeu para emissão de um parecer sobre a compatibilidade do Acordo Comercial Anticontrafação (ACTA) com os Tratados Europeus, por ter considerado não existir qualquer possibilidade realista de o Parlamento, após ter rejeitado de forma substancial o referido acordo em julho de 2012, poder posteriormente vir a alterar a sua posição.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004567/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: Tackling illegal downloads

The unprecedented file sharing and downloading network created by the communication and information society has created enormous community demand for this information and is threatening intellectual property rights.

Several Member States, in particular France and the United Kingdom, have already adopted national laws to identify and block Internet file sharing, using the threat of the suspension of Internet services for a year.

On 4 July, the European Parliament rejected the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA), believing this could threaten Internet users' rights to privacy and liberty.

There needs to be a global response to piracy and illegal downloads as the failure to respect intellectual property rights is a worldwide phenomenon.

The Court of Justice of the European Union is to assess the legality of the ACTA, which has already been signed by the 27 Member States.

1. As illegal downloads and file sharing are ever increasing and are threatening intellectual property rights and the survival of the industry, what additional measures will the Commission take to reduce these practices?

2. Bearing in mind national courts and tribunals, how can online piracy best be tackled?

3. Does the Commission have an alternative proposal, should the European Court consider that ACTA violates any of the abovementioned basic rights?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(26 June 2013)

The Commission has the right of initiative to propose measures at EU level in the field of intellectual property, including therefore measures against illegal downloading and file sharing. On 5 December 2012, the Commission announced various immediate and medium term actions in the field of copyright and the Digital Single Market ([1]). These actions include the stakeholder dialogue Licences for Europe to help find practical solutions to enhance legal access to creative content online.

National courts and tribunals have the primary responsibility in applying national law. However, there can also be other remedies which can be run in parallel. For example, the European Observatory on Infringement of Intellectual Property Rights ([2]) (IPR) has recently been looking at how to raise public awareness of the value of IPR and also through a dedicated working group, developing a repository of past awareness campaigns for Member States authorities to look at developing new public messaging campaigns.

Currently, the Commission is reviewing the results of its online public consultation on civil IP enforcement. It is considering a communication explaining whether and, if so, how it might adjust the current legislation in the IP enforcement field.

On 19 December 2012, the Commission decided to withdraw its request (dated 11 May 2012) to the European Court of Justice to give its opinion on whether the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA) is compatible with the European Treaties as it considered that there is no realistic chance that Parliament, after having massively rejected it in July 2012, will agree in the future to the proposed treaty.

([1]) More information can be found at http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-12-950_en.htm
([2]) More information can be found at http://oami.europa.eu/ows/rw/pages/OBS/index.en.do

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004568/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(23 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Dia Internacional dos Monumentos e Sítios

Considerando que:

— O dia 18 de abril foi consagrado como o Dia Internacional dos Monumentos e Sítios, criado no ano de 1982 pelo Conselho Internacional dos Monumentos e Sítios e aprovado pela Unesco, com o objetivo de sensibilizar e promover a conservação, a proteção e a funcionalidade sustentável dos monumentos culturais, arquitetónicos, arqueológicos e outros;

— A preservação e a manutenção deste património constituem encargos elevadíssimos para os Estados, embora eles possam ulteriormente ser revertidos em receitas de turismo e na difusão dos valores históricos junto das sociedades;

— Muitos Estados, regiões, autarquias e freguesias não conseguem suportar os encargos necessários para a manutenção e preservação dos monumentos e sítios, tendência agravada pela atual recessão económica;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Quais os fundos europeus e os instrumentos financeiros existentes para a preservação dos monumentos?

2. Não considera a Comissão relevante criar um local de informação para os governos centrais, regionais e locais, onde estas entidades possam saber da existência de fundos e projetos europeus de conservação e manutenção, uma vez que os meios de comunicação social portugueses revelaram um desconhecimento destes apoios?

Resposta dada por AndroullaVassiliou em nome da Comissão
(25 de junho de 2013)

A conservação e preservação do património cultural competem a cada um dos Estados-Membros. Em conformidade com o artigo 167.° do Tratado sobre o Funcionamento da União Europeia (TFUE), a União Europeia só pode incentivar a cooperação entre os Estados-Membros.

Por meio do seu programa «Cultura» (2007-2013), a Comissão apoia projetos de cooperação cultural, nomeadamente no domínio do património cultural, que envolvem operadores de diferentes Estados-Membros. Os órgãos de poder local e regional podem participar. Na sua proposta para o novo programa «Europa Criativa» (2014-2020), a Comissão continuará a prestar esse apoio.

Além disso, a Comissão apoia ativamente outras ações que visam pôr em destaque o património cultural europeu, tais como as Jornadas Europeias do Património, geridas conjuntamente com o Conselho da Europa, a Marca do Património Europeu e o Prémio da União Europeia para o Património Cultural.

Os pontos de contacto culturais ([1]) foram criados nos países que participam no atual programa «Cultura», para efeitos de promoção e facilidade de acesso ao mesmo. O futuro programa «Europa Criativa» prestará também este tipo de assistência através de uma rede de centros de informação, que serão estabelecidos.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/culture/annexes-culture/doc1232_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004568/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: International Day for Monuments and Sites

International Day for Monuments and Sites, created in 1982 by the International Council for Monuments and Sites and approved by Unesco, is celebrated on 18 April to promote and encourage the preservation, protection and sustainable use of cultural, architectural and archaeological monuments and other sites.

Although Member States spend vast sums preserving and maintaining this heritage, these may eventually be recouped through tourism revenue and by increasing society's interest in history.

However, many Member States, regions, authorities and councils are unable to meet the costs of maintaining and preserving monuments and sites, particularly during the current economic recession.

1. What EU funds and financial instruments are available for preserving monuments?

2. Will the Commission create an information point where central, regional and local governments can find out about EU preservation and maintenance funds and projects as the Portuguese media has shown it is unaware of such support?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(25 June 2013)

The conservation and preservation of cultural heritage is the responsibility of individual Member States. In accordance with Article 167 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), the European Union can only encourage the cooperation among Member States.

Through its Culture Programme (2007-2013), the Commission provides support to cultural cooperation projects, including in the field of cultural heritage, involving operators from different Member States. Local and regional authorities can participate. In its proposal for the new Creative Europe programme (2014-2020), the Commission will continue to provide such support.

In addition, the Commission actively supports other actions seeking to highlight European cultural heritage, such as the European Heritage Days, jointly managed with the Council of Europe, the European Heritage Label and the European Union Prize for Cultural heritage.

Cultural contact points ([1]) have been established in countries participating in the current Culture programme in order to promote and facilitate access to it. The future Creative Europe programme will also provide such assistance through a network of Creative desks that will be established.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/culture/annexes-culture/doc1232_en.htm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004569/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(23 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Proposta de utilização de fundos europeus em programas extraordinários de combate ao desemprego jovem

Considerando que:

— Segundo o jornal «Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung», a Chanceler Angela Merkel afirmou que os fundos europeus poderiam ser utilizados para cofinanciar programas extraordinários de reformas antecipadas nos países onde o desemprego juvenil é bastante elevado, como é o caso de Portugal, Grécia e Espanha;

— Os regulamentos dos fundos europeus impedem o uso dos mesmos para encargos com reformas, mas o novo pacote financeiro de 6 mil milhões de euros criado no próximo Quadro Financeiro Plurianual destina-se ao combate ao desemprego jovem;

— No âmbito da pergunta E-009928/2012, por mim elaborada, sobre a possibilidade de utilizar os fundos da União para o pagamento das rescisões amigáveis, solução apresentada pelo governo português no plano de cortes na despesa pública de 4 mil milhões de euros entre 2013 e 2014, a Comissão não tinha ainda conhecimento desta solução e do pedido português;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Qual a sua opinião e que possibilidade existe de aplicar esta solução apresentada pela Chanceler Angela Merkel sobre a utilização do pacote financeiro de 6 mil milhões de euros de combate ao desemprego jovem no cofinanciamento de programas extraordinários de reformas antecipadas?

2. Pretende a Comissão apresentar mais medidas de programas extraordinários para combater o desemprego jovem, através do uso de fundos europeus?

3. Tenciona a Comissão pretende analisar, uma vez mais, a proposta do governo português de utilizar o cofinanciamento para o pagamento de rescisões amigáveis?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(1 de julho de 2013)

1. Como proposto pela Comissão, o montante de 6 mil milhões de euros destinados à Iniciativa para o Emprego dos Jovens (IEJ) vai apoiar medidas de apoio estabelecidas no Pacote de Emprego dos Jovens e, em particular, a recomendação do Conselho relativa à criação de uma Garantia para a Juventude. Programas extraordinários de reforma antecipada não fazem parte do pacote.

2. Para além da IEJ, a proposta da Comissão para o regulamento relativo ao FSE para o próximo período de programação (2014-2020) inclui uma prioridade de investimento do FSE especificamente orientada para a integração sustentável de jovens que não estão empregados, não estudam e não seguem qualquer formação (NEET) no mercado de trabalho. Espera-se que os Estados-Membros com uma elevada taxa de desemprego jovem sejam capazes de identificar os jovens desempregados e os jovens NEET como um grupo específico para o financiamento do FSE.

3. A Comissão analisará atentamente e acompanhará o regime de requalificação português que foi anunciado como parte das medidas no âmbito da revisão das despesas públicas. Embora os pormenores relativos à medida sejam ainda desconhecidos, regra geral, o FSE pode ser utilizado para financiar a reorientação profissional, a renovação das competências e projetos de formação.

Em qualquer caso, o financiamento do FSE deve contribuir para aumentar a empregabilidade das pessoas que participaram em cursos de formação.

O FSE não pode financiar rescisões, independentemente de estas serem ou não amigáveis A indemnização por despedimento é uma medida «passiva» (como é o subsídio de desemprego) e, como tal, não é elegível para cofinanciamento do FSE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004569/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: Proposal to tackle youth unemployment using EU funds for special schemes

According to the newspaper *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, Chancellor Merkel has suggested that European funds could be used to co-finance special early retirement schemes in countries with high youth unemployment, such as Portugal, Greece and Spain.

Under the regulations governing EU funds, these may not be used for retirement costs, however, the next multiannual financial framework includes a new EUR 6 billion financial package to tackle youth unemployment.

In answer to my Question E-009928/2012 on the possibility of using EU funds to pay for voluntary redundancies, as proposed by the Portuguese Government in its plan to cut public spending by EUR 4 billion between 2013 and 2014, the Commission stated that it had no knowledge of this proposal or the Portuguese Government request.

1. What is the Commission's opinion, and what is the likelihood of applying Chancellor Merkel's suggestion to use the EUR 6 billion financial package to tackle youth unemployment by financing special early retirement schemes?

2. Will the Commission present any further special schemes for tackling youth unemployment using EU funds?

3. Will the Commission reassess the Portuguese proposal to use co-financing to pay for voluntary redundancies?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(1 July 2013)

1. As proposed by the Commission, the EUR 6 billion Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) will support measures set out in the Youth Employment Package, and in particular the Council Recommendation on the establishment of a Youth Guarantee. Special early retirement schemes are not part of the Package.

2. In addition to the YEI, the Commission proposal for the ESF Regulation for the forthcoming programming period (2014-20) includes a dedicated ESF investment priority for the sustainable labour-market integration of young people who are neither in employment nor in education or training (NEETs). Member States with high youth unemployment rates are expected to identify young unemployed persons and NEETs as a specific target group for ESF funding.

3. The Commission will carefully analyse and monitor the Portuguese requalification scheme that was announced as part of the measures in the framework of the public expenditure review. While the details of this measure are still unknown, as a general rule the ESF can be used to finance professional reorientation, retraining and reskilling.

In any event, ESF financing must contribute to enhance employability of those who have taken part in reskilling courses.

The ESF cannot finance redundancies, whether or not these are voluntary. Redundancy pay is a 'passive' measure (as is unemployment benefit) and as such is not eligible for ESF co-financing.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004570/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(23 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Grau de qualificações no Colégio da Europa

Tendo em conta que:

— A criação do Colégio da Europa teve origem nos movimentos europeus do pós-Segunda Guerra Mundial, no congresso de Haia em 1948, que pretendia formar uma elite europeia capaz de se identificar com um projeto de União, evitando as guerras constantes no continente;

— O Colégio da Europa forma não só cidadãos europeus e, por esta razão, tem um papel fundamental na educação sobre o projeto europeu;

— A diretiva das qualificações pretende a harmonização entre os diferentes sistemas nacionais no que diz respeito às competências e às qualificações, com o objetivo de facilitar e promover a mobilidade de trabalhadores e estudantes dentro do mercado interno;

— A Comissão Europeia patrocina técnica e financeiramente o Colégio e que os cursos que oferece são denominados *Masters*;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Tem conhecimento do facto de, em certos Estados-Membros, os *Masters* do Colégio não serem considerados como tal, mas sim como pós-graduações?

2. Pensa tomar alguma iniciativa junto dos Estados-Membros, uma vez que a diretiva das qualificações, em vigor desde 2008, pretende eliminar este tipo de incongruências e obstáculos à qualificação dos cidadãos europeus?

3. Não considera que os estudantes são, de alguma maneira, enganados, uma vez que só têm conhecimento deste facto após conclusão do ano letivo?

Resposta dada por AndroullaVassiliou em nome da Comissão
(26 de junho de 2013)

1. Os programas académicos do Colégio da Europa são certificados pelo organismo de acreditação flamengo-neerlandês (NVAO, Nederlands-Vlaamse Accreditatieorganisatie). Os graus de Mestre emitidos pelo Colégio da Europa são reconhecidos oficialmente pelo Governo flamengo e são equivalentes aos mestrados plenamente reconhecidos emitidos pelas universidades flamengas.

2. Se bem que a organização e os conteúdos do sistema de educação sejam da responsabilidade dos Estados-Membros, um dos princípios fundadores da cooperação europeia no ensino superior é o facto de os estudantes deverem poder circular livremente entre diferentes sistemas de ensino superior na UE. Contudo, o reconhecimento das suas qualificações noutro país para efeitos de prossecução dos estudos nem sempre é fácil para os estudantes. A construção de uma relação de confiança entre os sistemas constitui um passo fundamental no sentido de facilitar o reconhecimento. A Comissão apoia a construção deste tipo de relações de confiança de diversas formas, nomeadamente através do apoio à cooperação entre os centros nacionais ENIC/NARIC, que prestam aconselhamento ou decidem sobre o reconhecimento de qualificações obtidas no estrangeiro em conformidade com a Convenção sobre o Reconhecimento das Qualificações elaborada pelo Conselho da Europa e pela UNESCO, bem como através do Quadro Europeu de Qualificações para a Aprendizagem ao Longo da Vida, que tem por objetivo aumentar a transparência das qualificações em todos os países.

3. O Colégio da Europa define claramente a sua política e as modalidades de aplicação antes do processo de seleção.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004570/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(23 April 2013)

Subject: College of Europe Degrees

The College of Europe originates from post-Second World War European movements at the Congress of The Hague in 1948, which proposed to educate a European elite that would identify with the project for the European Union and bring an end to the constant wars on the continent.

The College of Europe plays a crucial role in providing education on the European project as it is not restricted to European nationals.

The aim of the qualifications directive is to draw together the various national systems for skills and qualifications in order to facilitate and promote worker and student mobility in the domestic market.

The Commission provides technical and financial support to the College, which offers what it describes as 'Masters' courses.

1. Is the Commission aware that some Member States consider the College qualifications as post graduate rather than 'Masters' degrees?

2. Given that the aim of the qualifications Directive, in force since 2008, is to eliminate inconsistencies as well as this kind of confusion about the qualifications awarded to European nationals, will the Commission take any action with these Member States?

3. Does it agree that students are to some extent misled as they only become aware of this issue after they have completed the academic year?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(26 June 2013)

1. The academic programmes of the College of Europe are accredited by the Dutch-Flemish Accreditation Organisation (NVAO, Nederlands-Vlaamse Accreditatieorganisatie). Masters degrees delivered by the College of Europe are officially recognised by the Flemish Government, and are equivalent to fully recognised Master's degrees issued by a Flemish university.

2. While the organisation and content of education is the responsibility of the Member States, a founding principle of European cooperation in higher education is that students should be able to move freely between different higher education systems in the EU. However, it is not always easy for students to have their qualifications recognised in another country for the purposes of further study. Building trust between systems is a key step in facilitating recognition. The Commission supports such trust-building in a number of ways, including by supporting cooperation between national ENIC/NARIC centres which provide advice or decisions on recognising foreign qualifications in accordance with the Council of Europe/Unesco Lisbon Recognition Convention, and through the European Qualifications Framework for lifelong learning which aims to increase the transparency of qualifications across countries.

3. The College of Europe clearly states its policy and application modalities in advance of its selection process.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-004571/13
a la Comisión
María Irigoyen Pérez (S&D)
(24 de abril de 2013)

Asunto: La modificación de la Ley 10/2012 continúa vulnerando el acceso a la justicia en igualdad de condiciones en España

En respuesta a una pregunta escrita (P-011601/2012) relativa a la vulneración en España del derecho de todos los ciudadanos a la tutela judicial efectiva, la Comisión subrayó que, si bien el requisito de pagar tasas a los tribunales por la tramitación de una causa no constituye en sí mismo una violación del derecho fundamental de acceso a la justicia, el carácter excesivo de una tasa puede constituir una restricción que vulnere la propia esencia del derecho fundamental de una persona a ser oída por un tribunal. La Comisión anunció también que llevaría a cabo un estrecho seguimiento de este asunto.

El pasado 22 de febrero, el Gobierno español, presionado por el enorme rechazo de la opinión pública, aprobó el Real-Decreto Ley 3/2012 por el que se modifica el régimen de las tasas en el ámbito de la administración de justicia regulado en la Ley 10/2012, de 20 de noviembre, y la Ley 1/1996, de 10 de enero, de asistencia jurídica gratuita.

Pese a las modificaciones introducidas, la Ley 10/2012 continúa fijando tasas desproporcionadas que vulneran el derecho de todos los ciudadanos a la tutela judicial efectiva, recogido en el artículo 47 de la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales y asimismo en el artículo 6, apartado 1, del Convenio Europeo de Derechos Humanos, y sigue sin garantizar el acceso a la justicia en igualdad de condiciones. Asimismo, la decisión del Gobierno de devolver la tasa a los nuevos beneficiarios de la justicia gratuita es insuficiente, ya que debería extenderse a todos aquellos que han abonado unas tasas que ahora se reconocen como excesivas y desproporcionadas.

A la espera del pronunciamiento del Tribunal Constitucional español, ¿puede informar la Comisión de si tiene conocimiento de la puesta en marcha de reformas de naturaleza similar en otros países de la Unión y el efecto que éstas han tenido en la aplicación del derecho de la Unión?

Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión
(28 de mayo de 2013)

Como se indica en la respuesta a la pregunta escrita E-11601/2012, la obligación de pagar tasas a los tribunales por la tramitación de una causa no constituye por sí misma una infracción del derecho fundamental de acceso a la justicia. No obstante, una tasa excesiva puede constituir una restricción que vulnere la propia esencia del derecho fundamental de una persona a ser oída por un tribunal. El carácter excesivo de una tasa debe evaluarse a la luz de todos los elementos pertinentes de la legislación que la establezca, incluidas las posibles excepciones para las personas que puedan acogerse a la asistencia jurídica gratuita.

Según la información disponible, parece que todos los Estados miembros, excepto Luxemburgo, contemplan la obligación general de pagar una tasa judicial para incoar un procedimiento ante un tribunal de competencia general ([1]). El importe de las tasas varía según los Estados miembros. La Comisión está al corriente de las reformas recientes o previstas de las tasas judiciales en los Estados miembros, especialmente en Portugal, Grecia, Italia, Letonia y los Países Bajos ([2]). Sin embargo, no tiene información sobre el efecto de estas reformas en la aplicación del Derecho de la UE.

([1]) Puede encontrarse información sobre las tasas judiciales en el capítulo 3.4 del Informe de evaluación de los sistemas judiciales europeos publicado por la Comisión europea para la eficacia de la justicia (CEPEJ) el 20 de septiembre de 2012: http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/cooperation/cepej/evaluation/2012/Rapport_en.pdf

([2]) Puede encontrarse información sobre las reformas judiciales en curso y previstas en los Estados miembros en http://ec.europa.eu/justice/effective-justice/files/cepej_study_justice_scoreboard_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004571/13
to the Commission
María Irigoyen Pérez (S&D)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: Amendments to Law 10/2012 still infringe the right of equal access to justice in Spain

In its answer to Written Question P-011601/2012 on infringement in Spain of the right of all citizens to an effective legal remedy, the Commission stressed that, although the requirement to pay fees to civil courts for a case to proceed does not constitute per se a violation of the fundamental right of access to justice, an excessive fee can constitute a restriction that impairs the very essence of a person's fundamental right to be heard by a court. The Commission also stated that it would follow this issue closely.

On 22 February 2013, with public opinion strongly against it, the Spanish Government adopted Royal Decree-Law 3/2013 amending the rules on fees applied in the field of the administration of justice, which are governed by Law 10/2012 of 20 November 2012 and Law 1/1996 of 10 January 1996 on free legal assistance.

Despite the introduction of amendments, Law 10/2012 still applies disproportionate fees which constitute an infringement of the right of all citizens to an effective legal remedy, as enshrined in Article 47 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union and in Article 6(1) of the European Convention on Human Rights, and it still fails to guarantee equal access to justice. The Government's decision to reimburse new beneficiaries of free justice for the fees paid is insufficient, since reimbursement ought to cover all those who have paid fees that have now been recognised as excessive and disproportionate.

Pending the decision of the Spanish Constitutional Court, can the Commission say whether it is aware of similar reforms being implemented in other European Union countries, and what effect such reforms have had on the application of EC law?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(28 May 2013)

As stated in the reply to Written Question E-11601/2012, the requirement to pay fees to courts for a case to proceed does not constitute per se a violation of the fundamental right of access to justice. An excessive fee can however constitute a restriction that impairs the very essence of a person's fundamental right to be heard by a court. The excessive nature of a fee should be assessed in light of all the relevant elements of the legislation establishing such a fee, including the possible exemptions for persons eligible for legal aid.

According to available information, it appears that all Member States except Luxembourg have a general requirement to pay a court fee to initiate a proceeding before a court of general jurisdiction ([1]). The amount of the fees varies across Member States. The Commission is aware of recent or planned reforms of court fees in Member States, notably Portugal, Greece, Italy, Latvia and the Netherlands ([2]). However, it has no information on the effect of these reforms on the application of EC law.

([1]) Information on court fees can be found in the Evaluation Report on European Judicial Systems published by the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice ('CEPEJ') on 20 September 2012, Chapter 3.4 at http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/cooperation/cepej/evaluation/2012/Rapport_en.pdf

([2]) Information on ongoing and foreseen judicial reforms in Member States can be found in http://ec.europa.eu/justice/effective-justice/files/cepej_study_justice_scoreboard_en.pdf

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-004572/13
à la Commission
François Alfonsi (Verts/ALE)
(24 avril 2013)

Objet: L'Europe et les aides d'État au cinéma en France

De grandes inquiétudes sont ressenties par l'ensemble des professionnels du cinéma et des producteurs audiovisuels des régions françaises. En effet, cette filière audiovisuelle, qui représente des milliers d'emplois, est suspendue dans l'attente de la communication de l'Union européenne relative aux aides d'État au cinéma.

Celle-ci vise à préciser l'article 107 du traité sur l'Union européenne en ce qui concerne la concurrence engendrée par les aides d'État au cinéma.

Les modalités du système de financement actuel du CNC tel qu'il a été mis en place en France seront remises en cause et les nouvelles modalités sont actuellement négociées. Du coup, par anticipation, certaines régions françaises ont suspendu toutes les aides régionales à la filière audiovisuelle laissant un secteur entier aux abois, risquant ainsi de faire s'effondrer des années de structuration de la filière audiovisuelle dans les territoires. Il est donc urgent de débloquer ce dossier.

La Commission peut-elle, à ce jour, indiquer une date de publication de cette communication sur les aides d'État au cinéma? Quels éléments d'ores et déjà envisagés par cette communication pourraient-ils être révélés de façon à ce que les collectivités s'adaptent à cette nouvelle donne et puissent rétablir leur dispositif de soutien?

Et enfin, la notion d'«œuvres difficiles» mise en avant durant cette négociation permettra-t-elle aux films de création et aux œuvres en langues régionales de bénéficier d'aides sans restriction au sein de l'Union?

Réponse donnée par M. Almunia au nom de la Commission
(25 juin 2013)

La communication sur le cinéma ([1]), qui donnait une interprétation précise de l'article 107, paragraphe 3, point d), du TFUE pour l'évaluation des aides d'État en faveur des œuvres cinématographiques et audiovisuelles, est venue à échéance le 31 décembre 2012. Toutefois, la Commission attire l'attention de l'Honorable Parlementaire sur la consultation publique lancée le 30 avril 2013 au sujet du projet de communication révisée (ci-après la «nouvelle communication sur le cinéma»). Ce texte peut être consulté en intégralité à l'adresse suivante: (http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-388_fr.htm). La nouvelle communication devrait être adoptée en juillet 2013.

Dans l'intervalle, la Commission se fonde directement sur l'article 107, point 3, paragraphe d), du TFUE pour évaluer les aides d'État aux œuvres cinématographiques et audiovisuelles, en tenant compte des critères énoncés dans la communication sur le cinéma, s'agissant en particulier de la légalité générale, du caractère culturel du projet, de la territorialisation et de l'intensité de l'aide. La Commission insiste sur le fait que les États membres sont tenus de l'informer au préalable des régimes d'aide qu'ils entendent mettre en place, quelle que soit la date à laquelle la nouvelle communication sur le cinéma sera adoptée. Après adoption de ce texte, ils devront confirmer que les mesures qu'ils ont instaurées sont conformes aux nouvelles règles ou les adapter en conséquence. Ils disposeront d'un délai d'un an pour ce faire.

En dépit des informations fournies par l'Honorable Parlementaire selon lesquelles les régimes d'aide français au niveau régional ont suspendu leurs versements dans l'attente de l'adoption de la nouvelle communication sur le cinéma par la Commission, celle-ci constate qu'elle continue de recevoir des notifications et d'approuver des régimes d'aides au cinéma, notamment en France.

Enfin, en ce qui concerne le financement des «œuvres difficiles», le projet de nouvelle communication sur le cinéma prévoit qu'une aide supérieure à 50 % du budget global de production pourrait être accordée.

([1]) Communication de la Commission au Conseil, au Parlement européen, au Comité économique et social et au Comité des régions concernant certains aspects juridiques liés aux œuvres cinématographiques et autres œuvres audiovisuelles. COM(2001)534 final du 26.9.2001, JO C 43 du 16.2.2002, p. 6; prorogée en 2004 (JO C 123 du 30.4.2004, p. 1), en 2007 (JO C 134 du 16.6.2007, p. 5) et en 2009 (JO C 31 du 7.2.2009, p. 1) jusqu'au 31 décembre 2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004572/13
to the Commission
François Alfonsi (Verts/ALE)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: EU policy and state aid for the French film industry

Film industry professionals and film producers throughout France are awaiting with concern the publication of the EU communication on state aid for the film industry, a sector that provides thousands of jobs.

The EU is looking to clarify Article 107 of the Treaty on European Union as it relates to the competitive environment created by state aid to the film industry.

The current funding arrangements for the French CNC (National Cinematography Centre) will have to change and revised arrangements are now under negotiation. In anticipation of this reform, some French regions have quite simply suspended all regional aid to the industry, leaving an entire sector in disarray. This could nullify years of efforts to develop the audiovisual sector in certain parts of the country. Progress is now urgently needed on the issue of state funding for the film industry.

Can the Commission now provide a date for the publication of the communication on state aid to the film industry? Which of its proposals can be revealed now, so that local authorities can adapt to the new situation and start providing funding again?

Finally, will the concept of 'difficult works', which was discussed in the negotiations, make it possible for creative and regional-language films to receive funding with no restrictions imposed at EU level?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(25 June 2013)

The Cinema communication ([1]) which contained a detailed interpretation of Article 107(3)(d) TFEU for assessing state aid to cinematographic and audiovisual works expired on 31 December 2012. However, the Commission draws the attention of the Honourable Member that it launched the public consultation on the revised draft Cinema communication (hereafter 'the new Cinema communication') on 30 April 2013. The text of the full draft can be consulted on the following link: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-388_en.htm. The Commission aims to adopt the new Communication in July 2013.

In the meantime, the Commission assesses state aid to cinematographic and audiovisual works directly on the basis of Article 107(3)(d) TFEU taking into account the assessment criteria set out in the Cinema communication, in particular the conditions on general legality, cultural project, territorial conditions and aid intensity. The Commission underlines that, regardless of the date of adoption of the new Cinema communication, Member States are obliged to inform the Commission of aid schemes in advance. Once the new Cinema communication is adopted, Member States will be asked to confirm either that their schemes are in line with the new rules or that they will adapt their schemes accordingly within a year.

The Commission notes that, despite the information from the Honourable Member that French regional film support schemes have suspended making payments while waiting for the new Cinema communication to be adopted by the Commission, it continues to receive and approve notifications of film support schemes, including from France.

Finally, as regards the funding of 'difficult works', under the published draft of the new Cinema communication aid could be awarded of more than 50% of their overall production budget.

([1]) Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on certain legal aspects relating to cinematographic and other audiovisual works. COM(2001)534 final of 26.9.2001,OJ C 43/6 of 16.2.2002; prolonged in 2004 (OJ C 123/1 of 30.4.2004), 2007 (OJ C 134/5 of 16.6.2007) and 2009 (OJ C 31/1 of 7.2.2009) until 31 December 2012.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004573/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(24 Απριλίου 2013)

Θέμα: Προστασία της πολιτιστικής κληρονομιάς της Ευρώπης — αρχιτεκτονική κληρονομιά

Δεδομένου ότι στο άρθρο 3 παράγραφος 3 της Συνθήκης της Λισαβόνας για την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση τα κράτη μέλη δεσμεύονται για την προστασία της πολιτιστικής κληρονομιάς της Ευρώπης, και δεδομένου ότι η αρχιτεκτονική κληρονομιά αποτελεί σπουδαίο τμήμα της πολιτιστικής κληρονομιάς και δεν περιορίζεται στα κτήρια-μνημεία που ανήκουν στα κράτη μέλη αλλά περιλαμβάνει και όσα ανήκουν σε ιδιώτες-πολίτες των κρατών μελών,

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Ποια συγκεκριμένα μέτρα έχουν ληφθεί μέχρι τώρα από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και τα κράτη μέλη για την προστασία των κτηρίων-μνημείων της αρχιτεκτονικής κληρονομιάς που ανήκουν στους ιδιώτες-πολίτες τους;

2. Ειδικότερα, και σύμφωνα με την Σύμβαση για την Προστασία της Ευρωπαϊκής Αρχιτεκτονικής Κληρονομιάς του Συμβουλίου της Ευρώπης, ή αλλιώς Σύμβαση της Γρανάδας, ποιο ειδικό φορολογικό καθεστώς (ετήσιοι τακτικοί και έκτακτοι φόροι κατοχής ακίνητης περιουσίας, φόροι αγοραπωλησίας, φόροι κληρονομιάς κ.λπ.) προβλέπεται και εφαρμόζεται για τα διατηρητέα κτήρια και μνημεία που ανήκουν σε ιδιώτες των κρατών μελών της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης;

3. Ομοίως, ποιου είδους οικονομικές ενισχύσεις-επιχορηγήσεις των ιδιοκτητών για τις εργασίες επισκευής, συντήρησης, αποκατάστασης κ.λπ. των διατηρητέων κτηρίων και μνημείων ιδιοκτησίας τους προβλέπονται και εφαρμόζονται (είτε από το κράτος μέλος είτε από οργανισμούς τοπικής αυτοδιοίκησης, όπως Δήμους κ.λπ.);

4. Ποια άλλα κίνητρα και ευνοϊκά μέτρα, από αυτά που αναφέρονται στην Σύμβαση της Γρανάδας, προβλέπονται και εφαρμόζονται υπέρ των διατηρητέων κτηρίων και μνημείων που ανήκουν σε ιδιώτες;

5. Και, τέλος, ποια μέτρα προτίθεται να λάβει για τα κράτη μέλη που δεν ανταποκρίνονται στις δεσμεύσεις τους απέναντι στους ιδιώτες-πολίτες των κρατών μελών αυτών, οι οποίοι προφανώς αδικούνται σε σχέση με του ιδιώτες-πολίτες των λοιπών κρατών μελών;

Απάντηση της κ. Βασιλείου εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(20 Ιουνίου 2013)

Υπάρχει ευρύ φάσμα υποστήριξης διαθέσιμο στα προγράμματα της ΕΕ για την πολιτιστική κληρονομιά. Η Επιτροπή υποστηρίζει π.χ. τις δραστηριότητες πολιτιστικής συνεργασίας σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο στο πλαίσιο του προγράμματος «Πολιτισμός» και, κατά τα τελευταία έξι έτη, έχει επενδύσει 32 εκατ. ευρώ του συνολικού του προϋπολογισμού σε πολιτιστικά έργα με επίκεντρο την κληρονομιά. Η Επιτροπή δραστηριοποιείται επίσης μέσω δράσεων ευαισθητοποίησης, όπως οι ευρωπαϊκές ημέρες πολιτιστικής κληρονομιάς, το ευρωπαϊκό βραβείο πολιτιστικής κληρονομιάς, τα βραβεία «Europa Nostra» και η πρωτοβουλία του σήματος ευρωπαϊκής πολιτιστικής κληρονομιάς.

Ωστόσο, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση δεν έχει καμία αρμοδιότητα στο πεδίο καταχώρισης προστατευόμενης πολιτιστικής κληρονομιάς, ούτε στην έκδοση διατάγματος για ειδικά προστατευτικά μέτρα. Η κατάρτιση, η συντήρηση, η προστασία, η διατήρηση και η αναπαλαίωση της πολιτιστικής κληρονομιάς είναι πρωτίστως ευθύνη των κρατών μελών, όπως και τα συναφή πολιτικά μέτρα, όπως φορολογικές ελαφρύνσεις, επιχορηγήσεις, επιδοτήσεις ή κυρώσεις.

Επιπλέον, θα ήθελα να ενημερώσω τον κ. βουλευτή ότι η ΕΕ δεν είναι συμβαλλόμενο μέρος στη σύμβαση πλαίσιο του Συμβουλίου της Ευρώπης για την προστασία της αρχιτεκτονικής κληρονομιάς της Ευρώπης (η λεγόμενη σύμβαση της Granada του 1985).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004573/13
to the Commission
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: Protection of Europe's cultural and architectural heritage

Under Article 3(3) of the Lisbon Treaty on European Union, the Member States undertake to protect Europe's cultural heritage, which is to a large extent made up by their own architectural heritage consisting of not only state-owned but also privately-owned listed buildings.

In view of this:

1. What specific measures have been taken to date by the European Union and Member States to protect privately-owned listed buildings making up their architectural heritage?

2. Under the Council of Europe Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe signed in Granada, what particular tax concessions (regarding annual and special occupancy tax, sales tax, inheritance tax, etc.) are being envisaged or implemented in respect of privately-owned listed buildings and scheduled monuments in the EU Member States?

3. What grants or subsidies are being envisaged or accorded to the owners of listed buildings and scheduled monuments for the purposes of repair, conservation, restoration, etc. (either by the Member State or by the local or municipal authorities)?

4. What other incentives and similar measures referred to in the Granada Convention are being envisaged and implemented in respect of privately-owned listed buildings and scheduled monuments?

5. Finally, what penalties will it impose on Member States failing to meet their obligations towards the private owners of such properties, who clearly receive less favourable treatment than their counterparts in other Member States as a result?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2013)

There is a wide array of support available in the EU programmes for cultural heritage. For example, the Commission supports cultural cooperation activities at European level within the framework of its Culture Programme. It has invested, over the last six years, 32 million EUR out of its total budget in cultural projects focusing on heritage. The Commission is also active through awareness-raising actions, like the European Heritage Days, the EU Prize for Cultural Heritage, the 'Europa Nostra' awards or the European Heritage Label initiative.

However, the European Union does not have any competence in the field of listing cultural heritage to be protected nor to edict specific measures for its protection. The listing, upkeep, protection, conservation and renovation of cultural heritage are primarily national responsibilities as are related policy measures, such as tax concessions, grants, subsidies or penalties.

Moreover, I would like to inform the Honourable Member that the EU is not party to the Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe (1985, the so-called Granada Convention).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004575/13
to the Commission
Claude Moraes (S&D)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: Burma/Myanmar sanctions/Rohingya Muslim persecution

On Monday, the EU lifted its trade sanctions against Burma on the premise that human rights, democracy, and the rule of law had improved sufficiently in the country. However, more reports have emerged showing that state sanctioned violence and oppression of minorities in Burma are rife, with a video uncovered by the BBC which shows a mob attacking Muslims in the town of Meikhtila, while police stood and watched without intervening. This occurred in the same region where just last month 40 people were killed and 12 000 displaced as a result of civil unrest directed at Rohingya Muslims.

Human Rights Watch has accused the Burmese Government of 'a campaign of ethnic cleansing against the Rohingya that continues today through the denial of aid and restrictions on movement'. A report by Human Rights Watch released this week details how government authorities destroyed mosques, conducted violent mass arrests and blocked aid to displaced Muslims following similar sectarian violence last year.

Considering these facts;

1. How will the Commission measure the effectiveness of lifting sanctions, and what does it consider to be a successful outcome?

2. If this violence continues or similar violence occurs, will the Commission consider reintroducing targeted sanctions as an indicator that the EU does not support the actions or inaction of the Burmese Government?

Could the Commission outline the specific criteria it will evaluate in making a future decision on whether or not the EU should reintroduce targeted sanctions? Under what circumstances would the Commission begin this evaluation?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2013)

The EU decided to lift sanctions against Myanmar/Burma, except the arms embargo and the embargo on equipment for internal repression which remain fully in force. While recognising remaining significant challenges, including the need for the Government to address the status and welfare of the Rohingyas, this decision was taken in response to the positive changes that have taken place and in the expectation that they will continue.

In that respect, the EU will continue to monitor the situation and progress towards democratisation, peace, national reconciliation and protection of human rights. The EU is also following the developments with regard to minorities in Myanmar/Burma closely. So far no decision has been taken in the EU to introduce sanctions in relation to these developments.

Sanctions are an instrument of the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy. A decision to impose sanctions can be taken by the Council on the basis of Article 29 of the Treaty on European Union (TEU), requiring unanimity among Member States, within the framework of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP). The EU's sanctions must be consistent with the Union's external action objectives, as set out in Article 21 of the TEU.

(Slovenska različica)

Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-004576/13
za Komisijo
Jelko Kacin (ALDE) in Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(24. april 2013)

Zadeva: Zaščita žensk in otrok pred tem, da postanejo žrtve trgovine z ljudmi v Moldaviji

Mednarodna organizacija za pravice žensk La Strada International je v svojem nedavnem poročilu opozorila na dejstvo, da moldavski predpisi o trgovini z ljudmi, otroškem delu in prisilnem delu „ne izpolnjujejo mednarodnih meril in so daleč pod zahtevami EU in ZDA". V poročilu je še navedena „neuspešnost in neučinkovitost organov kazenskega pregona", ki pogosto delujejo v skrivnem dogovoru z mrežami, ki se ukvarjajo s trgovino z ljudmi.

Ali Komisija lahko pojasni, katere ukrepe pripravlja za to, da bi zaustavila trgovino z ljudmi v Moldaviji in bi bile kazni, ki jih naložijo moldavski sodni organi, v skladu s standardi EU?

Odgovor Cecilie Malmström v imenu Komisije
(2. julij 2013)

EU se s svojo politiko boja proti trgovini z ljudmi celostno spoprijema s preprečevanjem te trgovine, zaščito pred njo in pregonom njenih storilcev ter pri tem razvija partnerstva z raznimi udeleženimi akterji, vključno s partnerji v okviru evropske sosedske politike (ESP), med katerimi je tudi Moldavija. V skupnem akcijskem načrtu ESP EU – Moldavija so določeni strateški cilji, med katerimi sta tudi boj proti organiziranemu kriminalu in spopadanje s trgovino z ljudmi.

Glede na najnovejši skupni delovni dokument Izvajanje ESP v Moldaviji (20. marec 2013) je Moldavija dosegla napredek; marca je bil sprejet zakon o organiziranem kriminalu, strategija za obdobje 2011–2016 in akcijski načrt zanjo pa sta v veliki meri skladna z evropskimi in mednarodnimi standardi. Center za boj proti trgovini z ljudmi je popolnoma zaživel. Posodobljen akcijski načrt za obdobje 2012–2013 za boj proti trgovini z ljudmi je bil odobren julija 2012. Kar se tiče pravosodnega sodelovanja, je zakonodajni okvir na področju medsebojne pravne pomoči v veliki meri pripravljen.

EU je februarja 2013 začela izvajati nov projekt, ki bo okrepil boj proti organiziranemu kriminalu in trgovini z ljudmi v Moldaviji. Ta inovativni pilotni projekt bo s pomočjo izmenjave podatkov, usposabljanja za organe pregona, pa tudi s spodbujanjem regionalnega sodelovanja izboljšal zmožnost spoprijemanja s trgovino z ljudmi ([1]).

EU sodeluje z drugimi mednarodnimi institucijami v kampanjah za večjo ozaveščenost, zlasti na področju novačenja za trgovino z ljudmi v Moldaviji.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/entity.action?path=EU+Policy%2FNew_EU_initiative

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004576/13
to the Commission
Jelko Kacin (ALDE) and Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: Protection of women and children against human trafficking in Moldova

A recent report by 'La Strada International', an international female human rights organisation, highlights the fact that Moldovan legislation on human trafficking, child labour and forced labour 'does not meet international criteria and is far from the EU and the US requirements'. It reports a 'failure and inefficiency of law enforcement authorities' which, it claims, often collude with the human trafficking networks.

Would the Commission clarify what actions are being taken to put a stop to human trafficking in Moldova and to bring Moldovan laws and the penalties imposed by the Moldovan judiciary into line with EU standards?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(2 July 2013)

The EU anti-trafficking policy takes a comprehensive approach focusing on prevention, protection, prosecution, and the developing partnerships with the various actors involved, including partners within the European Neighborhood Policy (ENP), where Moldova is a partner country. A joint EU-Moldova ENP Action Plan lays out the strategic objectives including fight against organised crime and addressing trafficking in human beings.

According to the last Joint Staff Working Document: Implementation of the ENP in Moldova (20 March 2013), Moldova has made progress; the Law on organised crime was adopted in March, the strategy and the accompanying Action Plan for 2011-2016, largely in line with the European and international standards. The Centre for Fighting Trafficking in Human Beings became fully operational. An updated action plan for 2012-2013 on combating trafficking in human beings was approved in July 2012. As regards judicial cooperation, the legislative framework in the area of mutual legal assistance is largely in place.

A new project that will boost the fight against organised crime and human trafficking in Moldova has been launched in February 2013 by the EU. This innovative pilot project will improve capacities for addressing trafficking in human beings, sharing data and providing training for law enforcement agencies, as well as promoting regional cooperation ([1]).

The EU together with other international institutions are working together in projects on awareness raising campaigns focusing on recruitment to trafficking in human beings in Moldova.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/entity.action?path=EU+Policy%2FNew_EU_initiative.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004577/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(24 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Pagamenti dell'Autorità palestinese ai militanti incarcerati

Nel mese di aprile 2013, il quotidiano Makor Rishon ha riferito che l'Autorità palestinese (AP) paga stipendi mensili ai militanti che scontano pene detentive nelle carceri israeliane. Il dipartimento della ricerca del ministero degli esteri israeliano ha scoperto che almeno il 4 % del bilancio dell'AP (17,5 milioni di shekel) va ogni mese ai terroristi incarcerati. Sebbene l'ex Primo ministro Salam Fayyad abbia condannato il terrorismo, due anni fa ha ordinato di triplicare gli stipendi per i militanti incarcerati.

Anche il Parlamento norvegese ha sollevato la questione, essendo codesto paese uno dei principali donatori a beneficio dell'AP. All'inizio di aprile, il ministro degli esteri della Norvegia, Espen Barth Eide, ha incontrato le autorità AP per esprimere la sua preoccupazione per quanto stava accadendo. Ha dichiarato: «Ho discusso la questione con il Presidente Abbas e il Primo Ministro Fayyad a Ramallah, il 4 aprile di quest'anno [2013], e ho di nuovo messo in chiaro che a parere della Norvegia taluni aspetti di questo programma sono problematici. Mi hanno informato che il programma esiste da molto tempo ed è finanziato da risorse proprie palestinesi». Il presidente Abbas ha confermato che il sostegno finanziario ai militanti incarcerati si applicherà anche in futuro, ma ha sottolineato che il denaro dei donatori non è stato utilizzato per questo scopo.

1. La Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante è a conoscenza del fatto che l'Autorità palestinese paga gli stipendi ai militanti incarcerati e che ciò potrebbe incoraggiare altri a commettere atti terroristici?

2. La Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante ha chiesto all'AP di fornire la prova del suo uso dei finanziamenti dei donatori e, in caso contrario, lo farà?

3. Quali passi è disposta ad effettuare la Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante per garantire che i finanziamenti dell'UE non siano utilizzati per promuovere e incoraggiare il terrorismo?

Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(7 giugno 2013)

La Commissione è a conoscenza del fatto che l'Autorità palestinese dispone da diversi anni di un sistema di pagamento di indennità ai carcerati e alle loro famiglie, che viene periodicamente adeguato. Questo programma non è sostenuto dall'Unione europea.

Nell'ambito del pacchetto di assistenza bilaterale l'Unione europea offre sostegno finanziario diretto alla spesa corrente dell'Autorità palestinese, principalmente per pagare gli stipendi dei funzionari pubblici e gli assegni familiari destinati ai nuclei più vulnerabili. Un meccanismo esteso e rigoroso di controllo e verifica permette all'Unione di accertare la destinazione precisa di ogni singolo euro impegnato attraverso il meccanismo PEGASE ([1]), che comprende, in particolare, la ricerca del nominativo dei potenziali beneficiari di ciascun pagamento in una banca dati accreditata di sospetti terroristi: se un nome figura nella banca dati, viene rimosso dall'elenco dei beneficiari.

Questo controllo viene espletato per ogni richiesta di pagamento; una volta completata la procedura, ogni pagamento del meccanismo PEGASE è sottoposto all'approvazione della Commissione.

Si rimanda inoltre l'onorevole deputato alle risposte alle precedenti interrogazioni scritte E-002309/2013 e E-011444/2012 ([2]).

([1]) Acronimo francese per meccanismo «palestino-europeo di gestione e di aiuto socio-economico».
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/it/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004577/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Palestinian Authority payments to jailed militants

In April 2013, the newspaper *Makor Rishon* reported that the Palestinian Authority (PA) pays monthly salaries to militants serving sentences in Israeli jails. The research department of Israel's Foreign Ministry discovered that at least 4% of the PA's budget (17.5 million shekels) goes to jailed terrorists each month. Although former Prime Minister Salam Fayyad has condemned terrorism, two years ago he ordered salaries for imprisoned militants to be tripled.

The Norwegian Parliament has also raised the issue, since the country is one of the PA's chief donors. At the beginning of April, Norway's Foreign Minister, Espen Barth Eide, met with PA authorities to express his concern over what was happening. He has stated: 'I discussed this issue with President Abbas and Prime Minister Fayyad in Ramallah on 4 April of this year [2013], when I again made it clear that Norway views aspects of this programme as problematic. They informed [me] that the programme has existed for a long time and is funded by the Palestinians' own resources.' President Abbas confirmed that financial support for jailed prisoners will also apply in the future, but emphasised that donor money has not been used for this purpose.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the Palestinian Authority paying salaries to jailed militants, which could encourage others to commit terrorist acts?

2. Has the Vice-President/High Representative requested that the PA provide evidence of its use of donor funding and, if not, will she?

3. What steps is the Vice-President/High Representative prepared to take to ensure that EU funding is not used to promote and encourage terrorism?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(7 June 2013)

The Commission is aware that the Palestinian Authority (PA) has a system of allowances provided to prisoners and their families, which has been in place for a number of years and which is adjusted from time to time. This programme is not supported by the EU.

As part of its bilateral assistance package the EU provides direct financial support to the recurrent expenditure of the PA, mainly for salaries of civil servants and social allocations for vulnerable families. A strict and extensive mechanism of audit and verification is in place which allows the EU to verify the precise destination of every single euro committed through the PEGASE ([1]) Mechanism, including notably a check on each individual potential beneficiary for each payment on a recognised database of terror suspects. In the event that any such names appear, they are removed from the list of beneficiaries.

This exercise is carried out with every payment request. All disbursements from the PEGASE Mechanism have to be approved by Commission Headquarters following completion of this procedure.

The Honourable Member may also wish to refer to the answers to previous written questions E-002309/2013 and E-011444/2012 ([2]).

([1]) French acronym for 'Mécanisme Palestino-Européen de Gestion de l'Aide Socio-économique'.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq#sidesForm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004578/13
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(24 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: La Commissione vigili attivamente sulle banche tedesche

Deutsche Bank è attualmente investita da uno scandalo di proporzioni immense: due suoi ex dipendenti hanno rivelato che la filiale Usa avrebbe nascosto dodici miliardi di perdite in derivati durante gli ultimi anni. Inoltre la Commerz, banca privata tedesca ma con un capitale per un quarto pubblico, ha ottenuto 35 miliardi di sovvenzioni statali, cifra pari al doppio di quanto richiesto dal default cipriota e pari a 5 volte la sua capitalizzazione in Borsa. Più in generale, la Germania ha creato un Fondo (Soffin) per aiutare le banche in stato fallimentare, con un capitale di 480 miliardi di euro.

Gran parte delle banche tedesche godono di un rating AAA grazie al fatto di essere di proprietà pubblica, creando di fatto una distorsione nella percezione dei mercati.

La Commissione ha analizzato il rischio sistemico delle banche tedesche?

La Commissione non ritiene che il sistema bancario tedesco violi i principi del libero mercato, godendo del sostegno pubblico e di un rating falsato dalla loro natura pubblicistica?

Risposta di Olli Rehn a nome della Commissione
(26 giugno 2013)

La Commissione monitora regolarmente i settori bancari degli Stati membri. La vigilanza individuale e sistemica delle banche rientra tuttavia nelle competenze delle autorità nazionali, assistite dall'Autorità bancaria europea e dal Comitato europeo per il rischio sistemico.

L'esistenza di banche di proprietà pubblica negli Stati membri è conforme all'articolo 345 del TFUE e, pertanto, non viola le norme in materia di concorrenza. Inoltre, l'assistenza finanziaria pubblica alle banche continua ad essere valutata e, all'occorrenza, autorizzata dalla Commissione in conformità delle norme del trattato relative agli aiuti di Stato.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004578/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: The Commission should actively supervise German banks

Deutsche Bank has recently been hit by a scandal of immense proportions — two of its former employees have revealed that its US branch has apparently hidden USD 12 billion in derivatives losses over the past few years. In addition, the Commerz, a German private bank a quarter of which is state-owned, has received 35 billion in state subsidies — double the amount required by the Cypriot default and five times its stock market capitalisation. More generally, Germany has set up a fund (Soffin) to help failed banks, with a capital of EUR 480 billion.

Most German banks enjoy an AAA credit rating due to the fact that they are publicly owned, thereby creating a distortion in market perception.

Has the Commission analysed the systemic risk of German banks?

Does the Commission not agree that the German banking system is infringing the principle of the free market, by enjoying public support and a credit rating that is distorted by the public ownership of the banks?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(26 June 2013)

The Commission routinely monitors the banking sectors of Member States. The supervision of banks, however, both on an individual and systemic level is the purview of the national authorities, with the assistance of the European Banking Authority and the European Systemic Risk Board.

The existence of publicly-owned banks in Member States is in accordance with Article 345 TFEU and, as such, does not infringe competition rules. Furthermore, public financial assistance to banks continues to be assessed and, where appropriate, authorised by the Commission, in accordance with the Treaty's rules on state aid.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004579/13
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(24 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: La Commissione renda illegale il bisfenolo A nelle confezioni per gli alimenti

L'Agenzia nazionale francese di sicurezza sanitaria e alimentare, dell'ambiente e del lavoro (Anses) ha presentato, martedì 9 aprile, uno studio allarmante sul bisfenolo A, sostanza capace di interferire sul sistema ormonale umano, presente in un gran numero di oggetti di uso comune quali plastica, scatole per conserve, lattine, amalgami dentari. Il maggior uso di questa sostanza si riferisce in effetti al confezionamento di alimenti, soprattutto le bottiglie d'acqua.

L'esposizione a tale sostanza agisce principalmente sui feti, che svilupperebbero un rischio di cancro elevato, e sulle donne, con conseguenze sull'apparato riproduttivo.

La Commissione è a conoscenza di tali studi?

La Commissione ritiene opportuno rendere illegale l'impiego dei composti che includono il bisfenolo A utilizzati a scopo di conservazione alimentare?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(3 giugno 2013)

La Commissione europea è a conoscenza della relazione sulla valutazione dei rischi del bisfenolo A presentata dall'Agenzia francese di sicurezza sanitaria e alimentare, dell'ambiente e del lavoro (ANSES) il 9 aprile scorso. L'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare (EFSA) sta attualmente valutando i rischi del bisfenolo A tenendo conto dei più recenti dati scientifici relativi a tale sostanza. L'EFSA presenterà il suo progetto di parere nel luglio 2013, avviando una consultazione pubblica.

La Commissione resta in attesa del parere dell'EFSA prima di prendere una decisione in merito all'eventuale revisione dello status del bisfenolo A come materiale a contatto con gli alimenti.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004579/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: The Commission should make bisphenol A in food packaging illegal

On Tuesday 9 April, the French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health and Safety (ANSES) presented an alarming study on bisphenol A, a substance that is capable of disrupting human hormone systems and that is present in a large number of commonly used items, such as plastic, cans, tins and dental amalgams. However, this substance is mostly used in food packaging, especially water bottles.

Exposure to this substance acts primarily on foetuses, which apparently develop a high risk of cancer, and in women, affecting their reproductive systems.

Is the Commission aware of these studies?

Does the Commission not think it might be appropriate to make the use of compounds containing bisphenol A illegal for the purpose of food preservation?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(3 June 2013)

The European Commission is aware of the risk assessment report on Bisphenol A issued on 9 April by the French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health and Safety (ANSES). The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) is currently assessing the risk from Bisphenol A taking account of the most recent scientific data on Bisphenol A. EFSA will launch in July 2013 its draft opinion for public consultation.

The Commission awaits the EFSA opinion before taking a decision on a possible revision of the status of Bisphenol A as food contact material.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004581/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(24 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Crisi dell'industria conciaria

La crisi in questo settore, già denunciata nel 2011, non accenna a diminuire. Sul piano internazionale si verifica un crescente protezionismo al quale si aggiunge la fuoriuscita del grezzo continentale (47 % del totale), quasi sempre comprato con sostegno pubblico dai competitori stranieri. L'industria europea utilizza ora prevalentemente la materia prima grezza continentale. Di conseguenza l'approvvigionamento sta diventando difficile, tanto che il settore italiano, ad esempio, sta rifiutando ordini per mancanza di rifornimento. Diminuendo la disponibilità, salgono i prezzi, con gravi difficoltà per le imprese che, tra l'altro, si vedono ridurre il credito a causa della crisi bancaria. Nella risposta ad una mia precedente interrogazione (E-008644/2011) la Commissione lasciava intravedere nuove possibilità per superare la crisi. Ma fino ad ora nulla si è mosso, anzi, la situazione di tale settore si è aggravata.

Può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se ha elementi nuovi da comunicare sul trend di questa crisi settoriale;

2. se il miglioramento della competitività, annunciato nel novembre del 2011 attraverso l'accesso più agevole a materie prime meno costose a seguito della negoziazione di accordi di libero scambio, ha dato i frutti sperati;

3. se sono stati fatti passi avanti in ordine alla questione della reciprocità;

4. in caso affermativo, con quali Paesi;

5. quali iniziative intende intraprendere per bloccare il declino?

Risposta di Karel De Gucht a nome della Commissione
(28 giugno 2013)

La Commissione è consapevole della problematica che si trova ad affrontare l'industria della concia nell'UE in relazione alla disponibilità di materie prime. La questione della disponibilità di materie prime occupa un posto importante nell'agenda della Commissione sin dall'adozione, nel 2008, della iniziativa «Materie prime» ([1]). Nel corso di diversi negoziati commerciali la Commissione ha ottenuto risultati importanti, ragion per cui le concerie dell'UE possono aver accesso a materie prime a prezzi abbordabili: i negoziati già conclusi in merito a un accordo di libero scambio globale approfondito con l'Ucraina prevedono l'eliminazione dei dazi all'esportazione dei pellami grezzi. Quando la Russia ha aderito all'OMC ([2]), la Commissione ha negoziato l'impegno assunto dalla Russia a ridurre significativamente e vincolare il tasso dei dazi all'esportazione dei pellami grezzi.

La Commissione segue costantemente i nuovi sviluppi che interessano le restrizioni all'esportazione e adotta misure nei confronti dei paesi terzi. Quando il dialogo non dà esiti la Commissione è pronta ad avvalersi delle procedure di composizione delle controversie dell'OMC come nel primo caso riguardante le restrizioni alle esportazioni imposte dalla Cina su un certo numero di materie prime, controversia che si è conclusa positivamente all'inizio del 2012.

Nel corso del 2013 la Commissione pubblicherà i risultati di uno studio che valuta la necessità e la fattibilità dell'etichettatura delle pelli a livello unionale ([3]). Nello studio è stata analizzata un'ampia gamma di possibilità di armonizzazione dell'etichettatura: paese d'origine, etichettatura sociale, etichettatura ambientale, etichettatura delle specie animali e dell'autenticità della pelle. Dalla rassegna dei potenziali impatti evocati emerge l'opportunità di intervenire nel campo dell'autenticità. La Commissione ha pertanto avviato il processo di valutazione d'impatto per determinare la fattibilità in un sistema di etichettatura dell'autenticità delle pelli a livello di UE al fine di supportare la competitività dell'industria dei pellami europea e le sue catene di valore nonché di migliorare la protezione dei consumatori.

([1]) COM(2008)699 def.
([2]) Organizzazione mondiale del commercio.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/newsroom/cf/itemdetail.cfm?item_id=6394&lang=en.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004581/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: Crisis in the leather industry

The crisis in the leather industry, which was brought to the Commission's attention in 2011, shows no signs of easing. Internationally protectionism is growing, added to which there is an exodus of raw materials (47% of the total amount) out of Europe, in nearly all cases purchased by foreign competitors backed by public funds. The EU leather industry mainly uses European rawhide. Consequently, finding supplies of raw materials is becoming difficult, to the point that in Italy, for instance, the industry is turning away orders for lack of supplies. And as availability decreases, prices increase, causing serious difficulties for companies which, amongst other things, are having their credit cut owing to the banking crisis. In its answer to a previous question of mine (E-008644/2011) the Commission indicated possible new ways of overcoming the crisis. But there has been no sign of action so far and the situation in the sector has instead grown even worse.

1. Does the Commission have any new information on how the crisis in this sector is likely to develop?

2. In November 2011 the Commission said that negotiations on free trade agreements would provide better access to less expensive raw materials, which would improve competitiveness. Has this borne fruit as hoped?

3. Has any progress been made on the question of reciprocity?

4. If so, with which countries?

5. What action will the Commission take to halt the decline?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(28 June 2013)

The Commission is aware of the problem of availability of raw materials faced by the EU tanning industry. The issue of availability of raw materials has been high on the Commission's agenda since the adoption in 2008 of the 'Raw Material Initiative' ([1]). Through different trade negotiations, the Commission has achieved important outcomes so that EU tanneries can access affordable raw materials: The concluded negotiations on a Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement with Ukraine provides for the elimination of export duties on raw hides and skins. When Russia joined the WTO ([2]), the Commission negotiated Russia's commitment to significantly reduce and bind its export duty rates on raw hides and skins.

The Commission is constantly monitoring new developments on export restrictions and taking action vis-à-vis third countries. When dialogue fails, the Commission is ready to use WTO dispute settlement procedures, as in the first case against China's export restrictions on a number of raw materials that was successfully concluded early 2012.

During 2013, the Commission published the results of a study to assess the need and feasibility of leather labelling at EU level ([3]). The study analysed a wide spectrum of labelling harmonisation possibilities: country of origin, social labelling, environmental labelling, animal species and leather authenticity labelling. The overview of potential impacts considered suggested action in the area of authenticity. Therefore, the Commission launched the impact assessment process to assess the feasibility of a leather authenticity labelling system at EU level in view of supporting the European leather industry's competitiveness and value chains as well as to improve the protection of consumers.

([1]) COM(2008) 699 final.
([2]) World Trade Organisation.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/newsroom/cf/itemdetail.cfm?item_id=6394&lang=en.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004582/13
alla Commissione
Giancarlo Scottà (EFD)
(24 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Commercializzazione illegale del liquore Sambuca

L'allegato II del regolamento (CE) n. 110/2008 relativo alla commercializzazione e alla protezione delle indicazioni geografiche delle bevande spiritose prevede una serie di requisiti specifici per l'immissione in commercio nel mercato europeo del liquore aromatizzato all'anice denominato «Sambuca».

In particolare, la normativa dispone che le bevande alcoliche denominate «Sambuca» siano incolori, possiedano un tenore naturale di anetolo non inferiore a 1 g/l e non superiore a 2 g/l e abbiano, infine, un volume alcolometrico minimo del 38 %.

Indagini nei mercati di alcuni Stati membri dell'Unione europea rivelano l'immissione in commercio di prodotti che, pur riportando la denominazione «Sambuca», non sono in realtà conformi a uno o più dei requisiti previsti dalla normativa di settore.

È evidente che pratiche di questo tipo sono da condannare in quanto contrarie ai principi di leale concorrenza e trasparenza negli scambi commerciali.

Con riferimento a quanto appena esposto, si chiede pertanto alla Commissione:

1. se è a conoscenza di pratiche commerciali messe in atto da alcuni operatori del settore in aperta violazione delle disposizioni del regolamento (CE) n. 110/2008;

2. quali iniziative intende adottare a livello europeo affinché gli Stati membri applichino misure e provvedimenti sanzionatori in grado di arginare queste pratiche abusive.

Risposta di Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(12 giugno 2013)

1. La Commissione è venuta a conoscenza da pochissimo tempo delle pratiche commerciali riferite dall'on. parlamentare.

2. La Commissione esaminerà la questione e adotterà i necessari provvedimenti, anche prendendo contatti con gli Stati membri interessati, al fine di garantire il pieno rispetto delle vigenti norme dell'UE cui fa riferimento l'on. parlamentare.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004582/13
to the Commission
Giancarlo Scottà (EFD)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: Illegal marketing of sambuca liqueur

Annex II to Regulation (EC) No 110/2008 on the marketing and protection of the geographical indications of spirit drinks lays down a series of specific requirements for placing the aniseed-flavoured liqueur known as 'sambuca' on the EU market for sale.

The regulation provides in particular that the alcoholic beverage known as 'sambuca' must be colourless, have a natural anethole content of not less than 1 gram and not more than 2 grams per litre and, lastly, have a minimum alcoholic strength of 38%.

Investigations on the markets of some EU Member States have found products being sold there which although labelled as 'sambuca', do not in reality conform to one or more of the requirements laid down in the legislation.

Clearly, practices of this kind are to be condemned as they are contrary to the principles of fair competition and transparency in trade relations.

1. Is the Commission aware of the trade practices employed by some operators in the sector, in direct breach of Regulation (EC) No 110/2008?

2. What action will the Commission take at EU level to ensure Member States apply measures and sanctions that are able to curb these abusive practices?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2013)

1. The Commission has very recently become aware of the trade practices alluded to by the Honourable Member.

2. The Commission will examine the issue and will take the necessary action, including contacting the Member States concerned, with a view to ensuring the EU rules in force as referred to by the Honourable Member are fully respected.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-004585/13
Komisijai
Juozas Imbrasas (EFD)
(2013 m. balandžio 24 d.)

Tema: Žemės pardavimas užsieniečiams

Lietuvoje žemės pardavimo užsieniečiams draudimas baigs galioti 2014 m. Tačiau mano šalies ūkininkai taip pat gauna mažesnes nei ES vidurkis tiesiogines išmokas, o tai sumažina jų galimybes įsigyti žemę tėvynėje. Lietuvos žemdirbiai baiminasi, jog, leidus žemę pirkti užsieniečiams, jiems bus dar sunkiau steigti ir plėsti savo ūkius. Mūsų ūkininkai nesutinka jau kitais metais leisti užsieniečiams įsigyti žemes Lietuvoje. Dėl nesąžiningų tiesioginių išmokų skiriasi žemdirbių perkamoji galia ir galimybės įsigyti žemę. Todėl mūsų ūkininkai mano, kad draudimas užsieniečiams įsigyti žemę Lietuvoje turi būti pratęstas iki to laiko, kol tęsis pereinamieji tiesioginių išmokų suvienodinimo laikotarpiai.

Ar Komisija nemano, kad reikėtų atidėti žemės pardavimą užsieniečiams iki to laiko, kol tiesioginės išmokos pasieks ES vidurkį?

M. Barnier atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2013 m. birželio 7 d.)

Pagal Stojimo aktą Lietuvai buvo suteiktas septynerių metų pereinamasis laikotarpis, todėl iki 2011 m. gegužės 1 d. ES ir (arba) EEE piliečiams buvo galima taikyti žemės ūkio paskirties žemės ir miškų Lietuvoje įsigijimo apribojimus. Ši laikina nukrypti leidžianti nuostata nesusijusi su tiesioginių išmokų Lietuvos ūkininkams ar daugiametės finansinės programos raida. Stojimo akte taip pat buvo numatyta galimybė pratęsti pereinamąjį laikotarpį ne ilgiau kaip trejiems metams. Pereinamasis laikotarpis Lietuvai buvo pratęstas. Pagal susitarimą Lietuvos žemės ūkio paskirties žemės ir miškų rinka turėtų būti liberalizuota 2014 m. gegužės 1 d. Dar kartą pratęsti pereinamojo laikotarpio pagal Stojimo aktą ir Sutartį dėl Europos Sąjungos veikimo (SESV) negalima.

Taigi nuo nurodytos datos taikomos visos SESV nuostatos, o Lietuvos teisės aktai, susiję su žemės ūkio paskirties žemės ir miškų įsigijimu, turi būti suderinti su ES teise, visų pirma su laisvo kapitalo judėjimo ir atitinkamomis ES Teisingumo Teismo jurisprudencijos nuostatomis. Komisija neturi teisės dar kartą pratęsti pereinamojo laikotarpio.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004585/13
to the Commission
Juozas Imbrasas (EFD)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: Sale of land to foreign nationals

The ban on the sale of land to foreign nationals in Lithuania will cease to apply in 2014. However, the fact that their direct payments are below the EU average reduces the possibilities for Lithuania's farmers to acquire land in their home country. The worry is that foreign land purchases will make it even more difficult for Lithuanian farmers to set up in business and expand their farms: farmers have, indeed, been opposed for some years to the idea that foreigners should be allowed to acquire land in Lithuania. The unfair direct payments translate into differences in farmers' purchasing power and their opportunities to acquire land. That is why Lithuanian farmers believe that the ban on foreign land purchases in Lithuania should remain in force for the duration of the transitional period laid down for the purpose of aligning direct payments.

Does not the Commission take the view that no land should be sold to foreign nationals until direct payments have been brought up to the EU average?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(7 June 2013)

According to the Act of Accession, Lithuania was granted a transitional period of seven years, allowing it to maintain, until 1 May 2011, the existing restrictions on acquisition of agricultural land and forests in Lithuania by EU/EEA citizens. This temporary derogation is not linked to developments in direct payments to Lithuanian farmers or in the multiannual financial framework. The Act of Accession also foresaw a possibility to extend the transitional period for up to a maximum of three years. According to the extension granted to Lithuania, the agricultural land and forests market should be liberalised as of 1 May 2014. No further extension of the transitional period is possible under the Act of Accession and the Treaty on the Functioning of European Union (TFEU).

Thus, as from the above date, the TFEU fully applies and the Lithuanian legislation on the acquisition of agricultural and forest land has to comply with the EC law, in particular, with the provisions on free movement of capital and the relevant jurisprudence of the Court of Justice of the EU. The Commission has no competence to further prolong this extension.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004586/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(24 de abril de 2013)

Asunto: El Banco Santander calcula que los tres grandes bancos tendrán el 70 % del mercado tras la crisis — Competencia y abusos de posición dominante

El director general de banca comercial de Banco Santander, Enrique García Candelas, ha calculado que su entidad, el BBVA y Caixabank aglutinarán una cuota de negocio del 70 % tras la reestructuración del sector financiero español ([1]). Este cálculo, que es la primera vez que comenta en público, supone que las grandes entidades se quedarían con los tres bancos nacionalizados: Bankia, CatalunyaBanc y Novagalicia. Según ejecutivos del Santander, BBVA y Caixabank, ahora entre todos pueden tener un 38 % del mercado. Se supone que las entidades nacionalizadas tienen un 15 % de cuota, así que sumarían un 53 %. Es decir, aun faltan diecisiete puntos de cuota para llegar a ese 70 % que ha fijado Enrique García Candelas.

«Se va a producir de forma más rápida de lo que espera el mercado», ha afirmado el director general del Santander en su intervención en el XX Encuentro del Sector Financiero. Enrique García Candelas ha explicado que esto conllevará que el Banco Santander cuente con una cuota de oficinas de entre el 13 % y el 14 %, y que en el caso del BBVA será del 11 % y más para Caixabank. «Va a haber una concentración brutal en dos o tres años. Será una oportunidad clara para ganar más dinero. Cuando se normalicen las cuentas, con el ahorro de costes y las menores provisiones, vamos a ganar mucho más dinero», concluyó.

Esta opinión ha sido compartida por el director del grupo BBVA en España y Portugal, Jaime Sáenz de Tejada, y el director general de negocio de Caixabank, Juan Antonio Alcaraz, que han participado en las mismas jornadas. El directivo del Santander además ha vaticinado que el sector quedará configurado por unas siete u ocho entidades al final del proceso de ajuste.

¿No piensa la Comisión que las ayudas estatales concedidas a las entidades bancarias pueden falsear indebidamente la competencia?

¿Cree la Comisión que esta concentración y restricción del número de entidades bancarias restringe la competencia y se pueden crear abusos de posición dominante?

¿No cree la Comisión que esta concentración de las entidades en el sector bancario español puede ser perjudicial para los consumidores?

Respuesta del Sr. Almunia en nombre de la Comisión
(20 de junio de 2013)

La Comisión coincide con Su Señoría en que las ayudas estatales concedidas a las entidades bancarias pueden falsear indebidamente la competencia. En efecto, la finalidad del control de las ayudas estatales realizado por la UE es evaluar si la ayuda es necesaria y, de serlo, minimizar cualquier falseamiento de la competencia que de ella se derive. En lo que respecta a España, la concesión de ayuda a las entidades bancarias era necesaria para restablecer la confianza en el sector financiero y evitar una crisis financiera sistémica más profunda. Con vistas a limitar lo más posible el falseamiento de la competencia, la Comisión, en su calidad de responsable de la aplicación de las normas sobre ayudas estatales de la UE, impuso a las entidades a las que se concedió ayuda una serie de medidas correctoras. Dado el importe relativamente elevado de ayuda estatal recibida, las tres entidades bancarias nacionalizadas deben someterse a una radical reestructuración. Como resultado de esas medidas, al término de los procesos de reestructuración, dichas entidades tendrán un alcance y unas dimensiones más reducidas y ejercerán, por tanto, un menor efecto falseador sobre la competencia. Asimismo, se han impuesto a las entidades bancarias otras medidas, como la prohibición de la comercialización agresiva y de las adquisiciones.

Si bien la Comisión se mantiene atenta a la evolución del mercado, especular sobre las predicciones del Banco Santander no entra dentro de sus atribuciones. La concentración y restricción del número de entidades bancarias puede reducir la competencia y dar lugar a abusos de posición dominante, perjudicando a los consumidores. No obstante, se han establecido instrumentos eficaces de control de las prácticas restrictivas y las concentraciones, que corresponde aplicar a las autoridades nacionales de defensa de la competencia y a la Comisión, a fin de evitar que se produzcan tales situaciones.

([1]) http://economia.elpais.com/economia/2013/04/23/actualidad/1366738641_895058.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004586/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: Banco Santander predicts that Spain's three biggest banks will hold a market share of 70% after the crisis — competition and abuses of dominant position

The senior executive vice-president of commercial banking at Banco Santander, Enrique García Candelas, predicts that his bank, together with CaixaBank and BBVA, will hold a market share of 70% after the restructuring of the Spanish financial sector ([1]). This prediction, which is the first to be made public, is based on the assumption that Spain's three biggest banking institutions will be left with the three nationalised banks: Bankia, CatalunyaBanc and Novagalicia. According to top executives at Santander, CaixaBank and BBVA, their banks have a combined market share of 38%. The nationalised banks are thought to have 15% of the market, bringing the aggregate total to 53%, still 17 percentage points short of the 70% predicted by Mr García Candelas.

'This will happen faster than the market expects,' anticipated the senior executive of Banco Santander in his speech at the 20th Financial Sector Meeting. He explained that this would lead to Banco Santander holding between 13% and 14% of branches in Spain, with BBVA's share expected to rise to 11% and that of CaixaBank further still. 'The banking sector will become highly concentrated within the next two or three years. It will be a clear opportunity to make more money. When the accounts have been normalised, with cost savings and lower provisions, we will make a lot more money,' he concluded.

This view was shared by Jaime Sáenz de Tejada, director of the Spain and Portugal business unit of BBVA Group, and Juan Antonio Alcaraz, general director of business for CaixaBank, both of whom also spoke at the conference. The senior executive of Banco Santander also predicted that the sector would be shaped by some seven or eight banks at the end of the adjustment process.

Does the Commission not think that granting state aid to banks might unduly distort competition?

Does the Commission believe that this concentration and restriction on the number of banks might reduce competition and lead to abuses of dominant position?

Does the Commission not think that this concentration of the Spanish banking sector might be detrimental to consumers?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2013)

The Commission concurs with the statement that state aid to banks may unduly distort competition. It is indeed the role of EU State aid control to assess whether aid is necessary and if it is, to minimise any ensuing distortions of competition. In Spain's case, the aid to banks was necessary to restore confidence in the financial sector and avoid a deeper systemic financial crisis. In order to limit distortions of competition to the minimum, the Commission, in its function of implementing the EU State aid rules, imposed on the aided banks a set of remedying measures. Given the proportionally high amount of state aid received, the three nationalised banks must undergo very deep restructuring. As a result of those measures, at the end of the restructuring processes, those banks will be smaller in scope and size and hence exert a less distortive effect on competition. Other measures have been also imposed on the banks, such as bans on aggressive marketing and acquisition bans.

While the Commission monitors developments in the market, it is not in the Commission's competence to speculate on Banco Santander's predictions. Concentration and restriction of the number of banks may reduce competition and potentially lead to abuses of a dominant position, harming consumers. However, effective instruments of antitrust and merger control are in place, exercised by the national competition authorities as well as by the Commission, in order to prevent such situations.

([1]) http://economia.elpais.com/economia/2013/04/23/actualidad/1366738641_895058.html

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004587/13
a la Comisión
María Irigoyen Pérez (S&D)
(24 de abril de 2013)

Asunto: Fraude en la comercialización de productos financieros en España

Se estima en más de 700 000 el número de afectados en España por la adquisición de instrumentos híbridos de capital y deuda subordinada («participaciones preferentes») y en más de 30 000 los millones de euros de beneficios que las entidades bancarias españolas consiguieron con la comercialización de estos productos complejos de riesgo elevado y con una liquidez limitada.

La Comisión Nacional del Mercado de Valores (CNMV) ha detectado un alto índice de irregularidades relacionados con normas de conducta en la comercialización que han desembocado en expedientes sancionadores a once de las diecinueve entidades emisoras de participaciones preferentes. A esto se añade que algunas entidades, como Bankia, han comercializado participaciones preferentes con sobreprecio y sin la información necesaria sobre la inversión.

¿Piensa la Comisión introducir normas más estrictas relativas a la comercialización de los productos financieros complejos de alto riesgo destinados a los inversores minoristas y a la información que las empresas de inversión tienen que facilitar a sus clientes, especialmente en el caso de los consumidores más vulnerables que carecen por completo de conocimientos mínimos en materia financiera?

¿Piensa actuar la Comisión ante la evidencia de que se ha incumplido la Directiva 2004/39/CE sobre mercados de instrumentos financieros en la comercialización de estos productos al no haberse informado claramente y directamente a los clientes de las características reales de riesgo alto y posible iliquidez de estos productos, bien por error o con dolo?

¿Considera la Comisión que se han infringido las leyes de protección de los consumidores vigentes al haberse firmado contratos de suscripción que contenían cláusulas abusivas y engañosas y que estos por tanto deberían declarase nulos?

Respuesta del Sr. Barnier en nombre de la Comisión
(12 de junio de 2013)

La Directiva 2004/39/CE (MiFID) ([1]) regula la prestación de servicios de inversión por parte de las empresas de inversión y las entidades de crédito en lo que respecta a los instrumentos financieros, incluidas las acciones preferentes y otros instrumentos de deuda subordinada. Los bancos y las empresas de inversión deben actuar con honestidad, imparcialidad y profesionalidad en relación con sus clientes, y proporcionar información sobre los instrumentos financieros que proponen, lo que deberá incluir orientaciones y advertencias apropiadas acerca de los riesgos asociados a las inversiones en esos instrumentos ([2]).

La propuesta de revisión de la MiFID adoptada por la Comisión el 20 de octubre de 2011 ([3]) comporta un reforzamiento de las normas sobre prestación de servicios de inversión. Por otra parte, el 3 de julio de 2012, la Comisión adoptó una propuesta de Reglamento sobre los documentos de datos fundamentales relativos a los productos de inversión ([4]) que deberán facilitar los originadores de los productos con el fin de ayudar a los inversores de a pie a comprender y comparar los riesgos de las diferentes inversiones que se les ofrecen. Ambas propuestas están siendo objeto de negociación en el Parlamento Europeo y el Consejo.

Por lo que se refiere a la venta de los productos financieros mencionados, corresponde a las autoridades y órganos jurisdiccionales españoles competentes cerciorarse de que se respetaron todas las disposiciones pertinentes en materia de protección de los consumidores cuando se efectuaron tales ventas. Compete asimismo a los órganos jurisdiccionales nacionales resolver sobre las consecuencias de las posibles vulneraciones de la legislación nacional de transposición de la MiFID, incluida la posibilidad de declarar la nulidad de los contratos.

([1]) DO L 145 de 30.4.2004, p. 1.
([2]) Artículo 19 de la MiFID.
([3]) COM(2011)656 final.
([4]) COM(2012)352 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004587/13
to the Commission
María Irigoyen Pérez (S&D)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: Fraudulent marketing of financial products in Spain

It is estimated that more than 700 000 people in Spain have been affected by the fraudulent selling of hybrid capital instruments and subordinated debt ('preference shares'), and that Spanish banks made more than EUR 30 000 million in profits from these complex, high-risk products with limited liquidity.

The Spanish Securities Market Commission (CNMV) has identified a high rate of irregularities when it comes to marketing standards. This has led to disciplinary proceedings for 11 of the 19 banking institutions issuing preference shares. In addition, some banks, such as Bankia, have marketed preference shares at a premium and without the necessary investment information.

Does the Commission plan to introduce stricter rules on the marketing of complex, high-risk financial products to retail investors and on the information that investment companies should provide to their clients, especially when it comes to the most vulnerable consumers who lack even the most basic knowledge of financial matters?

Does the Commission plan to act on the evidence suggesting that the Markets in Financial Instruments Directive 2004/39/EC has been breached in the marketing of these products, whether knowingly or in error, since clients have not been directly provided with clear information about the real risks and possible illiquidity of these products?

Does the Commission believe that current consumer protection laws have been breached where subscription contracts containing unlawful and misleading clauses have been signed, and that these contracts should therefore be declared null and void?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2013)

Directive 2004/39/EC (MiFID) ([1]) regulates the provision of investment services by investment firms and credit institutions in relation to financial instruments, including preference shares and other subordinated debt instruments. Banks and investment firms should act honestly, fairly and professionally in relation to their clients and provide information about the financial instruments they provide, including appropriate guidance and warnings on the risks associated with investments in those instruments ([2]).

Rules for the provision of investment services have been reinforced in the MiFID review proposal adopted by the Commission on 20 October 2011 ([3]). In addition, on 3 July 2012 the Commission adopted a proposal for a regulation on key information documents for investment products ([4]) which will have to be produced by product originators in order to aid ordinary investors in understanding and comparing the risks of different investments offered to them. The two proposals are under negotiation in the European Parliament and the Council.

As far as the sale of the above financial products is concerned, it is for the competent Spanish authorities and courts to ensure that all the relevant consumer protection legislation was adhered to when these sales were carried out. It also falls under the competence of national courts to decide the consequences of potential violations of national legislation transposing MiFID, including whether contracts should be declared null and void.

([1]) OJ L 145, 30.4.2004, p. 1.
([2]) Article 19 of MiFID.
([3]) COM(2011) 656 final.
([4]) COM(2012) 352 final.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004588/13
an die Kommission
Michael Theurer (ALDE)
(24. April 2013)

Betrifft: Life+ Programm — EU-Förderung für deutsche Umweltprojekte

Laut Pressemitteilungen ([1]) ergibt sich folgendes Problem, welches auch andere deutsche Projektträger und Behördenvertreter in Aufruhr versetzt: Deutschland soll im Jahr 2013 offenbar erstmals mit keinem einzigen Projekt im größten europäischen Umwelt-Förderprogramm Life+ in der Sektion „Umweltpolitik und Verwaltungspraxis" vertreten sein. Dagegen sollen massiv Projekte in Südeuropa gefördert werden. Dadurch ergibt sich die Kritik am Verfahren für die Vergabe der Fördermittel, dass die italienisch-belgische Evaluierungs-Firma AGRECO, die seit 2012 zum spanischen Beratungs- und Entwicklungskonzern TYPSA gehört, die jährlich eingehenden Projektanträge aus ganz Europa bewertet und Empfehlungen für eine Fördermittelvergabe erstellt.

Viele Antragsteller sehen nun einen Zusammenhang zwischen dem externen Dienstleister und der vermehrten Vergabe der Fördermittel an südeuropäische Projekte.

1. Kann die Kommission sicherstellen, dass die Projekte anhand transparenter Auswahlkriterien ausgewählt werden und die entsprechenden Fördermittel gerecht verteilt werden, und wie wird sie dies gewährleisten?

2. Warum sollen deutsche Projekte keine Fördermittel mehr erhalten? Unter den Antragstellern waren auch einige deutsche Projekte, die in den letzten Jahren Erfolg gehabt hätten. Was ist die Ursache dafür, dass in diesem Jahr vermehrt südeuropäische Projekte gefördert werden und andere Länder auf Fördermittel verzichten sollen?

Antwort von Herrn Potočnik im Namen der Kommission
(6. Juni 2013)

1. Die volle Verantwortung für die Verwaltung des Auswahlverfahrens liegt bei der Europäischen Kommission. Die Kommission nutzt in diesem Verfahren Auftragnehmer für Unterstützung technischer Art; diese Auftragnehmer werden anhand eines wettbewerbsorientierten und transparenten Verfahrens ausgewählt.

Das LIFE+-Programm umfasst einen Mechanismus zur Unterstützung einer ausgewogenen geografischen Verteilung der Mittel. Zunächst werden Qualität und Vorzüge der Projekte beurteilt; in einer weiteren Phase wird der Mechanismus für die geografische Verteilung angewendet und zwar ausschließlich auf die Projekte, die die für die Aufforderung zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen festgelegte Mindestqualitätsstufe erreichen. Die Staatsangehörigkeit der Antragsteller wird während der Bewertung der Projektqualität in keiner Form berücksichtigt.

2. Wird das LIFE+-Programm als Gesamtes betrachtet, waren deutsche Vorschläge im Zeitraum 2007-2012 im Durchschnitt nahezu doppelt so häufig erfolgreich wie Vorschläge aus Spanien oder Italien. Auch bei der Auswahl für 2012 lag die Erfolgsquote deutscher Projekte in allen drei Teilbereichen von LIFE+ zusammen bei 23 % und damit deutlich höher als die der Projektvorschläge aus Italien (17 %) oder Spanien (19 %).

Angesichts der relativ geringen Zahl aus Deutschland eingegangener Vorschläge ist ein Ereignis wie in diesem Jahr (keine Vorschläge in einem bestimmten Aktionsbereich ausgewählt) aus statistischer Sicht nicht ungewöhnlich. In der Vergangenheit ist dieser Fall für andere Länder eingetreten, und dies deutet nicht auf eine Voreingenommenheit bei der Auswahl der Vorschläge hin. In der Tat führte eine ähnlich geartete Abweichung im Rahmen der Aufforderung zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen 2012 zu einer 100 %igen Erfolgsquote für deutsche Projekte im Teilbereich „Natur".

([1]) http://www.ndr.de/info/programm/sendungen/reportagen/umweltprojekte103.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004588/13
to the Commission
Michael Theurer (ALDE)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: LIFE+ programme — EU support for German environmental projects

According to press reports, the following problem has arisen, causing outrage among German project promoters and representatives of the relevant authorities: evidently, Germany will not have a single project in the 'environmental policy and administrative practice' section of Life+, the biggest European environmental support programme, in 2013. On the other hand, there will be huge support for projects in Southern Europe. This gives rise to criticism of the process for allocating funding, whereby the Italian-Belgian evaluation company AGRECO (a member of Spanish consulting and development group TYPSA since 2012) evaluates the project applications received from throughout Europe and publishes recommendations for the awarding of funding.

Many applicants now see a link between the external provider and the increased allotting of funding to Southern European projects.

1. Can the Commission ensure that projects are selected in accordance with transparent selection criteria and that the relevant funding is fairly distributed and how does it intend to guarantee this?

2. Why is it that German projects are no longer receiving funding? The applicants also included a number of German projects that would have been successful in previous years. What is the reason for the increased support for Southern European projects and why should other countries go without funding?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2013)

1. The full responsibility for the management of the selection process lies in the hands of the European Commission. The Commission uses contractors in this process for assistance of a technical nature, and the contractors are selected through a competitive and transparent process.

The LIFE+ programme foresees a mechanism to promote a balanced geographical distribution of finance. Projects are first evaluated on their quality and merits; the geographical distribution mechanism is applied in a subsequent step and only to those projects that reach the minimum quality level set in the call for proposals. Nationality of applicants is not considered in any way during the evaluation of project quality.

2. Considering the LIFE+ programme as a whole, the average success rate of German proposals over the period of 2007-2012 is almost twice as high as that of either Spain or Italy. Also in the selection for 2012 in all three strands of LIFE+ taken together the success rate of German projects was 23% and therefore significantly higher than the rate for Italy (17%) or Spain (19%).

Given the relatively low number of German proposals received, an event such as that which occurred this year (no proposals selected under a given strand) is not statistically aberrant. Such occurrences have happened in the past with other countries and do not indicate any bias in the selection process. In fact, a parallel variation led to a German success rate of 100% under the Nature strand of the 2012 call.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004589/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(24 Απριλίου 2013)

Θέμα: Καταστροφή μνημείου στην Αλβανία

Κατά τον Β' Παγκόσμιο Πόλεμο, η ελληνοϊταλικη σύρραξη του 1940-41 διεξήχθη εντός του αλβανικού εδάφους, κατεχομένου τότε υπό της Ιταλίας. Το ύψωμα, με υψοδείκτη 731 μ., της οροσειράς Τρεμπεσίνα-Τομόρι, βορείως της πόλεως Κλεισούρας, κατέστη θρυλικό και σύμβολο του πολέμου αυτού δια τους Έλληνες. Τούτο διότι, τόσο κατά την κατάληψή του από αυτούς, όσο και κατά την διατήρησή του, στη γενομένη εαρινή αντεπίθεση των Ιταλών τον Μάρτιο του 1941 (γνωστή με τον κωδικό «Πριμαβέρα»), εθυσιάσθη μεγάλος αριθμός Ελλήνων στρατιωτικών, οι οποίοι επέδειξαν πρωτοφανή ηρωϊσμό και έγραψαν με το αίμα τους σελίδα δόξης εις την ελληνική ιστορία. Το ύψωμα έχει καταχωρηθεί στη συλλογική συνείδηση και μνήμη των Ελλήνων ως το ιερό σύμβολο του αγώνος των έναντι των εισβολέων.

Πρόσφατα, άνευ λόγου, άγνωστον πόθεν ορμώμενοι Αλβανοί, με την προφανή ανοχή των αρχών, εβεβήλωσαν τον χώρο του εν λόγω υψώματος, με την καταστροφή του εκεί ανεγερθέντος από ετών μνημείου, επιδείξαντες ασέβεια και βαρβαρότητα ανήκουστη δια πολιτισμένη χώρα.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Τι προτίθεται να πράξει επί του προκειμένου, δεδομένου ότι η Αλβανία, επιδιώκει την ένταξη της εις την ΕΕ, χωρίς όμως και να στέργει να ενστερνισθεί τα κεκτημένα της Ευρώπης, ιδιαίτερα στον χώρο του πολιτισμού και του σεβασμού ιερών τόπων και μνημείων, ως αποδεικνύει η ως άνω εκτεθείσα προσβλητική ενέργεια;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(26 Ιουνίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή δεν διαθέτει ακριβή στοιχεία σχετικά με τα συγκεκριμένα περιστατικά στα οποία αναφέρεται το Αξιότιμο Μέλος.

Ωστόσο, η Επιτροπή εξακολουθεί να παροτρύνει την Αλβανία σε όλα τα κατάλληλα πλαίσια ώστε να παραμείνει προσηλωμένη στον εποικοδομητικό της ρόλο στην περιοχή και να προωθήσει τις σχέσεις συνεργασίας και καλής γειτονίας. Η Αλβανία και η Ελλάδα έχουν ισχυρό συμφέρον να συνεχίσουν την πολύ καλή συνεργασία τους, στην οποία θα πρέπει, όπως είναι προφανές, να συμπεριλαμβάνεται ο σεβασμός και η προστασία των πολιτιστικών μνημείων και θρησκευτικών χώρων.

Σε γενικές γραμμές, η Επιτροπή θεωρεί ότι οι πολιτιστικοί χώροι και οι τόποι ιστορικής μνήμης έχουν ζωτική κοινωνική και οικονομική σημασία για τις χώρες και τις τοπικές κοινότητες, ειδικότερα. Στο πλαίσιο αυτό, η Επιτροπή εξακολουθεί να παρέχει βοήθεια στην περιοχή στον τομέα αυτό υποστηρίζοντας τη διαδικασία της Λιουμπλιάνα.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004589/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: Destruction of monuments in Albania

During the Second World War, armed conflict between Greece and Italy from 1940-41 took place on Albania territory, occupied at the time by Italy. The Trebeshina-Tomori massif, 731 m high, north of the town of Këlcyrë, is a legendary symbol of this war for Greeks. The reason for this is that, during its seizure and occupation by the Greeks in the Italian spring offensive of May 1941 (codenamed 'Primavera'), a large number of Greek soldiers, who showed great courage, sacrificed their lives and wrote a new page of Greek history in their blood. The mountain is part of the collective consciousness and memory of Greek citizens as a sacred symbol of the battle against the invasions.

Recently, for no apparent reason, Albanians, provoked by unknown persons but clearly tolerated by the authorities, desecrated the area of this mountain where long-standing monuments are erected, displaying disrespect and unbelievable savagery towards a civilised country.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

What does it intend to do with regard to this matter, given that Albania intends to gain accession to the EU but is failing to adopt the EU acquis, particularly with regards to culture and respect of holy sites and monuments, as shown by the aforementioned insulting action?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(26 June 2013)

The Commission does not have any accurate information about the specific incidents mentioned by the Honourable Member.

Nevertheless, the Commission continues to encourage Albania in all appropriate fora to remain committed to playing a constructive role in the region and promoting cooperation and good neighbourly relations. Albania and Greece have a strong interest to continue their very good cooperation, which should evidently include respect for and protection of cultural monuments and religious sites.

In general, the Commission considers that cultural sites and places of historical memory have a vital social and economic importance for the countries and for the local communities in particular. In this respect, it continues to provide assistance to the region in this area in support of the Ljubljana Process.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-004590/13
till kommissionen
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(24 april 2013)

Angående: Försvagad rättsstatsprincip genom s.k. Special 301 Reports

Varje år sedan 1989 tar Office of the United States Trade Representative (USA:s handelsrepresentant) fram en rapport (Special 301 Report) med en utvärdering av tredjeländers regelverk för skydd av immateriella rättigheter. De länder som pekas ut i rapporterna som ”prioriterade länder” kan bli föremål för handelspolitiska motåtgärder av den amerikanska regeringen, tills denna är nöjd med skyddet för de immateriella rättigheterna.

En av de aktörer som har störst inflytande på utarbetandet av denna rapport är International Intellectual Property Alliance (internationella immaterialrättsförbundet, IIPA), en privat koalition av amerikanska lobbyorganisationer med ett stort engagemang för att stärka branschens ställning beträffande immaterialrätt. Förbundets främsta mål har i många år varit att ändra tolkningen av justitieministerns meddelande från maj 2006 så att det blir straffbart med peer-to-peer-fildelning.

I sin nuvarande utformning är utkastet till Ley Lasalle (lagförslaget om att reformera den nuvarande spanska immaterialrätten) skrivet så att det inte är möjligt att tolka ur justitieministerns perspektiv, och därför uppfyller det inte IIPA:s ovan nämnda krav och inte heller de krav som förs fram i de meddelanden jag nämnde i skriftlig fråga E-010043/2012. Detta agerande försvagar klart principen om maktdelning och därmed också rättsstatsprincipen.

Anser kommissionen ändå, så som sades i svaret på skriftlig fråga E-010043/2012, att det är ”förenligt med regelverket” att en av EU:s grundläggande principer försvagas?

Tänker kommissionen vidta några åtgärder för att skydda de konstitutionella pelarna i Spanien? Hur tänker kommissionen i så fall agera om ovannämnda lag genomförs?

Svar från Michel Barnier på kommissionens vägnar
(27 juni 2013)

Kommissionen hänvisar till svaret på den skriftliga frågan E-010043/2012 och upprepar att ingenting i EU-lagstiftningen förhindrar att en medlemsstat ändrar den tillämpliga lagstiftningen inom området skydd för immateriella rättigheter, inklusive den som det hänvisas till i den aktuella frågan, så länge som den relevanta EU-lagstiftningen följs.

Kommissionen har förstått att Spaniens nationella bestämmelser om immateriella rättigheter nyligen behandlades i en bred offentlig samrådsprocess som alla intresserade berörda parter välkomnades att medverka i ([1]). Kommissionen kan inte ta ställning till själva lagstiftningsprocessen eller den amerikanska 301-rapportens påstådda inverkan på en sådan process.

Om Spanien överväger att införa eller ändra de nuvarande föreskrifterna gällande informationssamhällets tjänster, bör kommissionen informeras om förslagen till föreskrifterna i enlighet med förfarandet i direktiv 98/34/EG, ändrat genom direktiv 98/48/EG. Kommissionen kommer då att lämna synpunkter på lagstiftningsförslaget.

([1]) http://www.mecd.gob.es/servicios-al-ciudadano-mecd/participacion-publica/propiedad-intelectual.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004590/13
to the Commission
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: Weakening of the rule of law through the influence of Special 301 Reports

Every year since 1989, the Office of the United States Trade Representative has drafted a Special 301 Report evaluating the intellectual property rights frameworks of third countries. Countries which are identified in the Special 301 Reports as 'priority foreign countries' may be subject to trade retaliation from the US Government, until such time as it is satisfied that adequate intellectual property rights protection is in place.

One of the main influencing actors in the preparation of this report is the International Intellectual Property Alliance (IIPA), a private coalition of American lobbies with a strong interest in reinforcing industry's position with regard to intellectual property rights, whose main focus for a number of years has been to change the interpretation of the Attorney General's May 2006 Circular to one that will consider P2P file exchange an offence under criminal law.

The current draft of the 'Ley Lasalle' Bill — the draft bill to reform prevailing Spanish intellectual property law — is written in a way that does not allow the possibility of interpretation from the point of view of the Attorney, and, therefore, does not comply with the aforementioned demands of the IIPA or those that appeared in the communications I mentioned in Written Question E-010043/2012. This action clearly weakens the separation of powers and, therefore, the rule of law.

Does the Commission consider that the weakening of one of the fundamental principles of the EU still respects the *acquis*, as referred to in its answer to Written Question E-010043/2012?

Is the Commission planning to take measures to protect its constitutional pillars in Spain? If so, how will it act should the aforementioned law is implemented?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2013)

Referring to the answer to Written Question E-010043/2012 the Commission would like to reiterate that nothing in EC law prevents Member States from changing the applicable legislation in the area of protection of intellectual property rights, including the one referred to in the present question, as long as they respect relevant EU legislation.

The Commission understands that the national intellectual property law of Spain was recently subject to a wide public consultation process to which all interested stakeholders were invited to contribute ([1]). The Commission is not in a position to comment on this legislative process itself, including on the alleged impact of the US 301 Special Report in relation to such process.

Should Spain consider the introduction or amendment of the existing rules concerning information society services, it would have to notify the draft rules to the Commission in accordance with the procedure of Directive 98/34/EC as amended by Directive 98/48/EC. The Commission would then give its comments on the draft legislation.

([1]) http://www.mecd.gob.es/servicios-al-ciudadano-mecd/participacion-publica/propiedad-intelectual.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004592/13
to the Commission
Alyn Smith (Verts/ALE)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: European Directory of Notaries

The Council of the Notariats of the European Union (CNUE) is the professional body for the notaries of those 21 Member States whose legal systems are based on Latin civil law. On its website, the organisation states that: 'the CNUE's mission is to promote the notariat and its active contribution to any decision-making processes of the European institutions.'

The CNUE has, as part of its efforts to promote its interests and services, developed a website entitled 'European Directory of Notaries' ([1]). As the website is run by CNUE, it only allows users to search for notaries in the 21 Member States whose legal systems are based on Latin civil law. This, however, has not stopped the Commission providing financial support to the website.

What were the tendering arrangements leading to this financial support, and what was the value hereof? Is financial support ongoing and, if so, what is the annual amount?

Can the Commission explain why it has given financial support to develop such a directory to a body whose aim is to promote one particular notarial tradition?

Can the Commission explain why it has not imposed any requirements to ensure that the website contains accurate information about all notariats in all 27 EU Member States? Has the Commission verified the accuracy of the website's data?

What actions will the Commission take to correct the website to reflect the true distribution of notaries in the EU?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(24 June 2013)

The website referred to by the Honourable Member is the intellectual property of the Council of the Notariats of the European Union (CNUE) and the content of it is its sole responsibility. It was developed by a partnership led by the Slovenian Chamber of Civil Notaries following a successful action grant application submitted under the Specific Programme Civil Justice — Call for Proposals 2009-1 Specific Transnational Projects. In line with the provision of its legal base ([2]), this programme may support transnational actions involving at least two Member States. The detailed terms and conditions of these grants are available on the website of DG Justice:
http://ec.europa.eu/justice/newsroom/grants/091022_en.htm

The project was implemented between 06/2010-08/2011. The total grant awarded for this proposal was EUR 94 418,70.

In 2012 the operation of the website was included in the work programme of CNUE, for the implementation of which it received financial support following a successful application for an operating grant. As part of its operating budget under heading 'Web hosting and maintenance' 80% of the costs associated with this activity was co-financed (grant amount to be established after final contract closure).

The Commission is now currently working towards the provision of a 'find a notary' tool, on the basis of the established directory, as part of the European e-Justice Portal. The Commission is in contact with the Member States where a notary profession exists, but which are not present in the directory, in order to establish whether the relevant professions would be willing to join the project with the aim of maximising the coverage of the provided service.

([1]) http://notaries-directory.eu/
([2]) Article 4(b) of Decision No 1149/2007/EC of 25 September 2007; OJ L 257, 3.10.2007, p. 16.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004593/13
à la Commission
Isabelle Thomas (S&D)
(24 avril 2013)

Objet: Méthode de négociation des accords de pêche avec la Norvège

Il est juridiquement établi et tout à fait admis que les échanges annuels entre l'Union et la Norvège sur la pêche ne sont pas soumis à une procédure de consultation du Parlement européen, mais sont réglementés par voie de procès-verbaux qui ne sont contraignants pour aucune des parties. De fait, cela ne requiert juridiquement pas l'approbation du Parlement, stricto sensu.

Cependant, il se révèle que l'importance de ces échanges sur le plan à la fois économique et écologique a des répercussions notables sur les pêcheries de l'Union. C'est la raison pour laquelle il avait été demandé oralement à la Commission, lors d'une réunion de la commission de la pêche du Parlement, de bien vouloir considérer cette demande, et les échanges avaient permis d'envisager une plus grande transparence concernant les rapports entre l'Union et la Norvège.

Les questions suivantes visent à déterminer si la Commission va poursuivre sa méthode de négociation actuelle, concernant les accords de pêche avec la Norvège.

1. Compte tenu de l'importance politique, économique et écologique desdits accords, la Commission entend-elle continuer à mener les négociations de pêche avec la Norvège par la voie de procès-verbaux non contraignants, qui ne nécessitent aucune consultation du Parlement?

2. La Commission entend-elle proposer un calendrier de révision des procédures relatives auxdits accords, afin que le Parlement soit consulté? Si tel est le cas, peut-elle en préciser la teneur?

Réponse donnée par Mme Damanaki au nom de la Commission
(1er juillet 2013)

La Commission invite l'Honorable Parlementaire à se reporter à la réponse apportée à sa question précédente (P-001745/2013).

La Commission souhaite aussi souligner qu'aucun mandat de négociation formel n'est nécessaire pour procéder aux consultations annuelles avec la Norvège. De plus, les procès-verbaux agréés qui résultent des consultations effectuées ne sont pas des instruments juridiquement contraignants; il n'est donc pas nécessaire qu'ils soient conclus par le Conseil ni qu'ils soient approuvés par le Parlement européen.

Néanmoins, la Commission continuera d'informer le Parlement à intervalles réguliers des résultats du processus de consultation.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004593/13
to the Commission
Isabelle Thomas (S&D)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: Negotiation of fisheries agreements with Norway

It is a legally established and absolutely accepted fact that annual talks between the EU and Norway on fisheries are not subject to consultation by Parliament, but are governed by reports that are not binding on either party. Strictly speaking, this does not legally require Parliament's approval.

However, it is clear that the economic and ecological importance of these talks has significant consequences for EU fisheries. That is why, during a meeting of Parliament's Committee on Fisheries, the Commission had been asked to consider this request, and the talks had paved for the way for relations between the EU and Norway to become more transparent.

The following questions are intended to establish whether the Commission is going to carry on with its current approach to negotiating fisheries agreements with Norway.

1. In view of the political, economic and ecological importance of these agreements, will the Commission continue to conduct negotiations on fisheries with Norway based on non-binding reports which do not require Parliament to be consulted?

2. Will the Commission propose a timetable for changing the procedures relating to these agreements so that Parliament is consulted? If so, can it say what this will consist of?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(1 July 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to her previous question (P-001745/2013).

The Commission would therefore underline that no formal negotiating mandate is necessary for the conduct of the annual consultations with Norway. Furthermore, the Agreed Records, which result from the consultations, are not legally binding instruments and thus they must neither be concluded by the Council, nor do they require the consent of the European Parliament.

Nevertheless, the Commission will continue to inform Parliament, at regular intervals, of the outcomes of the consultation process.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004594/13
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(24 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Lavori edilizi nelle dune di Badesi (OT) nella regione Sardegna, in palese violazione delle direttive 92/43/CEE e 2011/92/UE

Sul litorale dunale di Badesi (OT) sono in corso ingenti lavori di natura edilizia in località Baia delle Mimose, nome del contiguo villaggio turistico realizzato nel corso degli anni '70 e '80 del secolo scorso. In seguito a varie azioni legali (2011-2013) da parte delle associazioni ecologiste Amici della Terra e Gruppo d'Intervento Giuridico onlus, il Servizio SAVI dell'Assessorato della difesa dell'ambiente della Regione autonoma della Sardegna, con nota del 3 aprile 2013 (prot. n. 7354), ha comunicato di aver richiesto al Comune di Badesi (anche con precedenti note prot. n. 22067 del 29 settembre 2011 e n. 27517 del 25 novembre 2011) «la documentazione amministrativa e tecnica utile a verificare se le opere in questione debbano essere assoggettate alle procedure di Valutazione di Impatto Ambientale e di Incidenza Ambientale, ai sensi del D. Lgs. 152/2006 e ss.mm.ii., della DGR 34/33 del 2012 e del DPR 357/1997 e s.m.i.», significando la perdurante e plateale assoluta assenza di qualsiasi preventivo svolgimento della procedura di verifica di assoggettabilità riguardo i lavori attualmente in corso.

Infatti, la realizzazione di «villaggi turistici di superficie superiore a 5 ha, centri residenziali turistici ed esercizi alberghieri con oltre 300 posti letto o volume edificato superiore a 25.000 m^3, o che occupano una superficie superiore ai 20 ha, esclusi quelli ricadenti all'interno dei centri abitati» (come quello in argomento) deve essere preceduta da positiva conclusione di procedura di verifica di assoggettabilità, ai sensi della direttiva 2011/92/UE (allegato II, punto 12, lett. c), del decreto legislativo n. 152/2006 e s.m.i. (art. 20, allegati II e IV), delle legge regionale n. 1/1999 e s.m.i. (art. 31) e allegato B della deliberazione Giunta regionale n. 24/24 del 23 aprile 2008, estesa ad ampliamenti e/o modifiche al fine di verificarne gli impatti cumulativi, come da giurisprudenza costante.

L'area rientra nel sito di importanza comunitaria — SIC «Foci del Coghinas» ai sensi della direttiva 92/43/CEE.

1. È la Commissione a conoscenza di quanto sopra?

2. Quali iniziative la Commissione intende assumere contro questa palese violazione delle direttive 92/43/CEE e 2011/92/UE?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(6 giugno 2013)

La Commissione contatterà le autorità italiane per ottenere chiarimenti in merito all'applicazione delle direttive 2011/92/UE ([1]) e 92/43/CEE ([2]) al progetto in questione.

([1]) Direttiva 2011/92/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 13 dicembre 2011, concernente la valutazione dell'impatto ambientale di determinati progetti pubblici e privati Testo rilevante ai fini del SEE (GU L 26 del 28.1.2012, pagg. 1-21).

([2]) Direttiva 92/43/CEE del Consiglio, del 21 maggio 1992, relativa alla conservazione degli habitat naturali e seminaturali e della flora e della fauna selvatiche, GU L 206 del 22.7.1992, pagg. 7-50.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004594/13
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: Building work on the dunes at Badesi (province of Olbia-Tempio) in Sardinia, in clear breach of Directives 92/43/EEC and 2011/92/EU

Along the dune-lined coast of Badesi, in the province of Olbia-Tempio, major building works are under way at the Baia delle Mimose resort, the name of the neighbouring tourist village built in the 1970s and 1980s. Following several legal actions brought by the environmental organisations Friends of the Earth and Gruppo d'Intervento Giuridico onlus (Legal Action Group, non-profit social organisation) between 2011 and 2013, the environmental sustainability, impact assessment and IT service of the environmental protection department of the Autonomous Region of Sardinia issued a note on 3 April 2013 (ref. No 7354) to say that it had asked the Badesi municipal authorities (also with previous notes Nos 22067 of 29 September 2011 and 27517 of 25 November 2011) for the administrative and technical documentation necessary to assess whether the works in question should be subject to environmental impact and environmental implications assessments, under Legislative Decree No 152/2006, as subsequently amended and supplemented, Decision of the Regional Council No 34/33 of 2012 and Presidential Decree No 357/1997, as subsequently amended and supplemented, which means that there has been a persistent, blatant and complete failure to conduct any prior screening procedure in respect of the works in progress.

Construction of tourist villages with a surface area greater than five hectares, holiday residential complexes and hotels with more than 300 beds or a constructed volume greater than 25 000 m^3, or which cover a surface area greater than 20 hectares, except those falling within populated areas (such as the works in question), can only begin after the successful conclusion of the screening procedure under Directive 2011/92/EU (Annex II, point 12(c)), Legislative Decree No 152/2006, as subsequently amended and supplemented (Article 20, Annexes II and IV), Regional Law No 1/1999, as subsequently amended and supplemented (Article 31), and Annex B to the decision of the Regional Council No 24/24 of 23 April 2008, which extends to extensions and/or alterations in order to determine their cumulative impacts, in accordance with settled case-law.

The area is part of the 'Foci del Coghinas' site of Community importance under Directive 92/43/EEC.

1. Is the Commission aware of the above matter?

2. What action will the Commission take in response to this clear breach of Directives 92/43/EEC and 2011/92/EU?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2013)

The Commission will contact the Italian authorities to obtain clarifications on the application of Directives 2011/92/EU ([1]) and 92/43/EEC ([2]) to the abovementioned project.

([1]) Directive 2011/92/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment Text with EEA relevance, OJ L 26, 28.1.2012, pp. 1-21.

([2]) Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora, OJ L 206, 22.7.1992, pp. 7-50.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004595/13
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(24 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Intervento dell'UE a tutela della salute dei cittadini

Il rapporto annuale sulla malattia del legionario della rete ELDSNet (European Legionnaires' Disease Surveillance Network) coordinata dall'ECDC (European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control) segnala che sono stati quasi cinquemila (4 897) i casi di legionellosi segnalati nel 2011 nei paesi dell'Unione europea, oltre a Islanda e Norvegia, mostrando un calo del 22 % rispetto all'anno precedente. L'83 % dei casi è stato registrato in sei paesi: Francia, Italia, Spagna, Germania, Olanda e Regno Unito.

La fascia d'età più colpita è stata quella degli ultra cinquantenni (77 %) e in particolare gli uomini (il rapporto maschi/femmine è di 2,7:1). Il tasso di mortalità è rimasto stabile dal 2005 e nel 2011 è stato di circa il 10 %. La malattia ha avuto origine comunitaria nel 67 % dei casi, associata a viaggi nel 24 % e origine ospedaliera nel 7 %. In particolare, per quanto riguarda i casi associati ai viaggi, seppur in calo del 12 % rispetto al 2010, la maggior parte dei casi (72 %) è stata concentrata in Francia, Italia, Paesi Bassi e Regno Unito e il gruppo maggiore è stato proprio quello italiano.

La legionellosi è una grave forma di infezione respiratoria, causata da batteri Gram-negativi. La legionellosi, inoltre, non si trasmette da persona a persona, ma tramite flussi d'aerosol o di acqua contaminata, quindi in luoghi in cui è in funzione un sistema di condizionamento, umidificazione, trattamento dell'aria o di ricircolarizzazione delle acque.

È la Commissione in possesso di dati più recenti circa i casi di legionellosi in Europa?

Come intende intervenire la Commissione a tutela della salute dei cittadini europei?

Quali misure di revisione/controllo sono previste a livello europeo sui sistemi di condizionamento, umidificazione, trattamento dell'aria o di ricircolarizzazione delle acque che sono la fonte di questa grave malattia?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(24 giugno 2013)

Ogni anno gli Stati membri forniscono dati al Centro europeo per la prevenzione e il controllo delle malattie mediante la rete europea di sorveglianza della malattia dei legionari (ELDSNet); i dati disponibili più recenti si riferiscono al 2011.

Nel 2011 gli Stati membri dell'Unione, Islanda e Norvegia hanno segnalato 4 897 casi di legionellosi ([1]). I casi notificati sono stati 9,7 per milione di abitanti, il che corrisponde ad un calo del 22 % rispetto all'anno precedente.

L'83 % dei casi è stato notificato in sei Stati membri (Francia, Italia, Spagna, Germania, Paesi Bassi e Regno Unito). La maggior parte dei casi (67 %) è di origine comunitaria, il 24 % è associato a viaggi e il 7 % ha origine nosocomiale. Il 77 % di tutti i casi notificati era costituito da persone di età superiore a 50 anni. Nel 2011 il tasso di mortalità era pari al 10 %, sostanzialmente simile al valore riscontrato negli anni precedenti.

Secondo quanto stabilito dalla decisione n. 2119/98/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio ([2]), del 24 settembre 1998, che istituisce una rete di sorveglianza epidemiologica e di controllo delle malattie trasmissibili nella Comunità, è stato elaborato un quadro globale per monitorare le malattie trasmissibili, ivi inclusa la legionellosi, e per coordinare gli interventi nel caso in cui si abbia un numero significativo di casi.

([1]) Notificato mediante sorveglianza passiva e quindi mediante l'ordinaria attività di segnalazione dei casi di malattia registrati presso le strutture di assistenza sanitaria per un trattamento o una prestazione.

([2]) GU L 268 del 3.10.1998, pag. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004595/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: EU action to safeguard public health

According to the annual report on legionnaires' disease by the European Legionnaires' Disease Surveillance Network (ELDSNet), which is coordinated by the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC), in 2011 almost 5 000 (4 897) cases of legionellosis were reported in the EU Member States, Iceland and Norway, a 22% fall from the previous year. Six countries accounted for 83% of cases: France, Italy, Spain, Germany, the Netherlands and the UK.

The most affected age group was the over 50s (77%), with men being particularly affected (the male to female ratio is 2.7:1). The mortality rate remained stable since 2005 and stood at around 10% in 2011. The disease was community-acquired in 67% of cases, travel-associated in 24% and contracted in hospital in 7%. In particular, although travel-associated cases fell by 12% from 2010, most cases (72%) were concentrated in France, Italy, the Netherlands and the UK, and the largest group was that in Italy.

Legionellosis is a severe form of respiratory infection caused by Gram-negative bacteria. Moreover, legionellosis is not transmitted from person to person, but by aerosols or contaminated water, so in places where there is an air conditioning, humidification, air treatment or water recirculation system in operation.

Does the Commission have any more recent figures on cases of legionellosis in Europe?

What will the Commission do to safeguard European public health?

What auditing/inspection is planned at EU level in respect of air conditioning, humidification, air treatment or water recirculation systems, which are the source of this serious disease?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(24 June 2013)

Data is provided by Member States on a yearly base to the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control through the European Legionnaires' Disease Surveillance Network and the most recent data available refers to 2011.

In 2011, 4,897 cases of Legionellosis ([1]) were reported by EU Member States, Iceland and Norway. The number of notifications per million inhabitants was 9.7, which represented a 22% decrease compared to the previous year.

Six Member States (France, Italy, Spain, Germany, Netherlands and the United Kingdom) accounted for 83% of all notified cases. Most cases were community-acquired (67%) while 24% were travel-associated and 7% were linked with healthcare facilities. People over 50 years of age accounted for 77% of all cases. The case-fatality ratio was 10% in 2011, similar to previous years.

Under Decision 2119/98/EC ([2]) of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 September 1998 setting up a network for the epidemiological surveillance and control of communicable diseases in the Community, a comprehensive framework has been established for monitoring communicable diseases, including legionellosis, and coordinating measures in case of an outbreak.

([1]) Notified under passive surveillance, thus during the routine reporting of the cases of diseases reaching healthcare facilities for treatment or service.
([2]) OJ L 268/1, 3.10.1998.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-004596/13
till kommissionen
Marita Ulvskog (S&D), Göran Färm (S&D), Anna Hedh (S&D) och Jens Nilsson (S&D)
(24 april 2013)

Angående: Statsstöd till regionala flygplatser

Kommissionen förbereder just nu ett förslag om att revidera det regelverk som styr möjligheten att ge offentligt stöd till flygplatser. Enligt uppgift skulle det förslag som diskuteras leda till avveckling av merparten av de 36 regionala flygplatser som finns runt om i Sverige.

De regioner i Sverige som vi representerar skulle därmed drabbas hårt. Det handlar bland annat om flygplatserna i Mora, Borlänge, Skellefteå, Arvidsjaur, Pajala, Örnsköldsvik, Norrköping, Linköping, Kalmar, Växjö, Karlstad och Jönköping. Dessa flygplatser är alla viktiga för kommunikationer till storstadsregioner som Stockholm, Göteborg och Malmö samt för transfertrafik till utländska resmål. Om kommissionens förslag blir verklighet skulle det inte heller vara möjligt för Sverige att efter egen bedömning understödja sådana investeringar i flyg som bedöms viktiga för jobb och tillväxt. Förslaget skulle exempelvis negativt påverka skidorten Sälen där planer finns på att bygga en flygplats för att utveckla besöks- och turismnäringen.

Sverige är EU:s till ytan tredje största land och samtidigt ett av EU:s mest glesbefolkade länder med endast 21 invånare per kvadratkilometer. Under dessa förutsättningar är fungerande transportinfrastruktur avgörande för jobb, tillväxt och sysselsättning i hela Sverige. De regionala flygplatserna ligger ofta kopplade till en lokal industri, besöksnäring eller universitet som är helt beroende av fungerande kommunikationer.

Om kommissionens planer förverkligas innebär det ett hårt slag mot Sveriges möjligheter att säkerställa fungerande nationella kommunikationer. Med anledning av detta vill vi fråga kommissionen:

1. Kan kommissionen garantera att de nya statsstödsreglerna för flyg inte hotar de svenska regionala flygplatserna?

2. Kan kommissionen lova att de nya statsstödsreglerna för flyg respekterar de särskilda förutsättningar som gäller för sysselsättning, regional sammanhållning och tillväxt i glesbefolkade EU-länder som Sverige?

Svar från Joaquín Almunia på kommissionens vägnar
(11 juni 2013)

Kommissionen förbereder ett förslag till översyn av de gällande riktlinjerna för statligt stöd till flygplatser och flygbolag. De reviderade riktlinjerna kommer att behöva finna en balans mellan behovet av att undvika snedvridning av konkurrensen mellan flygbolagen och flygplatserna å ena'Fast mellanslag å andra'respektive till respektive sidan, och å andra'respektive till respektive sidan, behovet av att beakta de regionala flygplatsernas betydelse för den lokala utvecklingen och den territoriella sammanhållningen.

Samråd kommer att ske med alla berörda parter före antagandet av nya bestämmelser.

De nuvarande riktlinjerna för luftfart gör det möjligt för medlemsstaterna att anmäla statligt stöd för finansiering av flygplatsinfrastruktur för att bygga och underhålla regionala flygplatser. Dessutom kan medlemsstaterna ge små flygplatser, där nya flygförbindelser inrättas, igångsättningsstöd för att locka till sig flygbolag att öppna nya flyglinjer från flygplatsen. Det är också möjligt att bevilja socialt stöd till förmån för vissa grupper av medborgare som bor i avlägsna områden för att förse dessa medborgare med flygförbindelser från sin region. Medlemsstaterna har också möjlighet att införa en skyldighet att tillhandahålla allmännyttiga tjänster för vissa flyglinjer i enlighet med förordning (EG) nr 1008/2008. Slutligen kan medlemsstaterna anförtro en flygplats uppgiften att tillhandahålla en tjänst av allmänt ekonomiskt intresse i enlighet med 2011 års paket om tjänster av allmänt ekonomiskt intresse.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004596/13
to the Commission
Marita Ulvskog (S&D), Göran Färm (S&D), Anna Hedh (S&D) and Jens Nilsson (S&D)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: State aid for regional airports

The Commission is currently preparing a proposal for the revision of the legislation governing the facility to grant state aid to airports. According to the available information, the proposal that is under discussion would result in the decommissioning of the majority of the 36 regional airports located around Sweden.

The regions of Sweden that we represent would be seriously affected by this. The airports include those in Mora, Borlänge, Skellefteå, Arvidsjaur, Pajala, Örnsköldsvik, Norrköping, Linköping, Kalmar, Växjö, Karlstad and Jönköping. All of these airports are important for communications with conurbations like Stockholm, Gothenburg and Malmö, and for transfer traffic to destinations abroad. If the Commission's proposal is implemented, it will also not be possible for Sweden to use its own judgment to subsidise any investments in aviation that are deemed important for jobs and growth. The proposal would have a negative impact on the ski resort of Sälen, for example, where there are plans to build an airport to develop the visitor and tourism industry.

In terms of surface area, Sweden is the EU's third largest country and at the same time one of the EU's most sparsely populated countries, with just 21 inhabitants per square kilometre. Given these circumstances, an effective transport infrastructure is crucial for jobs, growth and employment throughout Sweden. The regional airports are often linked to a local industry, tourism or a university that is entirely dependent on effective communications.

If the Commission's plans are implemented, it will deal a severe blow to Sweden's chances of ensuring effective national communications.

1. Can the Commission guarantee that the new state aid rules for the aviation sector will not threaten Sweden's regional airports?

2. Can the Commission promise that the new state aid rules for the aviation sector will respect the special conditions that apply to employment, regional cohesion and growth in sparsely populated EU Member States like Sweden?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2013)

The Commission is preparing a proposal for the revision of the current state aid guidelines for airports and airlines. The revised guidelines will have to strike the balance between the need to avoid distortions of competition between airlines and airports on one hand, and on the other hand, the need to take into consideration the importance of regional airports for local development and territorial cohesion.

All stakeholders will be duly consulted before the adoption of new rules.

The current Aviation Guidelines enable Member States to notify state aid to support the financing of airport infrastructure to create and maintain regional airports. In addition, Member States can provide small airports, where new air links are established, with start-up aid in order to attract airlines to set up new routes from there. Granting of social aid for the benefit of certain groups of citizens living in remote areas is also allowed to provide those citizens with air links out of their region. Member States also have the possibility to establish Public Service Obligations for certain routes in line with the regulation 1008/2008. Finally, Member States may entrust an airport with a mission of general economic interest in compliance with the 2011 SGEI package.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004597/13
a la Comisión
Maria Badia i Cutchet (S&D), Raimon Obiols (S&D) y Andrés Perelló Rodríguez (S&D)
(24 de abril de 2013)

Asunto: Insuficiencia de los aspectos preventivos de la legislación de la UE ante la práctica del «fracking». El caso de Riudaura

La Comisión Europea está recibiendo continuos requerimientos y denuncias sobre proyectos de extracción de gas por el método del «*fracking*» provenientes de toda la UE. El Parlamento Europeo, en su resolución de noviembre 2012, solicitó a la Comisión que recabara mayor información acerca de las consecuencias negativas que podría tener para el medio ambiente y la salud esta técnica de extracción antes de emprender cualquier tipo de iniciativa legislativa.

Uno de los proyectos de extracción actualmente en curso es el de la localidad catalana de Riudaura, donde la fuerte oposición ciudadana al mismo puede considerarse un claro ejemplo de la inquietud que la práctica del *fracking* está generando entre la ciudadanía europea.

En los primeros documentos que hacían referencia a esta técnica, la Comisión ponía como ejemplo en positivo la implantación del *fracking* en algunas regiones de los Estados Unidos, sin tener en cuenta que dicho modelo no es exportable a la Unión, entre otros motivos, por las diferentes características morfológicas de suelo y las posibles repercusiones en el mismo y en los acuíferos colindantes. Dado que parece ser que la Comisión tiene dudas acerca de la necesidad de prohibir la extracción por *fracking* e incluso ha manifestado en alguna ocasión que la actual legislación medioambiental ya previene los posibles riesgos derivados:

¿Entiende la Comisión que, lejos de la aplicación del principio de precaución, se tiene necesariamente que producir un accidente de contaminación de acuíferos o de mala gestión de los residuos de extracción para que directivas como la 2006/18/CE (aguas subterráneas) o la 2004/35/CE (residuos de las industrias extractivas) puedan intervenir en las extracciones por *fracking*?

¿Considera la Comisión suficiente que pozos similares a los ya existentes en Riudaura (más de 2 500m de profundidad) queden solamente sometidos para evaluación ambiental al criterio de los Estados miembros o piensa la Comisión que la actividad de extracción por *fracking* debería trasladarse al anexo I de la Directiva 2011/92/UE durante el proceso de revisión de la misma que se encuentra en curso?

¿No considera la Comisión que el hecho de que proyectos como el de Riudaura puedan ser directamente aprobados por el gobierno de la Generalitat, con todas las implicaciones que presenta para la población, podría estar en contradicción con la Directiva 2003/35/CE sobre participación del público?

¿Es consciente la Comisión de que la extracción por *fracking* podría tener graves consecuencias para el espacio protegido por Natura 2000 «Alta Garrotxa»?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(6 de junio de 2013)

1., 3. y 4. La Comisión no hace un seguimiento detallado de las operaciones de explotación de gas de esquisto en lugares o zonas concretas. Corresponde a los Estados miembros garantizar —mediante la realización de evaluaciones adecuadas, regímenes de autorización y actividades de supervisión— que las actuaciones en materia de exploración o explotación de fuentes de energía, incluidas las que hacen uso de la fractura hidráulica, se ajusten a los requisitos establecidos en el marco jurídico vigente en la EU. Dicho marco incluye, entre otros elementos, disposiciones en materia de evaluaciones de impacto ambiental y participación del público ([1]), protección de las aguas superficiales y subterráneas ([2]), gestión de residuos ([3]) y conservación de los hábitats naturales ([4]).

2. La propuesta de revisión de la Directiva sobre evaluación de impacto ambiental se está debatiendo actualmente en el Parlamento y el Consejo. La Comisión analizará a su debido tiempo toda modificación presentada por los colegisladores con objeto de incluir la exploración y la producción de gas de esquisto en el anexo I.

([1]) Directiva 2011/92/UE, relativa a la evaluación de las repercusiones de determinados proyectos públicos y privados sobre el medio ambiente (DO L 26 de 28.1.2012, p. 1). Esta Directiva incluye la Directiva 2003/35/CE, por la que se establecen medidas para la participación del público en la elaboración de determinados planes y programas relacionados con el medio ambiente y por la que se modifican, en lo que se refiere a la participación del público y el acceso a la justicia, las Directivas 85/337/CEE y 96/61/CE del Consejo (DO L 156 de 26.5.2003, p. 17).

([2]) Directiva 2000/60/CE, por la que se establece un marco comunitario de actuación en el ámbito de la política de aguas (DO L 327 de 22.12.2000, p. 1) y Directiva 2006/118/CE, relativa a la protección de las aguas subterráneas contra la contaminación y el deterioro (DO L 372 de 27.12.2006, p. 19).

([3]) Directiva 2006/21/CE ,sobre la gestión de los residuos de industrias extractivas y por la que se modifica la Directiva 2004/35/CE (DO L 102 de 11.4.2006, p. 15).

([4]) Directiva 92/43/CE, relativa a la conservación de los hábitats naturales y de la fauna y flora silvestres (DO L 206 de 22.7.1992, p. 7).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004597/13
to the Commission
Maria Badia i Cutchet (S&D), Raimon Obiols (S&D) and Andrés Perelló Rodríguez (S&D)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: Shortcomings of the preventive aspects of EU legislation with respect to fracking — the case of Riudaura

The Commission is receiving a steady stream of petitions and complaints from all over the EU regarding gas extraction projects employing the method known as fracking. Parliament, in its resolution of November 2012, asked the Commission to compile further information on the negative implications posed by this extraction technique for health and the environment before undertaking any kind of legislative initiative.

One extraction project currently in progress is in the Catalan municipality of Riudaura, where strong public opposition to the use of fracking echoes the concerns of many European citizens.

In early documents referring to this technique, the Commission cited as a positive example the deployment of fracking operations in certain regions of the United States, disregarding the fact that this model is not exportable to the European Union due, among other reasons, to the different morphological features of the ground and the possible repercussions on the soil and adjoining aquifers. Given that it seems the Commission has doubts about the need to ban fracking and has even expressed the view on one occasion that current environmental legislation prevents the potential risks of this practice:

Does the Commission consider that, far from implementing the precautionary principle, an aquifer must first be contaminated or extractive waste mismanaged before directives such as 2006/18/EC (groundwater) or 2004/35/EC (waste from extractive industries) can be invoked in relation to fracking operations?

Does the Commission consider it sufficient that wells similar to those already existing in Riudaura (to depths of more than 2 500 m) are subject to environmental assessment only at the discretion of the Member States, or does the Commission think that fracking operations should be moved to Annex I of Directive 2011/92/EU as part of the current review process?

Given that projects such as the one in Riudaura can be directly approved by the Government of Catalonia, with all the associated implications for the population, does the Commission not think that such practice might be in conflict with Directive 2003/35/EC on public participation?

Is the Commission aware that fracking could have grave consequences for Alta Garrotxa, a Natura 2000 protected area?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2013)

1, 3, 4. The Commission does not follow in detail specific shale gas exploitation operations in individual locations or regions. It is the responsibility of the Member States to ensure — via appropriate assessments, permitting regimes and monitoring activities — that any exploration or exploitation of energy sources, including those using hydraulic fracturing, complies with the requirements of the existing legal framework in the EU. This includes, *inter alia*, provisions on environmental impact assessments (EIA) and public participation ([1]), the protection of surface and groundwater ([2]), on waste management ([3]) and on the conservation of natural habitats ([4]).

2. The proposal for the revision of the EIA Directive is currently discussed by Parliament and Council. The Commission will consider in due time any amendments put forward by the co-legislators aiming to bring shale gas exploration and production into Annex I.

([1]) Directive 2011/92/EU on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on environment (OJ L 26/1, 28.1.2012). This directive comprises Directive 2003/35/EC providing for public participation in respect of the drawing up of certain plans and programmes relating to the environment and amending with regard to public participation and access to justice Council Directives 85/337/EEC and 96/61/EC (OJ L156, 26.5.2003, p. 17).

([2]) Directive 2000/60/EC establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy (OJ L 327, 22.12.2000, p. 1) and Directive 2006/118/EC on the protection of groundwater against pollution and deterioration (OJ L372/19, 27.12.2006).

([3]) Directive 2006/21/EC on the management of waste from extractive industries and amending Directive 2004/35/EC (OJ L 102, 11.4.2006, p. 15).

([4]) Directive 92/43/EC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora (OJ L 206, 22.7.1992, p. 7).

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004598/13
an die Kommission
Michael Theurer (ALDE)
(24. April 2013)

Betrifft: Verteilung der Beiträge zum EU-Haushalt

In seinem Buch „Deutschland, Zahlmeister der EU" errechnete der emeritierte Heidelberger Volkswirtschaftslehre Professor Franz-Ulrich Willeke, dass die Bundesrepublik Deutschland seit 1991 383,6 Milliarden EUR an die Europäische Union gezahlt habe und in der gleichen Zeit lediglich 213 Milliarden EUR durch EU-Programme nach Deutschland zurückgeflossen seien. Insgesamt zahlte Deutschland netto 170,6 Milliarden EUR in den EU-Haushalt ein. Dieser Betrag entspricht, so die Argumentation Willekes, 45 % der gesamten Nettobeiträge der zehn Nettozahler in diesem Zeitraum. Denselben Tenor hat ein Pressebericht in der Frankfurter Allgemeinen Zeitung vom 11. Februar 2013 (S. 17).

Nach Hochrechnungen unter Berücksichtigung der Inflation betrage die Summe gar 250 Milliarden EUR, wenn man Zolleinnahmen und die restlichen nach Brüssel abgeführten Abgaben einbezieht.

1. Stimmen die von Herrn Willeke errechneten Zahlen mit den Zahlen der Kommission überein?

2. Stimmt es, dass Deutschland etwa 60 Milliarden EUR hätte einsparen können (seit 1991), wenn die Geberländer den gleichen prozentualen Anteil ihres BNE hätten beisteuern müssen?

3. Was ist die Position der Kommission zur Finanzierung des EU-Haushaltes?

4. Wie soll langfristig eine faire Lastenverteilung unter den Mitgliedstaaten gewährleistet werden?

Antwort von Herrn Lewandowski im Namen der Kommission
(17. Juni 2013)

1. Die von Herrn Willeke in seinem Buch genannten (und in der schriftlichen Anfrage zitierten) Zahlen stimmen mit den Angaben, die die Kommission in ihrem Finanzbericht vorgelegt hat (s. beigefügte Tabelle), nicht ganz überein. Wichtig ist aber der Hinweis darauf, dass es sich bei der Schätzung von Haushaltspositionen im Zusammenhang mit dem EU-Haushalt um einen rein buchtechnischen Vorgang handelt und sich daraus kein Indikator für die mittelbaren Gewinne aus derartigen Finanzströmen (z. B. Aufträge für inländische Unternehmen aufgrund von kohäsionspolitischen Projekten in einem anderen Mitgliedstaat) sowie die gesamten Vorteile ergibt, die jeder Mitgliedstaat aus den EU-Politiken u. a. für Binnenmarkt und wirtschaftliche Integration und politische Stabilität und Sicherheit zieht.

2. Zu einem hypothetischen Beispiel einer Neuberechnung von Zahlungen der Nettozahler gemäß dem Buchbeitrag kann sich die Kommission nicht äußern.

3. und 4. Die Position der Kommission zum derzeitigen System der Finanzierung des EU-Haushalts sowie Änderungsvorschläge stehen in dem im Juni 2011 veröffentlichten Bericht über das Eigenmittelsystem (SEK(2011)510 endg.). 2011 hat die Kommission somit Legislativvorschläge für eine Reform des Finanzierungssystems des EU-Haushalts vorgelegt, die ein einfacheres und faireres Berichtigungssystem auf der Grundlage von Pauschalbeträgen vorsehen; dies würde zu einer Verringerung des Anteils der BNE-Eigenmittel (oft als „nationale Beiträge" angesehen) führen und zu einer Erhöhung des Anteils dessen, was oft als „echte" Eigenmittel dargestellt wird, d. h. von Einnahmequellen, die — wie bei Zöllen der Fall — als unabhängig von nationalen Haushalten oder keinem einzelnen Mitgliedstaat zuzuordnen wahrgenommen werden könnte.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004598/13
to the Commission
Michael Theurer (ALDE)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: The distribution of contributions to the EU budget

In his book entitled 'Deutschland, Zahlmeister der EU' (Germany, the Paymaster of the EU), Heidelberg's Emeritus Professor of Economics, Franz-Ulrich Willeke, calculated that Germany had paid EUR 383.6 billion to the European Union since 1991 and that only EUR 213 billion had returned to Germany in the same period through EU programmes. In all, Germany contributed a net figure of EUR 170.6 billion to the EU budget. According to Willekes' argument, this amount corresponds to 45% of the total net contributions by the 10 net payers in this period. A press report in the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung newspaper from 11 February 2013 (p. 17) contained similar information.

When inflation is taken into account, the amount totalled EUR 250 billion when duty revenue and the remaining contributions to Brussels are included.

1. Do Mr Willeke's figures correspond with those of the Commission?

2. Is it true that Germany could have saved about EUR 60 billion (since 1991) if the donor countries had all been required to contribute the same percentage share of their GNI?

3. What is the position of the Commission concerning the funding of the EU budget?

4. How is it possible to ensure that the burden is shared out fairly between the Member States in the long term?

Answer given by Mr Lewandowski on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2013)

1. The figures that Mr Willeke mentions in the book (and which were included in the written question) are slightly different compared to the figures presented by the Commission in its Financial report (see the annexed table). It is however important to point out that constructing estimates of budgetary positions vis-à-vis the European budget is merely an accounting exercise and does not give an indication of the indirect gains from such financial flows (e.g. orders for domestic companies resulting from cohesion policy projects in another Member State) and all the benefits that each Member State derives from the EU policies such as those relating to internal market and economic integration, not to mention political stability and security.

2. The Commission cannot comment on a hypothetical example of recalculating payments by net payers as mentioned in the book.

3 and 4. The Commission position concerning the current system of funding of the EU budget and proposals for changes were included in the report on the operation of the Own Resources system published in June 2011 (SEC(2011) 510 final). In 2011, the Commission submitted legislative proposals for a reform of the system of financing the EU budget, including a simpler and fairer system of corrections based on lump sums, which would result in a reduction of the share of the GNI-based own resource (which is often perceived as 'national contributions') and an increase of the share of what is often referred to as 'genuine' own resources, i.e. revenue sources that could be perceived as independent from national budgets or not attributable to individual Member States as is the case for customs duties.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-004599/13
till kommissionen
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(24 april 2013)

Angående: Betrodda assistenter – hantering av konfidentiella handlingar

Kan kommissionen klargöra om den anser att parlamentsassistenter – som har ett nära förhållande, präglat av ömsesidigt förtroende, med sina respektive parlamentsledamöter – är lika betrodda som ledamöterna själva vad gäller att ta emot konfidentiella handlingar?

Svar från Maros Šefčovič på kommissionens vägnar
(5 juli 2013)

Europaparlamentet och kommissionen har i ramavtalet om förbindelserna dem emellan, undertecknat den 20 oktober 2010, enats om reglerna för att översända sekretessbelagd information till parlamentet. Dessa regler motsvarar dels internationellt tillämpade standarder för hantering och skydd av sekretessbelagd och annan konfidentiell information, dels ger de parlamentet möjlighet att effektivt utöva sina rättigheter och befogenheter.

Enligt dessa regler ska Europaparlamentet och kommissionen, i samförstånd och från fall till fall, ange vilka personer i parlamentet som har ”behovsenlig behörighet” att få tillgång till konfidentiell information för att parlamentet ska kunna utöva sina rättigheter och befogenheter. Denna ”behovsenliga behörighet” tillkommer vanligtvis befattningshavare vid parlamentet och/eller ledamöter av parlamentet. I enskilda fall kan det vara berättigat att även valda anställda vid parlamentet ges ”behovsenlig behörighet”.

I inget fall får en person som har ”behovsenlig behörighet” och som haft tillgång till konfidentiell information ge denna information vidare till en person som inte beviljats ”behovsenlig behörighet”.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004599/13
to the Commission
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: Reliability of assistants in dealing with confidential documents

Could the Commission clarify whether it considers a parliamentary assistant, who shares a close mutual trust with his or her Member of Parliament, to be of equal reliability as the MEP in terms of receiving confidential documents?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(5 July 2013)

The European Parliament and the Commission, in the framework Agreement on their relations signed 20 October 2010, have agreed the rules for forwarding confidential information to Parliament, which, on the one hand, reflect internationally applied standards for the handling and protection of classified and other confidential information, and, on the other hand, allow Parliament to effectively exercise its competences and prerogatives.

These rules foresee that the European Parliament and the Commission, in accord and on a case-by-case basis, identify those persons in Parliament who have a 'need to know' for a confidential piece of information for Parliament to be able to exercise its competences and prerogatives. This 'need to know' is normally established for office-holders in Parliament and/or MEPs. In individual cases, a 'need to know' may be justified also for selected Parliament staff.

In no case may a person for whom a 'need to know' exists and who has had access to confidential information pass on that information to a person for whom no 'need to know' has been agreed.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-004600/13
adresată Comisiei
Minodora Cliveti (S&D)
(24 aprilie 2013)

Subiect: Serviciile de îngrijire a copiilor în Uniunea Europeană, o soluție pentru reconcilierea vieții private cu cea profesională, în rândul femeilor

Reconcilierea vieții private cu cea profesională este încă o mare problemă în rândul femeilor. Statisticile arată că una din trei femei este obligată să lucreze cu fracțiune de normă, comparativ cu doar unu din zece bărbați. În UE mai mult de 6 milioane de femei cu vârste între 25 și 49 de ani sunt obligate să nu lucreze sau să lucreze cu fracțiune de normă pentru a se putea ocupa de îngrijirea copiilor și de responsabilitățile familiale. Aceste aspecte conduc însă și la lipsa remunerației sau la scăderea acesteia și, în consecință, la imposibilitatea plății serviciilor de îngrijire a copiilor (creșe, grădinițe), care ar putea fi o soluție pentru această reconciliere, dar și la scăderea veniturilor și, în final, a pensiilor femeilor.

Din păcate, în UE încă nu avem un cadru unitar în ceea ce privește serviciile de îngrijire a copiilor, însă în contextul Obiectivelor de la Barcelona, Comisia Europeană s-a angajat să promoveze schimburi de bune practici în acest domeniu între statele membre (SM) și, de asemenea, a promis să încurajeze SM să utilizeze suma 500 de milioane de euro din Fondul Social European, alocată pentru perioada 2007-2013, pentru dezvoltarea serviciilor de îngrijire a copiilor.

1. În acest context ar putea Comisia să ne ofere informații privind rezultatele schimburilor de bune practici între SM în acest domeniu al serviciilor de îngrijire a copiilor?

2. Poate Comisia să ne ofere o statistică pe țări a utilizării celor 500 de milioane de euro și să precizeze care sunt rezultatele concrete obținute în perioada 2007-2013?

Răspuns dat de dl Andor în numele Comisiei
(28 iunie 2013)

1. În 2008, a fost organizat un schimb de bune practici privind serviciile de îngrijire a copiilor din Slovenia — rezultatele au fost publicate ([1]). Un nou studiu va fi organizat în această toamnă în Franța. Rezultatele vor fi publicate pe site-ul Direcției Generale Justiție a Comisiei, în secțiunea dedicată egalității de șanse între femei și bărbați ([2]). Comisia a adoptat un raport privind realizarea obiectivelor de la Barcelona, care oferă câteva exemple de bune practici ([3]).

2. Suma de 500 de milioane de euro la care se referă distinsul membru al Parlamentului pare a fi bazată pe o neînțelegere, deoarece copiii nu reprezintă un grup-țintă al FSE. Cu toate acestea, Comisia Europeană sprijină progresele către îndeplinirea obiectivelor de la Barcelona, în special prin încurajarea utilizării cofinanțării FSE. Unele proiecte finanțate de FSE au un impact indirect asupra copiilor, cum ar fi proiectele menite să faciliteze punerea în aplicare a politicilor care vizează atingerea unui echilibru între viața profesională și cea privată sau cele care favorizează educația în spiritul familiei și al copiilor al femeilor migrante singure, responsabile cu întreținerea familiei etc. FEDER sprijină femeile pe piața forței de muncă prin investiții în infrastructura pentru îngrijirea copiilor. În perioada curentă, suma de 457 601 804 EUR a fost alocată operațiunilor selectate, reprezentând 74,3% din suma planificată (616 034 37 EUR). Pentru următoarea perioadă de programare, problema atragerii cât mai multor femei pe piața muncii, alături de îmbunătățirea calității și accesului la facilitățile de îngrijire a copiilor este abordată în mai multe documente de poziție, ca bază pentru negocierile cu statele membre. În plus, Recomandarea Comisiei din 20.2.2013 („Investiția în copii: ruperea cercului vicios al defavorizării” ([4])), care face parte din pachetul de măsuri privind investițiile sociale, susține, de asemenea, aspectele menționate anterior și subliniază importanța sprijinirii mamelor și a serviciilor de îngrijire a copiilor.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/exchange_slovenia_report_en.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/other-institutions/good-practices/index_en.htm
([3]) COM(2013)322 http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/documents/130531_barcelona_en.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/files/c_2013_778_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004600/13
to the Commission
Minodora Cliveti (S&D)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: Childcare services in the European Union — a solution to help women achieve a work-life balance

Achieving a work-life balance remains a major problem for women. According to the statistics, one in three women has to work part-time, compared with just one in 10 men. In the EU more than 6 million women aged between 25 and 49 years have to work part-time or cannot work at all in order to be able to look after their children and deal with family responsibilities. However, these facts also mean that they have a reduced income or no income at all, which results not only in their inability to pay for childcare services (crèches and nurseries), which could provide a solution for achieving this balance, but also in a drop in women's incomes and, ultimately, in their pensions.

Unfortunately, we still do not have a uniform framework for childcare services in the EU, even though, as part of the Barcelona objectives, the Commission undertook to foster exchanges of good practice in this area between Member States. It also promised to encourage Member States to deploy the EUR 500 million allocated from the European Social Fund for the 2007-2013 period to develop childcare services.

1. In light of this, could the Commission provide us with information about the outcome of the exchanges of good practice between Member States in this area of childcare services?

2. Can the Commission provide us with a breakdown by Member States showing how this sum of EUR 500 million has been used, and indicate what specific results have been achieved in the 2007-2013 period?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(28 June 2013)

1. An exchange of good practices was organised in 2008 on childcare services in Slovenia, results have been published ([1]). A new one will be organised this autumn in France, the results will be published on the Justice/gender equality website ([2]). A report on the attainment of the Barcelona targets has just been adopted by the Commission and provides some good practice examples ([3]).

2. The amount of EUR 500 million the Honourable Member of Parliament refers to seems to be based on a misunderstanding, as children are not an ESF target group. However, the European Commission supports progress towards the Barcelona targets and in particular by encouraging the use of ESF co-funding. Some ESF-funded projects have an indirect impact on children, such as projects aiming to facilitate the implementation of work life balance policies, or those offering family education and childcare for single women migrants in charge of families, etc. The ERDF supports women in employment through investments in childcare infrastructure. In the current period from the planned amount of EUR 616,034,37 for childcare infrastructure 74,3% (457,601,804) have been allocated to selected operations. For the next programming period the issue of bringing more women in the labour market linked with improving the quality and access to childcare facilities is addressed in several position papers as a basis for the negotiations with the MS. Moreover, the Commission Recommendation of 20.2.2013 'Investing in children: breaking the cycle of disadvantage' ([4]), which is part of the Social Investment Package further supports the above and underlines the importance of mother and childcare support.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/exchange_slovenia_report_en.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/other-institutions/good-practices/index_en.htm
([3]) COM(2013)322 http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/documents/130531_barcelona_en.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/files/c_2013_778_en.pdf

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-004601/13
до Комисията
Gay Mitchell (PPE), Peter Skinner (S&D), Charles Tannock (ECR), Marianne Thyssen (PPE), Angelika Werthmann (ALDE), Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE), Nirj Deva (ECR), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Diane Dodds (NI), Nessa Childers (S&D), Emer Costello (S&D), Marian Harkin (ALDE), Michael Cashman (S&D), David Casa (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Wim van de Camp (PPE), Hannu Takkula (ALDE), András Gyürk (PPE), Struan Stevenson (ECR), Evgeni Kirilov (S&D), Pavel Poc (S&D), Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE), Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Miroslav Ouzký (ECR) и Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE)
(24 април 2013 г.)

Относно: Последващи действия във връзка с Писмената декларация относно епилепсията

Писмената декларация относно епилепсията беше приета от Парламента с огромно мнозинство през септември 2011 г. Наред с други въпроси, писмената декларация относно епилепсията прикани Комисията и Съвета да:

1. насърчават изследванията и иновациите в областта на превенцията и ранното диагностициране и лечение на епилепсията;

2. превърнат епилепсията в приоритет като широко разпространено заболяване, което представлява значително бреме в цяла Европа;

3. предприемат инициативи за насърчаване на държавите членки да гарантират еднакво качество на живот за хората с епилепсия в сфери като образование, заетост, транспорт и обществено здравеопазване.

Какви стъпки са предприети от страна на Комисията за изпълнение на мерките, изложени в Писмената декларация относно епилепсията, след нейното приемане? Също така, би ли могла Комисията да представи конкретни примери за предприети от нея инициативи с цел облекчаване на бремето на хората с епилепсия в Европа?

В заключение Комисията е взела решение да обяви май 2013 г. за Европейски месец на мозъка. Тъй като епилепсията е третото най-често срещано в Европа неврологично разстройство, какви инициативи са предприети от Комисията за включване на епилепсията в рамките на Европейския месец на мозъка?

Отговор, даден от г-н Борг от името на Комисията
(26 юни 2013 г.)

Комисията споделя изразената от Европейския парламент в писмена декларация от 2011 г. загриженост относно епилепсията и бремето, което тя представлява.

Според проучване от 2011 г., озаглавено „Мащаб и бреме на психичните и мозъчните разстройства в Европа през 2010 г." ([1]), 2,65 милиона души живеят с епилепсия. Това означава, че епилепсията е петото по разпространеност неврологично заболяване в ЕС.

В рамките на Седмата рамкова програма за научни изследвания и развитие (2007—2013 г.) от 2007 г. насам беше оказана подкрепа за научните изследвания в областта на епилепсията в размер на повече от 50 милиона евро. Освен това последната покана за представяне на предложения в област „Здраве" в рамките на Седмата рамкова програма включваше като приоритет научните изследвания на патофизиологията и лечението на епилепсия и епилептиформени заболявания. Предстои няколко проекта да бъдат избрани за финансиране, след като бъде извършена оценка.

„Хоризонт 2020" — следващата рамкова програма на ЕС за научни изследвания и иновации, вероятно ще предостави допълнителни възможности за подкрепа на изследванията на мозъчните заболявания, включително на епилепсията. Предизвикателството „Здравеопазване, демографски промени и благосъстояние" може да се окаже от особено голямо значение. За справяне с него ще бъда използван подход, насочен към решаване на проблемите, и ще се обърне внимание на подобряването на диагностиката, по-доброто разбиране и лечение на заболяванията или на насърчаването на интегрираните грижи — области от практическо значение за изследването на мозъчните заболявания.

И накрая, като част от Европейския месец на мозъка, от 25 до 27 май в Дъблин се проведе Европейски форум за научни изследвания в областта на епилепсията, който беше финансиран по Седмата рамкова програма за научни изследвания и на който имах възможност да участвам.

([1]) Проучване от H.U. Wittchen и др. European Neuropsychopharmacology (2011) 21, 655-679.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004601/13
a la Comisión
Gay Mitchell (PPE), Peter Skinner (S&D), Charles Tannock (ECR), Marianne Thyssen (PPE), Angelika Werthmann (ALDE), Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE), Nirj Deva (ECR), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Diane Dodds (NI), Nessa Childers (S&D), Emer Costello (S&D), Marian Harkin (ALDE), Michael Cashman (S&D), David Casa (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Wim van de Camp (PPE), Hannu Takkula (ALDE), András Gyürk (PPE), Struan Stevenson (ECR), Evgeni Kirilov (S&D), Pavel Poc (S&D), Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE), Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Miroslav Ouzký (ECR) y Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE)
(24 de abril de 2013)

Asunto: Seguimiento de la declaración por escrito sobre la epilepsia

La declaración por escrito sobre la epilepsia fue aprobada por el Parlamento Europeo por una mayoría abrumadora en septiembre de 2011. Entre otros asuntos, la declaración por escrito pide a la Comisión y al Consejo que:

1. promueva la investigación y la innovación en el ámbito de la prevención, el diagnóstico precoz y el tratamiento de la epilepsia;

2. dé prioridad a la epilepsia como una enfermedad importante que impone una carga significativa en toda Europa;

3. tome iniciativas para animar a los Estados miembros a garantizar una calidad de vida igualitaria en cuanto a educación, empleo, transporte y salud pública para la gente que padece epilepsia.

¿Qué gestiones ha emprendido la Comisión Europea para cumplir con las medidas contempladas en la declaración por escrito sobre la epilepsia desde su aprobación? Asimismo, ¿puede la Comisión proporcionar ejemplos concretos sobre las iniciativas que ha tomado para reducir la carga de la epilepsia en Europa?

Finalmente, la Comisión Europea ha decidido declarar el mes de mayo de 2013 como Mes Europeo del Cerebro. Dado que la epilepsia es el tercer trastorno neurológico más común en Europa, ¿qué iniciativas ha adoptado la Comisión Europea para integrar la epilepsia en el Mes Europeo del Cerebro?

Respuesta del Sr. Borg en nombre de la Comisión
(26 de junio de 2013)

La Comisión comparte la inquietud del Parlamento Europeo sobre la epilepsia y la carga que supone, inquietud que queda reflejada en la declaración por escrito de 2011.

Según el estudio «The size and burden of mental disorders and other disorders of the brain in Europe 2010» ([1]) (Magnitud e importancia de los trastornos mentales y otros trastornos cerebrales en Europa en 2010), de 2011, hay 2,65 millones de personas que viven con epilepsia, lo que coloca la epilepsia en el quinto lugar de la lista de trastornos neurológicos más frecuentes en la EU.

El Séptimo Programa Marco de Investigación y Desarrollo Tecnológico (7PM, 2007-2013) ha venido financiando la investigación sobre la epilepsia con más de 50 millones de euros desde 2007. Además, la última convocatoria de propuestas del 7PM en el ámbito de «Salud» incluía entre sus prioridades la investigación sobre la patofisiología y terapia de la epilepsia y de los desórdenes epileptiformes. Se prevé que la evaluación dé como resultado una selección de proyectos para su financiación.

Probablemente, Horizonte 2020, el próximo Programa Marco de Investigación e Innovación, proporcionará nuevas oportunidades de prestar apoyo a la investigación sobre los trastornos cerebrales, incluida la epilepsia. El reto «Salud, cambio demográfico y bienestar» puede resultar especialmente pertinente. En él se seguirá un planteamiento de resolución de problemas y se intentará mejorar el diagnóstico, la comprensión y el tratamiento de enfermedades o fomentar la asistencia integrada, que son todos ellos aspectos pertinentes en la investigación sobre los trastornos cerebrales.

Por último, en el marco del Mes Europeo del Cerebro, los días 25 a 27 de mayo se celebró en Dublín el Foro Europeo de Investigación de la Epilepsia, financiado por el Séptimo Programa Marco y en el que tuve la oportunidad de intervenir.

([1]) Estudio realizado por H.U. Wittchen y otros: European Neuropsychopharmacology (2011) 21, pp. 655-679.

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-004601/13
Komisi
Gay Mitchell (PPE), Peter Skinner (S&D), Charles Tannock (ECR), Marianne Thyssen (PPE), Angelika Werthmann (ALDE), Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE), Nirj Deva (ECR), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Diane Dodds (NI), Nessa Childers (S&D), Emer Costello (S&D), Marian Harkin (ALDE), Michael Cashman (S&D), David Casa (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Wim van de Camp (PPE), Hannu Takkula (ALDE), András Gyürk (PPE), Struan Stevenson (ECR), Evgeni Kirilov (S&D), Pavel Poc (S&D), Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE), Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Miroslav Ouzký (ECR) a Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE)
(24. dubna 2013)

Předmět: Opatření v návaznosti na písemné prohlášení o epilepsii

V roce 2011 Parlament schválil naprostou většinou hlasů písemné prohlášení o epilepsii. Písemné prohlášení o epilepsii vyzývá mimo jiné Komisi a Radu, aby:

1. podporovaly výzkum a inovaci v oblasti prevence, včasné diagnózy a léčby epilepsie;

2. přiřadili epilepsii coby závažnému onemocnění, které v celé Evropě představuje značnou zátěž, prioritní význam;

3. podnikly iniciativy, jimiž podnítí členské státy, aby osobám trpícím epilepsií zaručily rovnocennou kvalitu života, a to v oblastech vzdělávání, zaměstnanosti, dopravy a veřejného zdravotnictví.

Jaké kroky dosud Komise učinila od doby, kdy bylo prohlášení přijato, aby zajistila soulad s opatřeními v něm uvedenými? Mohla by Komise dále poskytnout konkrétní příklady iniciativ, které přijala s cílem snížit zátěž epilepsie v celé Evropě?

Komise rovněž rozhodla, že se květen 2013 stane „evropským měsícem mozku". Jelikož epilepsie představuje v Evropě třetí nejčastěji se vyskytující neurologickou poruchu, jaké iniciativy přijala Komise, aby zahrnula epilepsii do „evropského měsíce mozku"?

Odpověď Tonia Borga jménem Komise
(26. června 2013)

Komise sdílí obavy Evropského parlamentu ohledně epilepsie a její zátěže vyjádřené i v písemném prohlášení z roku 2011.

Podle studie „Rozsah a zátěž duševních poruch a dalších poruch mozku v Evropě 2010" („Size and burden of mental disorders and other disorders of the brain in Europe 2010") ([1]) z roku 2011 trpí epilepsií 2,65 milionu lidí. To činí z epilepsie pátou nejčastější neurologickou poruchu v EU.

Sedmý rámcový program pro výzkum a vývoj (FP7, 2007-2013) podpořil od roku 2007 výzkum epilepsie částkou více než 50 milionů. Poslední výzva FP7 k podávání návrhů v oblasti „zdraví" navíc jako jednu z priorit zahrnovala výzkum patofyziologie a léčby epilepsie a epileptiformních poruch. Očekává se, že po vyhodnocení bude vybráno několik projektů k financování.

Příští rámcový program EU pro výzkum a inovace Horizont 2020 pravděpodobně poskytne další možnosti na podporu výzkumu mozkových poruch včetně epilepsie. Významná může být zejména oblast „zdraví, demografických změn a dobrých životních podmínek". Bude se zabývat zlepšením diagnostiky, pochopení a léčby chorob nebo podporou integrované péče, stejně jako řešením případných problémů. Všechny tyto oblasti jsou pro výzkum poruch mozku plně relevantní.

Závěrem bych rád dodal, že v rámci Evropského měsíce mozku se v Dublinu od 25. do 27. května konalo Evropské fórum o výzkumu epilepsie. Na tomto fóru financovaném sedmým rámcovým programem jsem měl možnost hovořit.

([1]) Studie H.U. Wittchena a kol. European Neuropsychopharmacology (2011) 21, 655-679.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004601/13
an die Kommission
Gay Mitchell (PPE), Peter Skinner (S&D), Charles Tannock (ECR), Marianne Thyssen (PPE), Angelika Werthmann (ALDE), Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE), Nirj Deva (ECR), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Diane Dodds (NI), Nessa Childers (S&D), Emer Costello (S&D), Marian Harkin (ALDE), Michael Cashman (S&D), David Casa (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Wim van de Camp (PPE), Hannu Takkula (ALDE), András Gyürk (PPE), Struan Stevenson (ECR), Evgeni Kirilov (S&D), Pavel Poc (S&D), Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE), Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Miroslav Ouzký (ECR) und Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE)
(24. April 2013)

Betrifft: Folgemaßnahmen zur schriftlichen Erklärung zu Epilepsie

Die schriftliche Erklärung zu Epilepsie wurde vom Parlament im September 2011 mit überwältigender Mehrheit verabschiedet. Unter anderem werden die Kommission und der Rat in der schriftlichen Erklärung zu Epilepsie aufgefordert,

1. Forschung und Innovation im Bereich der Prävention sowie der Frühdiagnose und Behandlung der Epilepsie zu verstärken;

2. Epilepsie als eine wichtige Krankheit einzustufen, die für Europa eine erhebliche Belastung darstellt;

3. Initiativen zu ergreifen, um die Mitgliedstaaten zu ermutigen, für Menschen mit Epilepsie in Bereichen wie Bildung, Beschäftigung, Beförderung und öffentliches Gesundheitswesen gleiche Lebensqualität zu gewährleisten.

Welche Schritte hat die Kommission unternommen, um die Maßnahmen, die in der schriftlichen Erklärung zu Epilepsie aufgeführt sind, seit deren Verabschiedung einzuhalten? Kann die Kommission darüber hinaus konkrete Beispiele für die Initiativen nennen, die sie eingeleitet hat, um die von Epilepsie ausgehende Belastung für Europa zu verringern?

Schließlich hat die Kommission beschlossen, den Monat Mai 2013 zum Europäischen Monat des Gehirns zu erklären. Epilepsie stellt die dritthäufigste neurologische Störung in Europa dar. Welche Initiativen hat die Kommission vor diesem Hintergrund ergriffen, um Epilepsie in den Europäischen Monat des Gehirns einzubeziehen?

Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(26. Juni 2013)

Die Kommission teilt die Sorge des Europäischen Parlaments hinsichtlich Epilepsie und der damit verbundenen Belastungen, wie sie in der schriftlichen Erklärung von 2011 zum Ausdruck kommt.

Der Studie „The size and burden of mental disorders and other disorders of the brain in Europe 2010" ([1]) aus dem Jahr 2011 zufolge leben 2,65 Millionen Menschen mit Epilepsie. Somit befindet sich Epilepsie auf Rang fünf der häufigsten neurologischen Erkrankungen in der EU.

Seit 2007 ist die Epilepsieforschung mit mehr als 50 Mio. EUR aus dem Siebten Forschungsrahmenprogramm (FP7, 2007-2013) unterstützt worden. Ferner waren Forschungsprojekte zur Pathophysiologie und Behandlung von Epilepsie und epileptiformen Erkrankungen eine der Prioritäten der letzten FP7-Aufforderung zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen zum Thema Gesundheit. Nach der Bewertung werden voraussichtlich mehrere Projekte für eine Finanzierung ausgewählt.

Auch im Rahmen des nächsten EU-Forschungsrahmenprogramms „Horizont 2020" wird es wahrscheinlich weitere Möglichkeiten zur Förderung der Erforschung von Hirnerkrankungen, einschließlich Epilepsie, geben. Die darin hervorgehobene Herausforderung „Gesundheit, demografischer Wandel und Wohlbefinden" kann hier von besonderer Bedeutung sein. Die Tätigkeiten werden einem auf Problemlösung orientierten Ansatz folgen und sich mit der Verbesserung von Diagnosen, dem Verstehen und Behandeln von Erkrankungen oder der Förderung integrierter Pflege befassen — alle diese Themen sind auch für die Forschung von Erkrankungen des Gehirns von Belang.

Schließlich fand im Rahmen des „Europäischen Monats des Gehirns" vom 25. bis zum 27. Mai in Dublin ein Europäisches Forum über Epilepsieforschung statt. Ich habe mit einem Redebeitrag an diesem Forum teilgenommen, das über das Siebte Forschungsrahmenprogramm finanziert wurde.

([1]) Studie von H. U. Wittchen et al., European Neuropsychopharmacology (2011) 21, S. 655.-679.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004601/13
à la Commission
Gay Mitchell (PPE), Peter Skinner (S&D), Charles Tannock (ECR), Marianne Thyssen (PPE), Angelika Werthmann (ALDE), Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE), Nirj Deva (ECR), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Diane Dodds (NI), Nessa Childers (S&D), Emer Costello (S&D), Marian Harkin (ALDE), Michael Cashman (S&D), David Casa (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Wim van de Camp (PPE), Hannu Takkula (ALDE), András Gyürk (PPE), Struan Stevenson (ECR), Evgeni Kirilov (S&D), Pavel Poc (S&D), Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE), Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Miroslav Ouzký (ECR) et Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE)
(24 avril 2013)

Objet: Suites données à la déclaration écrite sur l'épilepsie

La déclaration écrite sur l'épilepsie a été publiée par le Parlement européen en septembre 2011 après avoir reçu la signature d'une écrasante majorité de députés. Cette déclaration invite notamment la Commission et le Conseil:

1. à encourager la recherche et l'innovation dans le domaine de la prévention, ainsi que du diagnostic et du traitement précoces de l'épilepsie;

2. à accorder la priorité à l'épilepsie au titre de grave maladie qui représente une lourde charge dans l'ensemble de l'Europe;

3. à prendre des initiatives visant à encourager les États membres à assurer une qualité de vie égale, y compris en matière d'éducation, d'emploi, de transport et de soins de santé public, pour les personnes atteintes d'épilepsie.

Quelles mesures la Commission a-t-elle prises qui aillent dans le sens esquissé dans la déclaration écrite sur l'épilepsie, depuis que cette déclaration lui a été transmise? Pourrait-elle de surcroît donner des exemples concrets d'initiatives qu'elle aurait prises pour alléger la charge de l'épilepsie dans l'ensemble de l'Europe?

Par ailleurs, la Commission a décidé de faire de mai 2013 le Mois européen du cerveau. Puisque, par sa fréquence, l'épilepsie est le troisième trouble neurologique en Europe, quelles initiatives a-t-elle prises pour inscrire l'épilepsie au programme du Mois européen du cerveau?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(26 juin 2013)

La Commission partage les préoccupations exprimées dans la déclaration écrite de 2011 du Parlement européen au sujet de l'épilepsie et de la charge de morbidité qu'elle représente.

Selon l'étude intitulée «The size and burden of mental disorders and other disorders of the brain in Europe 2010» (Importance et charge de morbidité des troubles mentaux et autres troubles cérébraux en Europe), étude publiée en 2011 ([1]), 2,65 millions de personnes sont atteintes d'épilepsie, laquelle occuperait ainsi la cinquième place au classement des troubles neurologiques les plus fréquents dans l'Union européenne.

Le septième programme-cadre de recherche et de développement (PC7, 2007-2013) alloue plus de 50 millions d'euros à la recherche sur l'épilepsie. Son dernier appel à propositions dans le domaine de la santé comportait parmi ses priorités une recherche sur la pathophysiologie et le traitement de l'épilepsie et des troubles épileptiformes. Plusieurs projets devraient bénéficier d'une aide financière au terme de l'évaluation.

Horizon 2020, le futur programme-cadre de l'Union pour la recherche et l'innovation, devrait offrir de nouvelles possibilités de soutenir la recherche sur les troubles cérébraux, y compris l'épilepsie. Les actions menées au titre du défi «Santé, évolution démographique et bien-être» peuvent être particulièrement utiles à cet égard. Elles suivront une nouvelle méthode de résolution des problèmes et viseront à améliorer le diagnostic, la compréhension et le traitement des maladies ou à promouvoir un traitement intégré, autant d'aspects présentant un grand intérêt pour la recherche sur les troubles cérébraux.

Enfin, dans le contexte du «Mois européen du cerveau», un forum européen consacré à la recherche sur l'épilepsie et financé par le PC7 s'est tenu à Dublin du 25 au 27 mai. J'ai eu l'occasion d'y prendre la parole.

([1]) Étude de H.U. Wittchen et al «European Neuropsychopharmacology» (Neuropsychopharmacologie européenne) (2011) 21, 655-679.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004601/13
alla Commissione
Gay Mitchell (PPE), Peter Skinner (S&D), Charles Tannock (ECR), Marianne Thyssen (PPE), Angelika Werthmann (ALDE), Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE), Nirj Deva (ECR), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Diane Dodds (NI), Nessa Childers (S&D), Emer Costello (S&D), Marian Harkin (ALDE), Michael Cashman (S&D), David Casa (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Wim van de Camp (PPE), Hannu Takkula (ALDE), András Gyürk (PPE), Struan Stevenson (ECR), Evgeni Kirilov (S&D), Pavel Poc (S&D), Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE), Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Miroslav Ouzký (ECR) e Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE)
(24 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Seguito della dichiarazione scritta sull'Epilessia

La dichiarazione scritta sull'Epilessia è stata approvata dal Parlamento europeo con una maggioranza schiacciante nel settembre 2011. Tra le altre questioni, la dichiarazione scritta sull'epilessia ha invitato la Commissione e il Consiglio a:

1. incoraggiare la ricerca e l'innovazione nell'ambito della prevenzione, della diagnosi precoce e della cura dell'epilessia;

2. dare priorità all'epilessia quale malattia grave che impone un onere significativo in tutta Europa;

3. prendere iniziative per incoraggiare gli Stati membri a garantire pari qualità di vita, anche con riferimento a istruzione, occupazione, trasporti e sanità pubblica, per le persone affette da epilessia.

Quali passi ha effettuato la Commissione per aderire alle misure delineate nella dichiarazione scritta sull'epilessia da quando è stata approvata? Inoltre, può la Commissione offrire esempi concreti di iniziative prese per ridurre l'onere dell' epilessia in tutta Europa?

Infine, la Commissione europea ha deciso di proclamare maggio 2013 il Mese europeo del Cervello. Dato che l'epilessia è al terzo posto tra i disturbi neurologici più comuni in Europa, quali iniziative ha preso la Commissione europea per inserire l'epilessia nell'ambito del Mese europeo del Cervello?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(26 giugno 2013)

La Commissione condivide le preoccupazioni del Parlamento europeo sulla problematica dell'epilessia e sugli oneri che essa comporta, come indicato nella dichiarazione scritta del 2011.

Secondo lo studio «The size and burden of mental disorders and other disorders of the brain in Europe 2010» (l'entità e l'onere delle turbe mentali e di altri disturbi cerebrali in Europa 2010) ([1]) si trovano a convivere con l'epilessia 2,65 milioni di persone. Ciò fa dell'epilessia il quinto disturbo neurologico a più alta prevalenza nell'UE.

Il Settimo programma quadro di ricerca e sviluppo (PQ7, 2007-2013) sostiene dal 2007 la ricerca sull'epilessia con un importo di più di 50 milioni di euro. Inoltre, nell'ambito del PQ7 l'invito a presentare proposte in relazione all'area «salute» comprendeva tra le priorità la ricerca sulla fisiopatologia e sulla terapia dell'epilessia e dei disturbi epilettiformi. Superata la fase di valutazione dovrebbero essere selezionati diversi progetti per ottenere un finanziamento.

Orizzonte 2020, il prossimo programma quadro per la ricerca e l'innovazione dell'UE, dovrebbe offrire ulteriori opportunità di sostegno per la ricerca sui disturbi cerebrali, compresa l'epilessia. Il capitolo «Salute, cambiamento demografico e benessere» può essere particolarmente pertinente. Il programma seguirà un approccio pragmatico di soluzione dei problemi e tratterà gli aspetti della diagnosi, della conoscenza e del trattamento delle malattie ovvero la promozione di cure integrate, tutti ambiti estremamente rilevanti per la ricerca sui disturbi cerebrali.

Inoltre, nel contesto del Mese europeo del cervello, si è svolto a Dublino il 25-27 maggio un forum europeo sulla ricerca sull'epilessia. Ho avuto l'occasione di prendere la parola in questo forum che è stato finanziato dal Settimo programma quadro di ricerca.

([1]) Studio di H.U. Wittchen et al., European Neuropsychopharmacology (2011) 21, 655-679.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-004601/13
a Bizottság számára
Gay Mitchell (PPE), Peter Skinner (S&D), Charles Tannock (ECR), Marianne Thyssen (PPE), Angelika Werthmann (ALDE), Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE), Nirj Deva (ECR), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Diane Dodds (NI), Nessa Childers (S&D), Emer Costello (S&D), Marian Harkin (ALDE), Michael Cashman (S&D), David Casa (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Wim van de Camp (PPE), Hannu Takkula (ALDE), Gyürk András (PPE), Struan Stevenson (ECR), Evgeni Kirilov (S&D), Pavel Poc (S&D), Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE), Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Miroslav Ouzký (ECR) és Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE)
(2013. április 24.)

Tárgy: Az epilepsziáról szóló írásbeli nyilatkozat nyomon követése

Az epilepsziáról szóló írásbeli nyilatkozatot a Parlament 2011 szeptemberében határozott többséggel elfogadta. Az epilepsziáról szóló írásbeli nyilatkozat többek között a következőkre hívta fel a Bizottságot és a Tanácsot:

1. ösztönözze a kutatást és fejlesztést az epilepszia megelőzése, korai diagnózisa és kezelése terén;

2. rangsorolja az epilepsziát súlyos betegségként, amely Európa-szerte számottevő terhet jelent;

3. indítson kezdeményezéseket, amelyek a tagállamokat az epilepsziás személyek egyenlő életminőségének biztosítására sarkallják, egyebek közt az oktatás, a foglalkoztatás, a közlekedés és az egészségügyi ellátás terén.

A nyilatkozat elfogadása óta milyen lépéseket tett a Bizottság az epilepsziáról szóló írásbeli nyilatkozatban felvázolt intézkedéseknek való megfelelés érdekében? Tudna-e a Bizottság konkrét példákkal szolgálni az olyan kezdeményezésekre, amelyeket az epilepszia Európa-szerte számottevő terhének csökkentése érdekében indított?

Végül, a Bizottság úgy határozott, hogy 2013 májusát az agykutatás európai hónapjává nevezi ki. Tekintettel arra, hogy az epilepszia a harmadik leggyakoribb idegrendszeri zavar Európában, milyen kezdeményezéseket tett a Bizottság annak érdekében, hogy az epilepszia témája része legyen az agykutatás európai hónapjának?

Tonio Borg válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. június 26.)

A Bizottság osztja az Európai Parlamentnek az epilepsziára és az azzal kapcsolatos tehertételre vonatkozó aggodalmát, amelyet 2011-es írásbeli nyilatkozatában is kifejezett.

A 2011-ben megjelent *The size and burden of mental disorders and other disorders of the brain in Europe 2010* ([1]) („A mentális zavaroknak és az agy egyéb rendellenességeinek mértéke és az ezek által jelentett teher 2010-ben Európában") című tanulmány szerint 2,65 millió ember szenved epilepsziában. Ez azt jelenti, hogy az epilepszia az ötödik leggyakoribb idegrendszeri zavar az Európai Unióban.

A hetedik kutatási és technológiafejlesztési keretprogram (FP7, 2007–2013) 2007 óta több mint 50 millió euróval támogatta az epilepszia kutatását. Továbbá a legutóbbi FP7 egészségügy területére vonatkozó ajánlattételi felhívásában a kórélettannal, valamint az epilepszia és az epileptiform betegségek gyógyításával kapcsolatos kutatás is prioritásként szerepelt. Az értékelést követően várhatóan számos projektet fognak finanszírozásra kiválasztani.

Az Unió következő, „Horizont 2020" elnevezésű kutatási és innovációs keretprogramja további lehetőségeket nyújthat az agyi rendellenességek, köztük az epilepszia kutatásának támogatására. Az „Egészség, demográfiai változások és jólét" kihívás rendkívül jelentőssé válhat. A keretprogram ezen része problémamegoldó megközelítést tartalmaz majd, és a betegségek diagnosztizálásának, megértésének és kezelésének tökéletesítését, illetve az integrált ellátás támogatását fogja célozni. Ezek a területek mind szorosan kapcsolódnak az agyi rendellenességek kutatásához.

Végül pedig az agykutatás európai hónapjának részeként május 25. és 27. között egy epilepsziakutatási fórumot rendeztek Dublinban. Alkalmam volt részt venni ezen a fórumon, amelyet a hetedik kutatási keretprogram finanszírozott.

([1]) H. U. Wittchen et al. tanulmánya, European Neuropsychopharmacology (2011) 21, 655–679.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-004601/13
lill-Kummissjoni
Gay Mitchell (PPE), Peter Skinner (S&D), Charles Tannock (ECR), Marianne Thyssen (PPE), Angelika Werthmann (ALDE), Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE), Nirj Deva (ECR), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Diane Dodds (NI), Nessa Childers (S&D), Emer Costello (S&D), Marian Harkin (ALDE), Michael Cashman (S&D), David Casa (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Wim van de Camp (PPE), Hannu Takkula (ALDE), András Gyürk (PPE), Struan Stevenson (ECR), Evgeni Kirilov (S&D), Pavel Poc (S&D), Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE), Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Miroslav Ouzký (ECR) u Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE)
(24 ta' April 2013)

Suġġett: Segwitu għad-Dikjarazzjoni Miktuba dwar l-Epilessija

Id-Dikjarazzjoni Miktuba dwar l-Epilessija ġiet approvata mill-Parlament b'maġġoranza assoluta f'Settembru 2011. Fost kwistjonijiet oħra, id-Dikjarazzjoni Miktuba dwar l-Epilessija stiednet lill-Kummissjoni u lill-Kunsill sabiex:

1. jinkoraġġixxu r-riċerka u l-innovazzjoni fil-qasam tal-prevenzjoni u d-dijanjosi bikrija u l-kura tal-epilessija;

2. jagħtu prijorità lill-epilessija bħala marda ewlenija li timponi piż sinifikanti fl-Ewropa kollha;

3. jieħdu inizjattivi sabiex iħeġġu lill-Istati Membri jiżguraw kwalità ta' ħajja ugwali f'oqsma bħall-edukazzjoni, l-impjiegi, it-trasport, u l-kura tas-saħħa pubblika, għall-persuni li jsofru mill-epilessija.

X'passi ħadet il-Kummissjoni sabiex tikkonforma mal-miżuri msemmija fid-Dikjarazzjoni Miktuba dwar l-Epilessija mindu ġiet approvata? Barra minn hekk, tista' l-Kummissjoni tipprovdi eżempji konkreti tal-inizjattivi li ħadet sabiex tnaqqas il-piż tal-epilessija fl-Ewropa?

Fl-aħħar nett, il-Kummissjoni ddeċidiet li tiddedika x-xahar ta' Mejju 2013 bħala x-Xahar Ewropew tal-Moħħ. Billi l-epilessija hija t-tielet marda newroloġika l-aktar komuni fl-Ewropa, x'inizjattivi ħadet il-Kummissjoni sabiex tintegra l-epilessija fi ħdan ix-Xahar Ewropew tal-Moħħ?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Borg f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(26 ta' Ġunju 2013)

Il-Kummissjoni tikkondividi t-tħassib tal-Parlament Ewropew dwar l-epilessija u l-konsegwenzi tagħha, kif mistqarr fid-Dikjarazzjoni bil-Miktub tagħha tal-2011.

Skont l-istudju, "The size and burden of mental disorders and other disorders of the brain in Europe 2010" ([1]) tal-2011, 2.65 miljun persuna qed jgħixu bl-epilessija. Dan jagħmel l-epilessija l-ħames l-aktar disturb newroloġiku prevalenti fl-UE.

Is-Seba' Programm Kwadru għar-Riċerka u l-Iżvilupp (FP7, 2007-2013) appoġġa r-riċerka dwar l-epilessija b'aktar minn EUR 50 miljun mill-2007. Barra minn hekk, l-aħħar sejħa għall-proposti tal-FP7 fil-qasam tas-saħħa tinkludi bħala prijorità r-riċerka dwar il-patofiżjoloġija u t-terapija fir-rigward tal-epilessija u d-disturbi epilettiformi . Bosta mill-proġetti mistennija jingħażlu għall-finanzjament wara l-evalwazzjoni.

Orizzont 2020, il-Programm Qafas tal-UE li jmiss għar-Riċerka u l-Innovazzjoni, aktarx li jipprovdi aktar opportunitajiet biex tiġi appoġġata r-riċerka dwar id-disturbi tal-moħħ, inkluż dwar l-epilessija. L-isfida "Saħħa, tibdil demografiku u benesseri" tista' tkun partikolarment rilevanti. Se ssegwi approċċ ta' soluzzjoni tal-problemi u se tindirizza t-titjib fid-dijanjożi, il-fehim u t-trattament tal-mard, jew il-promozzjoni tal-kura integrata, oqsma li kollha huma rilevanti bis-sħiħ għar-riċerka dwar id-disturbi tal-moħħ.

Fl-aħħar nett, bħala parti mix-Xahar Ewropew tal-Moħħ, sar Forum Ewropew dwar l-Epilessija f'Dublin bejn il-25 u s-27 ta' Mejju. Kelli l-opportunità nindirizza dan il-forum, li kien iffinanzjat mis-Seba' Programm ta' Qafas għar-Riċerka.

([1]) Studju ta' H.U Wittchen et al European Neuropsychopharmacology (2011) 21, 655-679.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004601/13
aan de Commissie
Gay Mitchell (PPE), Peter Skinner (S&D), Charles Tannock (ECR), Marianne Thyssen (PPE), Angelika Werthmann (ALDE), Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE), Nirj Deva (ECR), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Diane Dodds (NI), Nessa Childers (S&D), Emer Costello (S&D), Marian Harkin (ALDE), Michael Cashman (S&D), David Casa (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Wim van de Camp (PPE), Hannu Takkula (ALDE), András Gyürk (PPE), Struan Stevenson (ECR), Evgeni Kirilov (S&D), Pavel Poc (S&D), Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE), Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Miroslav Ouzký (ECR) en Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE)
(24 april 2013)

Betreft: Vervolg op de schriftelijke verklaring over epilepsie

De schriftelijke verklaring over epilepsie is in september 2011 met een overweldigende meerderheid door het Parlement aangenomen. In de schriftelijke verklaring over epilepsie werden onder andere de Commissie en de Raad verzocht om:

1. onderzoek en innovatie op het gebied van preventie en vroegtijdige diagnose en behandeling van epilepsie te stimuleren;

2. epilepsie prioriteit te geven als een belangrijke ziekte die in heel Europa voor een aanzienlijke belasting zorgt;

3. initiatief te nemen om lidstaten aan te moedigen een gelijke kwaliteit van leven te garanderen voor mensen met epilepsie op terreinen als onderwijs, werkgelegenheid, vervoer en gezondheidszorg.

Welke maatregelen heeft de Commissie sindsdien genomen om te voldoen aan de richtsnoeren die in de schriftelijke verklaring over epilepsie staan vermeld? Kan de Commissie verder concrete voorbeelden geven van de initiatieven die zij heeft genomen om de belasting van epilepsie in Europa te verminderen?

Ten slotte heeft de Commissie besloten om mei 2013 tot Europese Maand van de hersenen te maken. Welke initiatieven heeft de Commissie ondernomen om epilepsie te integreren in de Europese Maand van de hersenen, gezien het feit dat epilepsie de op twee na grootste neurologische aandoening in Europa is?

Antwoord van de heer Borg namens de Commissie
(26 juni 2013)

De Commissie deelt de bezorgdheid van het Europees Parlement over epilepsie en de belasting hiervan, als omschreven in haar schriftelijke verklaring van 2011.

Volgens het onderzoek „The size and burden of mental disorders and other disorders of the brain in Europe 2010" ([1]) uit 2011 hebben 2,65 miljoen mensen epilepsie. Dit betekent dat epilepsie de op vier na grootste neurologische aandoening in de EU is.

Het zevende kaderprogramma voor onderzoek en ontwikkeling (FP7, 2007-2013) heeft sinds 2007 meer dan 50 miljoen EUR vrijgemaakt voor onderzoek naar epilepsie. Daarnaast werd het onderzoek naar de pathofysiologie en therapie van epilepsie en epileptische aandoeningen, dat tot de laatste FP7-oproep voor het indienen van voorstellen op het gebied van „gezondheid" behoorde, aangemerkt als prioriteit. Naar aanleiding van de evaluatie wordt verwacht dat verschillende projecten geselecteerd zullen worden voor financiering.

Het volgende EU-kaderprogramma voor onderzoek en innovatie (Horizon 2020) zal waarschijnlijk aanvullende mogelijkheden bieden om het onderzoek naar hersenaandoeningen, waaronder epilepsie, te ondersteunen. De uitdaging „gezondheid, demografische veranderingen en welzijn" kan bijzonder relevant zijn. Het zal een probleemoplossende aanpak volgen en zich bezighouden met het verbeteren van de diagnose, het begrip en de behandeling van ziekten, of het bevorderen van geïntegreerde zorgverlening; al deze gebieden zijn volkomen relevant voor onderzoek naar hersenaandoeningen.

Tot slot vond er als onderdeel van de Europese Maand van de hersenen een Europees forum voor epilepsieonderzoek plaats in Dublin van 25-27 mei. Ik was in de gelegenheid om als spreker op te treden tijdens dit forum, dat gefinancierd werd door het zevende kaderprogramma voor onderzoek.

([1]) Onderzoek van H. U. Wittchen et al European Neuropsychopharmacology (2011) 21, 655-679.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-004601/13
do Komisji
Gay Mitchell (PPE), Peter Skinner (S&D), Charles Tannock (ECR), Marianne Thyssen (PPE), Angelika Werthmann (ALDE), Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE), Nirj Deva (ECR), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Diane Dodds (NI), Nessa Childers (S&D), Emer Costello (S&D), Marian Harkin (ALDE), Michael Cashman (S&D), David Casa (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Wim van de Camp (PPE), Hannu Takkula (ALDE), András Gyürk (PPE), Struan Stevenson (ECR), Evgeni Kirilov (S&D), Pavel Poc (S&D), Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE), Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Miroslav Ouzký (ECR) oraz Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE)
(24 kwietnia 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Oddźwięk oświadczenia pisemnego w sprawie padaczki

We wrześniu 2011 r. Parlament Europejski przytłaczającą większością głosów przyjął oświadczenie pisemne w sprawie padaczki. Poza innymi kwestiami oświadczenie pisemne w sprawie padaczki wzywało Komisję i Radę do:

1. zachęcania do prowadzenia badań i wprowadzania innowacji w obszarze zapobiegania, wczesnego wykrywania i leczenia padaczki;

2. uznania padaczki za ciężką chorobę będącą przyczyną znacznych obciążeń w skali ogólnoeuropejskiej;

3. podejmowania inicjatyw na rzecz zachęcania państw członkowskich do zapewniania chorym na padaczkę jednakowej jakości życia w takich obszarach jak edukacja, zatrudnienie, transport i publiczna opieka zdrowotna.

Jakie kroki poczyniła Komisja od momentu przyjęcia oświadczenia pisemnego w sprawie padaczki, by działać w zgodzie ze środkami określonymi w oświadczeniu? Czy Komisja mogłaby ponadto podać konkretne przykłady inicjatyw przez nią podjętych, by zmniejszać obciążenia związane z padaczką w skali ogólnoeuropejskiej?

Ponadto Komisja zdecydowała, że maj 2013 r. będzie Europejskim Miesiącem Mózgu. Jako że padaczka jest trzecim pod względem częstotliwości występowania zaburzeniem neurologicznym w Europie, jakie inicjatywy Komisja podjęła, by uwzględnić padaczkę w Europejskim Miesiącu Mózgu?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Tonia Borga w imieniu Komisji
(26 czerwca 2013 r.)

Komisja podziela zainteresowanie Parlamentu Europejskiego epilepsją i obciążeniami związanymi z tą chorobą, czego wyraz dała w swoim pisemnym oświadczeniu z 2011 r.

Według opublikowanego w 2011 r. badania „The size and burden of mental disorders and other disorders of the brain in Europe 2010" ([1]) (Zakres zaburzeń psychicznych i innych schorzeń mózgu oraz obciążeń z nimi związanych – sytuacja w Europie w 2010 r.) na epilepsję cierpi 2,65 mln osób. Oznacza to, że epilepsja zajmuje piąte miejsce na liście najpowszechniejszych zaburzeń neurologicznych w UE.

Od 2007 r. w ramach siódmego programu ramowego na rzecz badań i rozwoju (7PR, 2007-2013) na badania dotyczące epilepsji przeznaczono wsparcie w wysokości ponad 50 mln EUR. Ponadto w ostatnim zaproszeniu do składania wniosków w ramach 7PR dotyczącym obszaru „Zdrowie" badania nad patofizjologią oraz leczeniem epilepsji i zaburzeń padaczkopodobnych uznano za priorytet. Oczekuje się, że po dokonaniu oceny kilka projektów zostanie wyłonionych do finansowania.

„Horyzont 2020", kolejny program ramowy UE w zakresie badań naukowych i innowacji, może zapewnić dalsze możliwości wsparcia dla badań naukowych nad schorzeniami mózgu, w tym epilepsją. Szczególnie istotny może być obszar „Zdrowie, zmiany demograficzne i dobrostan". W jego ramach zastosuje się podejście ukierunkowane na rozwiązanie problemu i podejmie kwestie udoskonalania diagnostyki, rozumienia i leczenia choroby lub promowania zintegrowanej opieki – wszystkie mające znaczenie dla badań nad schorzeniami mózgu.

Wreszcie, w ramach inicjatywy „Europejski Miesiąc Mózgu" w dniach 25-27 maja w Dublinie odbyło się europejskie forum poświęcone badaniom nad epilepsją (European Forum on Epilepsy Research). Miałem możliwość wystąpienia na forum, które zostało sfinansowane w ramach siódmego ramowego programu badań.

([1]) Badanie zrealizowane przez H.U. Wittchen et al. European Neuropsychopharmacology (2011) 21, 655-679.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-004601/13
Komisii
Gay Mitchell (PPE), Peter Skinner (S&D), Charles Tannock (ECR), Marianne Thyssen (PPE), Angelika Werthmann (ALDE), Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE), Nirj Deva (ECR), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Diane Dodds (NI), Nessa Childers (S&D), Emer Costello (S&D), Marian Harkin (ALDE), Michael Cashman (S&D), David Casa (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Wim van de Camp (PPE), Hannu Takkula (ALDE), András Gyürk (PPE), Struan Stevenson (ECR), Evgeni Kirilov (S&D), Pavel Poc (S&D), Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE), Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Miroslav Ouzký (ECR) a Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE)
(24. apríla 2013)

Vec: Opatrenia v nadväznosti na písomné vyhlásenie o epilepsii

Písomné vyhlásenie o epilepsii schválil Parlament prevažnou väčšinou v septembri 2011. Okrem iného písomné vyhlásenie o epilepsii vyzvalo Komisiu a Radu, aby:

1. podporili výskum a inovácie v oblasti prevencie a včasného zistenia a liečby epilepsie;

2. považovali epilepsiu za dôležitú tému, keďže ide o vážne ochorenie, ktoré je významným problémom v celej Európe;

3. prejavili iniciatívu v podpore členských štátov, aby pre ľudí s epilepsiou zabezpečili rovnakú kvalitu života v oblastiach, ako je vzdelávanie, zamestnanosť, doprava a verejné zdravotníctvo.

Aké kroky Komisia prijala v súlade s opatreniami uvedenými v písomnom vyhlásení o epilepsii od jeho prijatia? Mohla by Komisia uviesť konkrétne príklady iniciatív uskutočnených v Európe s cieľom znížiť záťaž súvisiacu s epilepsiou?

A na záver, Komisia rozhodla zorganizovať v máji 2013 Európsky mesiac mozgu. Keďže epilepsia je tretím najčastejším neurologickým ochorením v Európe, aké iniciatívy prijala Komisia na začlenenie epilepsie do programu Európskeho mesiaca mozgu?

Odpoveď pána Borga v mene Komisie
(26. júna 2013)

Komisia sa stotožňuje s obavami Európskeho parlamentu, týkajúcimi sa epilepsie a s ňou súvisiacej záťaže, vyjadrenými v jeho písomnom vyhlásení z roku 2011.

Podľa štúdie z roku 2011 „Rozsah mentálnych porúch a iných mozgových porúch v Európe v roku 2010 a záťaž s nimi súvisiaca“ ([1]) žije 2,65 milióna ľudí na svete s epilepsiou. Epilepsia je tak piatou najčastejšou neurologickou poruchou v EÚ.

Siedmy rámcový program v oblasti výskumu a rozvoja (RP7, 2007 – 2013) podporil od roku 2007 výskum epilepsie sumou vyše 50 miliónov EUR. Okrem toho posledná výzva RP7 na predkladanie návrhov v oblasti „Zdravie“ obsahovala ako prioritu výskum patofyziológie a liečby epilepsie a epileptiformných porúch. Očakáva sa, že po vyhodnotení mnohé z týchto projektov získajú financovanie.

Horizont 2020, budúci rámcový program EÚ pre výskum a inovácie, pravdepodobne ponúkne ďalšie príležitosti na podporu výskumu mozgových porúch vrátane epilepsie. Relevantná môže byť najmä výzva „Zdravie, demografické zmeny a dobré životné podmienky“. Zameria sa na riešenie problémov a bude sa venovať zlepšeniu diagnostiky, porozumeniu a liečbe chorôb alebo podpore integrovanej starostlivosti, čo sú všetko oblasti v plnej miere relevantné pre výskum mozgových porúch.

Na záver, v rámci Európskeho roka mozgu sa 25. – 27. mája v Dubline konalo Európske fórum výskumu epilepsie. Mal som príležitosť vystúpiť na tomto fóre, ktoré bolo financované zo siedmeho rámcového programu v oblasti výskumu.

([1]) Štúdia H. U. Wittchena a i. In European Neuropsychopharmacology, 2011, č. 21, s. 655 – 679.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-004601/13
komissiolle
Gay Mitchell (PPE), Peter Skinner (S&D), Charles Tannock (ECR), Marianne Thyssen (PPE), Angelika Werthmann (ALDE), Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE), Nirj Deva (ECR), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Diane Dodds (NI), Nessa Childers (S&D), Emer Costello (S&D), Marian Harkin (ALDE), Michael Cashman (S&D), David Casa (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Wim van de Camp (PPE), Hannu Takkula (ALDE), András Gyürk (PPE), Struan Stevenson (ECR), Evgeni Kirilov (S&D), Pavel Poc (S&D), Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE), Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Miroslav Ouzký (ECR) ja Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE)
(24. huhtikuuta 2013)

Aihe: Epilepsiaa koskevan kirjallisen kannanoton seuranta

Parlamentti hyväksyi kirjallisen kannanoton epilepsiaan selvällä enemmistöllä syyskuussa 2011. Kirjallisessa kannanotossa komissiota ja neuvostoa kehotetaan muun muassa:

1. edistämään tutkimusta ja innovointia epilepsian ehkäisyn, varhaisen diagnosoinnin ja hoidon aloilla;

2. korostamaan epilepsian asemaa ensisijaisena vakavana sairautena, joka aiheuttaa merkittäviä ongelmia eri puolilla Eurooppaa;

3. tekemään aloitteita sen edistämiseksi, että jäsenvaltiot varmistavat epilepsiaa sairastavien yhtäläisen elämänlaadun muun muassa koulutuksen, työllisyyden, liikenteen ja julkisen terveydenhuollon aloilla.

Pyydämme komissiota vastaamaan seuraaviin kysymyksiin:

Mihin toimiin komissio on ryhtynyt kirjallisen kannanoton hyväksymisen jälkeen pannakseen kannanotossa esitetyt toimenpiteet täytäntöön? Voisiko komissio lisäksi esittää käytännön esimerkkejä aloitteista, joita se on tehnyt vähentääkseen epilepsian aiheuttamia ongelmia eri puolilla Eurooppaa?

Komissio on päättänyt nimetä toukokuun 2013 aivojen eurooppalaiseksi teemakuukaudeksi (European Month of the Brain). Ottaen huomioon, että epilepsia on kolmanneksi yleisin neurologinen häiriö Euroopassa, mitä aloitteita komissio on tehnyt sen edistämiseksi, että epilepsia sisällytetään aivojen eurooppalaiseen teemakuukauteen?

Tonio Borgin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(26. kesäkuuta 2013)

Komissio on Euroopan parlamentin tavoin huolissaan epilepsiasta ja sen aiheuttamista ongelmista, jotka parlamentin vuonna 2011 esittämässä kirjallisessa kannanotossa tuotiin julki.

Vuonna 2011 julkaistun tutkimuksen "The size and burden of mental disorders and other disorders of the brain in Europe 2010" ([1]) mukaan 2,65 miljoonaa ihmistä kärsii epilepsiasta. Tämän mukaan epilepsia on viidenneksi yleisin neurologinen häiriö EU:ssa.

Epilepsian tutkimusta on tuettu tutkimuksen ja kehittämisen seitsemännessä puiteohjelmassa (2007–2013) vuodesta 2007 lähtien yli 50 miljoonalla eurolla. Tämän lisäksi viimeisimpiin seitsemännen puiteohjelman aihealuetta "Terveys" koskeviin ehdotuspyyntöihin sisältyi ensisijaisena epilepsian patofysiologian sekä hoidon ja epileptiformisten häiriöiden tutkimus. Odotettavissa on, että arvioinneissa valitaan useita hankkeita rahoitettavaksi.

Seuraavassa EU:n tutkimuksen ja innovoinnin puiteohjelmassa Horisontti 2020:ssä todennäköisesti lisätään entisestään tukea aivotoiminnan häiriöiden ja näin ollen myös epilepsian tutkimukselle. Ohjelman "terveys, väestönmuutos ja hyvinvointi" -osa on erityisen tärkeä. Siinä pyritään ratkaisukeskeisesti parantamaan sairauksien diagnosointia sekä niiden tuntemusta ja hoitoa sekä edistämään kokonaisvaltaista hoitoa. Nämä kaikki ovat aivotoiminnan häiriöiden tutkimuksen kannalta täysin merkityksellisiä.

Todettakoon lopuksi, että osana aivojen eurooppalaista teemakuukautta Dublinissa järjestettiin 25.–27. toukokuuta eurooppalainen epilepsian tutkimusfoorumi. Minulla oli tilaisuus puhua kyseisessä foorumissa, joka rahoitettiin seitsemännestä tutkimuksen puiteohjelmasta.

([1]) H.U. Wittchen ym., European Neuropsychopharmacology (2011) 21, 655–679.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004601/13
to the Commission
Gay Mitchell (PPE), Peter Skinner (S&D), Charles Tannock (ECR), Marianne Thyssen (PPE), Angelika Werthmann (ALDE), Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE), Nirj Deva (ECR), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Diane Dodds (NI), Nessa Childers (S&D), Emer Costello (S&D), Marian Harkin (ALDE), Michael Cashman (S&D), David Casa (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Wim van de Camp (PPE), Hannu Takkula (ALDE), András Gyürk (PPE), Struan Stevenson (ECR), Evgeni Kirilov (S&D), Pavel Poc (S&D), Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE), Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Zuzana Roithová (PPE), Miroslav Ouzký (ECR) and Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: Follow-up to the Written Declaration on Epilepsy

The Written Declaration on Epilepsy was passed by Parliament by an overwhelming majority in September 2011. Amongst other issues, the Written Declaration on Epilepsy called on the Commission and the Council to:

1. encourage research and innovation in the area of prevention and early diagnosis and treatment of epilepsy;

2. prioritise epilepsy as a major disease that imposes a significant burden across Europe;

3. take initiatives to encourage Member States to ensure equal quality of life, in areas such as education, employment, transport, and public healthcare for people with epilepsy.

What steps has the Commission taken to comply with the measures outlined in the Written Declaration on Epilepsy since it was passed? Furthermore, could the Commission provide concrete examples of the initiatives it has taken to reduce the burden of epilepsy across Europe?

Finally, the Commission has decided to make May 2013 the European Month of the Brain. As epilepsy is the third most common neurological disorder in Europe, what initiatives has the Commission taken to integrate epilepsy within the European Month of the Brain?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(26 June 2013)

The Commission shares the European Parliament's concern on epilepsy and its burden, as expressed in its Written Declaration of 2011.

According to the study 'The size and burden of mental disorders and other disorders of the brain in Europe 2010' ([1]) of 2011, 2.65 million people are living with epilepsy. This would make epilepsy the fifth most prevalent neurological disorder in the EU.

The Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Development (FP7, 2007-2013), supported research on epilepsy with more than EUR 50 million since 2007. In addition, the last FP7 call for proposals in the area 'health' included research on the pathophysiology and therapy of epilepsy and epileptiform disorderss as a priority. Several projects are expected to be selected for funding following the evaluation.

Horizon 2020, the next EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation, is likely to provide further opportunities to support research on brain disorders, including on epilepsy. The 'Health, demographic change and well-being' challenge may be particularly relevant. It will follow a problem-solving approach and will address improving diagnosis, understanding and treating diseases, or promoting integrated care, all areas fully relevant for research on brain disorders.

Finally, as part of the European Month of the Brain, a European Forum on Epilepsy Research took place in Dublin from 25-27 May. I had the opportunity to address this Forum, which was financed by the 7th Framework Research Programme.

([1]) Study by by H.U. Wittchen et al European Neuropsychopharmacology (2011) 21, 655-679.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-004605/13
alla Commissione
Antonio Cancian (PPE)
(24 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Violazione del diritto di stabilimento e delle norme sulla concorrenza in Polonia

La Regione di Varmia e Masuria (Polonia) ha escluso dal Piano regionale di gestione dei rifiuti una discarica situata a Mażany (Ketrzyn), gestita dalla società Amest Ketrzyn Sp. z o.o. (controllata da capitale italiano), avente tutti i requisiti richiesti sia dalla normativa comunitaria che da quella polacca e situata a debita distanza dai Grandi laghi di Masuria, che sarebbe in grado di gestire i rifiuti dei Comuni vicini (tra cui il Comune di Gizycko), perché non beneficia di un aiuto comunitario né di nessun altro aiuto pubblico e la decisione della Regione è di sostenere e autorizzare solamente gli impianti finanziati con fondi pubblici.

Non ritiene la Commissione che ciò costituisca una violazione del diritto di stabilimento e delle norme sulla concorrenza?

È a conoscenza la Commissione dello stanziamento di fondi europei per la costruzione di una nuova discarica a Spytkowo/Swidry nel Comune di Gizycko in Polonia (Regione di Varmia e Masuria) e, in caso di risposta affermativa, a quanto ammonta tale stanziamento?

È al corrente la Commissione del fatto che la discarica è localizzata a circa 2 km dal Lago di Dargin e ad appena 1,5 km dal Lago di Skarz e ubicata direttamente sulla principale falda acquifera della Polonia (la n. 206)? Consta altresì alla Commissione che gli Enti centrali e quelli regionali si sono rifiutati di prendere in considerazione pareri e perizie tecniche (relativamente all'ubicazione della discarica di Spytkowo/Swidry), altamente qualificati, a loro sottoposti?

Intende la Commissione verificare se la suddetta discarica costituisce un pericolo per l'ambiente e per la salute umana e contrasta perciò con le norme sulla prevenzione e sulla tutela ambientale e con la direttiva 1999/31/CE?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(27 giugno 2013)

1. Né una prima valutazione della denuncia menzionata di seguito, né le informazioni presentate nell'interrogazione scritta fanno intravvedere un'eventuale violazione del diritto di stabilimento e delle norme sulla concorrenza.

2. Il progetto «Sistema regionale di gestione dei rifiuti — Protezione dei Grandi laghi di Masuria mediante la creazione di un sistema generale di gestione dei rifiuti», che comprende la discarica di Spytkowo, è finanziato anche con fondi UE, a titolo del programma operativo regionale per la Regione di Varmia e Masuria (2007-2013). Il costo complessivo del progetto ammonta a 11,2 milioni di EUR, che il Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale contribuisce a coprire con circa 3,75 milioni.

3.-4. Per quanto concerne la discarica di Spytkowo, nel comune di Gizycko, in Polonia, la Commissione ha ricevuto una denuncia, che sta attualmente esaminando. Da una prima analisi emerge la necessità di chiedere chiarimenti alle autorità polacche circa la conformità con alcuni elementi dell'allegato I della direttiva Discariche ([1]) per appurare che siano stati presi nella dovuta considerazione durante l'iter di autorizzazione.

([1]) GU L 182 del 16.7.1999, pag. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004605/13
to the Commission
Antonio Cancian (PPE)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: Breach of the right of establishment and of competition rules in Poland

Warmińsko-Mazurskie Province (Poland) has excluded from its regional waste management plan a landfill site located in Mażany (Kętrzyn) and managed by the Italian-owned company Amest Kętrzyn Sp. z o.o. The site meets all the criteria required under EU and Polish law, is located sufficiently far away from the Great Masurian Lakes, and would be able to manage the waste from the neighbouring municipalities (including the municipality of Giżycko), but it has been excluded because it is not in receipt of EU aid or of any other public aid, and the Province has decided to support and authorise only plants that are financed with public funds.

Does the Commission not believe that this constitutes a breach of the right of establishment and of competition rules?

Is it aware that European funds have been set aside for the construction of a new landfill site in Spytkowo/Świdry in the municipality of Giżycko in Poland (Warmińsko-Mazurskie Province), and if so, what is the amount of those funds?

Is it aware that the landfill site is located approximately 2 km from Lake Dargin and scarcely 1.5 km from Lake Skarz, and that it is situated directly above Poland's main water table (No 206)? Is it also aware that the central and regional bodies have refused to take into consideration expert technical opinions and assessments (in relation to the location of the Spytkowo/Świdry landfill) that have been submitted to them?

Does it intend to check whether the aforementioned landfill constitutes a danger to the environment and to human health, and is therefore contrary to the rules on prevention and environmental protection and to Directive 1999/31/EC?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2013)

1. Neither the preliminary assessment of the complaint referred to below, nor the information presented in the written question point to a potential breach of the right of establishment and of competition rules.

2. The project 'Regional waste management system — Protection of the Great Masurian Lakes through the creation of a comprehensive waste management system', which includes the Spytkowo landfill site, is indeed financially supported by the EU under the Regional Operational Programme for Warmia and Mazury (2007-2013). The total cost of the project amounts to EUR 11.2 million, with ca. EUR 3.75 million of European Regional Development Fund contribution.

3 and 4. The Commission has received a complaint concerning the landfill in Spytkowo in the Giżycko municipality in Poland. The Commission services are currently in the process of assessing the complaint. The initial analysis indicates that there is a need for clarification from the Polish authorities about compliance with elements of Annex I of the Landfill Directive ([1]) and whether they were sufficiently considered during the authorisation process.

([1]) OJ L 182 16.7.1999, p. 1.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004606/13
an die Kommission
Jörg Leichtfried (S&D)
(24. April 2013)

Betrifft: Nationale Aktionspläne für Tiergesundheit

Im Bericht der Kommission an das Parlament und den Rat über Kontrollen zu Lebensmittelsicherheit, Tiergesundheit, Tierschutz und Pflanzengesundheit KOM(2012)0122 wird unter dem Abschnitt „Nachfassende Maßnahmen der Kommission und Durchsetzung" darum gebeten, dass die Mitgliedstaaten nationale Aktionspläne zur Umsetzung der Empfehlungen vorlegen.

Kann die Kommission in diesem Zusammenhang folgende Auskünfte erteilen:

Welche Informationen über nationale Aktionspläne liegen der Kommission hinsichtlich der Maßnahmen und der Finanzierung zur Bekämpfung der Tollwut vor?

Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(6. Juni 2013)

Das in Europa im Zusammenhang mit der Tollwut bestehende Risiko liegt vor allem darin, dass die Krankheit in bestimmten Gebieten bei wild lebenden fleischfressenden Populationen auftritt. Zur Bekämpfung der Tollwut gewährt die Union den Mitgliedstaaten seit 1989 Finanzhilfen für Programme zur oralen Impfung wild lebender Tiere. Dies hat in den nachfolgenden Jahren in den meisten Mitgliedstaaten zur schrittweisen Tilgung der Krankheit geführt.

Seit 2010 wurde die finanzielle Unterstützung der Union von 50 auf 75 % erhöht. Die unterstützten Maßnahmen umfassen den Kauf und die Verteilung von oralen Impfstoffen aus der Luft sowie Labortests. Die Programme der Mitgliedstaaten zur oralen Impfung und die Finanzhilfen der Union, die den einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten gewährt werden, werden auf der Website der Kommission veröffentlicht, sobald die Kofinanzierung durch die Union genehmigt ist ([1]).

Die Ergebnisse der vom Lebensmittel- und Veterinäramt durchgeführten Audits, darunter auch diejenigen zum Thema Tollwut, sowie die Stellungnahmen der Mitgliedstaaten zu den Empfehlungen sind auf der einschlägigen Website ([2]) abrufbar.

([1]) Die Links zu den genehmigten Programmen befinden sich im Text der Entscheidungen/Beschlüsse zur Genehmigung der Tilgungsprogramme für die einzelnen Kalenderjahre.
http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/index_en.htm

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/ir_search_en.cfm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004606/13
to the Commission
Jörg Leichtfried (S&D)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: National action plans for animal health

The 'Commission follow-up and enforcement' section of the report from the Commission to the European Parliament and to the Council on the overall operation of official controls in the Member States on food safety, animal health and animal welfare, and plant health (COM(2012)0122) asks the Member States to present national action plans for transposing the recommendations.

With this in mind, can the Commission provide the following information:

What information about national action plans is available to the Commission in terms of the measures and funding aimed at combating rabies?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2013)

The main risk from rabies in Europe, originates from the presence of the disease in wild carnivore populations in certain areas. The Union, financial support to Member State (MS) wildlife oral vaccination programmes against rabies to combat the disease provides since 1989. This has led to the gradual eradication of the disease from most of the Member States in the following years.

Since 2010 the Union financial support was increased from 50% to 75%. The supported measures include the purchase and the aerial distribution of oral vaccines as well as laboratory tests. Once approved for Union co-financing Member States' oral vaccination programmes and the financial contribution by the Union granted to each Member State concerned for those programmes are published on the Commission website ([1]).

The findings of the Food and Veterinary Office audits, including those on rabies, plus the Member States' responses to the recommendations can be accessed on the web page ([2]).

([1]) Links opening the approved programmes are found inside the text of the decisions approving eradication programmes for each calendar year: http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/index_en.htm

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/ir_search_en.cfm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004607/13
alla Commissione
Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)
(24 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Conversione di chiese turche in moschee

Il 17 aprile 2013, il sito di notizie on-line «al-Monitor» ha riferito che nella città di Trebisonda sul Mar Nero, la chiesa di Hagia Sophia (Santa Sofia) del XIII secolo, di cui è responsabile il Ministero della Cultura e del Turismo della Turchia, sarà convertita in moschea. Tale è l'esito di una decisione del tribunale di Trebisonda dell'11 aprile in risposta ad un'iniziativa della Direzione Generale delle Pie Fondazioni.

Un giudice ha deciso che il Ministero della Cultura e del Turismo della Turchia è stato nella posizione di «occupante illegale» della Basilica di Santa Sofia negli ultimi 50 anni. La sentenza costituisce un precedente che potrebbe significare che tutte le chiese e sinagoghe storiche, sono davanti al rischio di essere trasformate in moschee. Il mufti di Trebisonda, Veysel Caki ha dichiarato che la Basilica di Santa Sofia sarà presto aperta per le preghiere musulmane. Tuttavia a Trebisonda, non mancano le moschee, e mentre la Direzione degli Affari religiosi ha la seconda dotazione di bilancio dopo quella militare, non sono stati spesi soldi per la manutenzione delle chiese e delle sinagoghe del paese.

1. Qual è la posizione della Commissione sulla decisione del tribunale di Trebisonda di convertire in moschea la basilica di Santa Sofia sul Mar Nero?

2. Qual è la valutazione dei funzionari dell'Unione europea sul ruolo che questo caso potrebbe svolgere quale precedente per la conversione di altre chiese e sinagoghe storiche turche?

3. La Commissione è pronta a sollevare la questione con il primo ministro turco, ed i turchi hanno mai affrontato la questione in passato?

Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(19 giugno 2013)

La Commissione è a conoscenza dei fatti menzionati dall'onorevole parlamentare.

Non appena riceverà gli opportuni chiarimenti dal governo turco, la Commissione fornirà una risposta dando seguito alla questione.

Nel frattempo, la Commissione continuerà a seguire la situazione da vicino.

Risposta complementare di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(16 settembre 2013)

Stando alle informazioni comunicate dalle autorità turche alla Commissione, i tribunali turchi hanno deciso che la sede del museo di Hagia Sofia di Trebisonda è di proprietà della direzione generale per le Fondazioni, e non del ministero della Cultura e del turismo. L'azione giudiziaria è stata promossa qualche mese fa dalla direzione generale per le Fondazioni. Sulla base della succitata decisione, la direzione generale per le Fondazioni ha classificato la sede del museo di Hagia Sofia come moschea e ha chiesto la nomina di un imam.

A quanto risulta alla Commissione, all'inizio di luglio 2013 un certo numero di ONG locali ha promosso un'azione giudiziaria contro la decisione dei tribunali che attribuisce la proprietà della sede del museo di Hagia Sofia alla direzione generale per le Fondazioni, affermando che tale decisione viola la legge n. 2863 sulla tutela dei monumenti culturali e naturali.

La relazione 2012 sui progressi della Turchia aveva già sollevato la questione della conversione del museo di Hagia Sofia di Iznik in una moschea ([1]). La Commissione intende sollevare con le autorità turche anche la questione della conversione del museo di Hagia Sofia di Trebisonda in una moschea.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2012/package/tr_rapport_2012_en.pdf, pag. 25.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004607/13
to the Commission
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: Conversion of Turkish churches into mosques

On 17 April 2013 the online news site al-Monitor reported that in the Black Sea town of Trabzon the 13th-century church Hagia Sophia, the care of which is the responsibility of Turkey's Ministry of Culture and Tourism, is to be converted into a mosque. This is the outcome of a decision on 11 April 2013 by a Trabzon court in response to an initiative from the General Directorate of Pious Foundations.

A judge decided that Turkey's Ministry of Culture and Tourism has been in the position of an 'illegal occupier' of Hagia Sophia for the past 50 years. This ruling sets a precedent that could mean that all historic churches and synagogues face the risk of being transformed into mosques. The mufti of Trabzon, Veysel Caki, said that the Hagia Sophia will soon be opened for Muslim prayers. There is, however, no shortage of mosques in Trabzon, and while the Directorate of Religious Affairs has the second-largest budget of any government agency after the military, no money has been spent on caring for the country's churches and synagogues.

1. What is the position of the Commission regarding the Trabzon court's decision to convert the Black Sea church of Hagia Sophia into a mosque?

2. In the assessment of EU officials, what role could this case play as a precedent for the conversion of other historic Turkish churches and synagogues?

3. Is the Commission prepared to raise this issue with the Turkish Prime Minister, and have they addressed it in the past?

Preliminary answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2013)

The Commission is aware of the issue raised by the Honourable Members.

As soon as it will receive appropriate clarification from the Turkish Government, the Commission will provide a follow-up answer.

In the meantime, the Commission will continue to follow the issue closely.

Supplementary answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(16 September 2013)

On the basis of information received from the Turkish authorities, the Commission understands that Turkish courts have decided that the owner of the Hagia Sofia Museum building in Trabzon is the Directorate-General for Foundations and not the Ministry of Culture and Tourism. The legal case was launched by the Directorate-General for Foundations a few years ago. Upon this decision, the Directorate-General for Foundations declared the Hagia Sofia Museum building as a mosque and requested the appointment of an imam.

The Commission understands that in early July 2013 a number of local NGOs launched a legal case against the courts' decision allocating the property of Hagia Sofia Museum building to the Directorate-General for Foundations, claiming that it is against law No 2863 on the protection of cultural and natural monuments.

The October 2012 Turkey Progress Report has already raised the issue of the conversion of the Hagia Sofia Museum in Iznik into a mosque ([1]). The Commission also intends to raise with the Turkish authorities the issue of the conversion into a mosque of the Hagia Sofia Museum in Trabzon.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2012/package/tr_rapport_2012_en.pdf; page 25

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004608/13
alla Commissione
Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)
(24 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Aumento della produzione di oppio in Afghanistan

A metà aprile 2013, l'Ufficio delle Nazioni Unite contro la Droga e il Crimine (UNODC) in Afghanistan, in collaborazione con il ministero afghano per la lotta agli stupefacenti, ha pubblicato un rapporto in cui si afferma che la produzione di oppio probabilmente aumenterà per il terzo anno consecutivo. L'Afghanistan è attualmente il maggior produttore mondiale di oppio, che è un ingrediente grezzo per l'eroina. Nel 2012, ha fornito il 75 % della resa globale della coltura, ma con un aumento della coltivazione, ci si aspetta che arrivi al 90 %. Le vendite del raccolto contribuiscono a finanziare le bande criminali, e la produzione più alta è nel sud del paese, dove le forze ISAF della NATO sono in procinto di partire.

Gli alti ricavi per gli agricoltori spingono verso l'alto la produzione. Il PIL del paese inoltre è previsto in discesa allorché le truppe straniere lasceranno il paese. Di conseguenza, si teme che l'Afghanistan possa diventare un «narcoStato». Il rapporto delle Nazioni Unite afferma anche che gli sforzi internazionali per combattere la produzione di tali colture hanno avuto scarso successo.

Nel documento di Strategia nazionale della Commissione per l'Afghanistan 2007-2013, si pone l'accento sulla gravità del traffico di stupefacenti nel paese, e si descrive il lavoro della Commissione per rafforzare i controlli di frontiera al confine tra Iran e Afghanistan e come si siano dati 95 milioni di euro alla Polizia di Stato afghana per contribuire a combattere il problema della droga.

1. Alla luce del previsto aumento della produzione di oppio in Afghanistan, nel prossimo anno, quali passi è disposta ad effettuare la Commissione in collaborazione con l'UNODC, per collaborare sul targeting delle regioni chiave dell'Afghanistan, note per la loro produzione di oppio?

2. Per il periodo 2013-2014, quale sostegno ha dato la Commissione alla polizia nazionale afghana per combattere il traffico di droga e quali successi ha ottenuto fino ad oggi la forza nel limitare il traffico di stupefacenti in Afghanistan?

3. Quali passi ha recentemente effettuato la Commissione, in cooperazione con altri organismi internazionali per impegnarsi nell'eradicare le coltivazioni da oppio in Afghanistan? Qual è la valutazione dei funzionari dell'Unione europea quanto alla riferita inefficacia degli sforzi internazionali per debellare la produzione d'oppio in Afghanistan, come evidenziato nella summenzionata relazione delle Nazioni Unite?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(12 giugno 2013)

La relazione dell'UNODC fornisce dati allarmanti sulla produzione di oppio in Afghanistan. Il sostegno dell'UE si concentra sulla strategia nazionale afgana di lotta contro la droga imperniata sulla piena titolarità e la responsabilità del governo . Insieme ai partner internazionali, l'UE continua a sostenere un approccio globale che comporta azioni di cooperazione transfrontaliera e bilancia l'azione di contrasto con il rafforzamento delle capacità, lo sviluppo dei mezzi di sussistenza alternativi sostenibili e lo sviluppo rurale.

Oltre a sovvenzionare uno studio approfondito sull'economia dell'oppio, l'UE eroga sostegno a diversi settori: risorse idriche e naturali, salute degli animali, sementi e orticoltura, rafforzamento delle comunità rurali locali. A livello regionale l'UE sostiene la riforma della gestione delle frontiere e le azioni contro il traffico illecito di stupefacenti e finanzia progetti di rafforzamento delle capacità. Lo strumento per la stabilità finanzia interventi mirati a rafforzare la capacità di cooperazione transregionale.

Dati recenti confermano che le squadre narcotici della polizia afghana sono sempre più in grado di intercettare i traffici illeciti. La missione EUPOL e i finanziamenti del DCI continuano a contribuire al rafforzamento delle capacità complessive e a coprire le spese correnti della polizia civile. Diversi Stati membri dell'UE erogano anche finanziamenti e formazione sulla lotta al narcotraffico a unità specifiche dell'Ufficio del procuratore generale e dei tribunali specializzati.

Il prossimo accordo di cooperazione conterrà importanti disposizioni sulla lotta al narcotraffico, in modo da suggellare un impegno a lungo termine e far fronte ai problemi legati alla criminalità organizzata e al riciclaggio di denaro.

Nell'ambito del ciclo programmatico dell'UE è stato elaborato un piano d'azione operativo che dà priorità alla lotta al traffico di stupefacenti sulle strade balcaniche. Il nuovo ciclo programmatico per il periodo 2013-2017 confermerà la centralità del problema.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004608/13
to the Commission
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: Rising opium production in Afghanistan

In mid-April 2013, the UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) in Afghanistan, in cooperation with the Afghan Ministry of Counter-Narcotics, released a report in which it stated that opium production is likely to increase for the third year in a row. Afghanistan is currently the world's largest producer of opium, which is a raw ingredient for heroin. In 2012, it provided 75% of the global crop yield, but with an increase in cultivation, this is expected to rise to 90%. Sales of the crop help to finance criminal gangs, and the production is highest in the south of the country where NATO ISAF forces are in the process of leaving.

High prices for farmers are pushing up production. The country's GDP is also expected to fall as foreign troops leave the country. As a result, there are fears that Afghanistan could become a 'narco-state'. The UN report also states that international efforts to combat crop production have had little success.

In the Commission's Country Strategy Paper for Afghanistan 2007-2013, emphasis is placed on the serious nature of the narcotics trade inside the country, and it outlines that the Commission has worked to strengthen border controls on the Iran-Afghan border, and that the Afghan National Police were given EUR 95 million to help combat the drugs problem.

1. In light of the expected increase in opium production in Afghanistan over the next year, what steps is the Commission prepared to take, in cooperation with UNODC, to work on targeting key regions of Afghanistan which are noted for their production of opium?

2. For the period 2013-2014, what support has the Commission given to the Afghan National Police to combat drug trafficking and what success has the force achieved to date in curtailing the narcotics trade inside Afghanistan?

3. What recent steps has the Commission taken in cooperation with other international bodies to engage in opium eradication in Afghanistan? What is the assessment of EU officials regarding the reported inefficiency of international efforts to stamp out opium production in Afghanistan, as highlighted in the aforementioned UN report?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2013)

The UNODC report highlights worrying trends in opium production in Afghanistan. The EU's support focuses on Afghanistan's National Drug Control Strategy which ensures the government's ownership and accountability. Together with its international partners the EU continues to support a holistic approach, which involves cross-border cooperation and balances law enforcement action with capacity-building and the development of sustainable alternative livelihoods and rural development.

EU funding includes support for: water and natural resources; animal health; seed and horticulture; strengthening of rural local communities, also the funding of an in-depth study on Opium Economy. At the regional level, the EU has been supporting border management reform and Counter Narcotic (CN) actions as well as funding of capacity building projects. The IfS is supporting capacity building for trans-regional cooperation.

Recent data confirm that the Afghan Counter Narcotics Police has become increasingly effective in seizing trafficked goods. The EUPOL mission and parallel DCI funding continue to contribute to the building of overall capacity and the running costs of the civilian police. Several EU Member States also provide CN related funding and training to specific units in the Attorney General's Office and specialised courts.

The upcoming Cooperation Agreement will contain substantial provisions on Counter Narcotic, reflecting the need for a long-term commitment and the issues of organised crime and money laundering.

An Operational Action Plan framed within the EU policy cycle made drug trafficking on Balkan roads a priority. Drug trafficking is to remain so within the new EU Policy cycle 2013-2017.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004610/13
alla Commissione
Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)
(24 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Presunta presenza di piombo nel riso importato

L'11 aprile 2013, una serie di fonti di notizie ha riferito che le analisi dei ricercatori della Monmouth University, nel New Jersey, ha dimostrato che il riso proveniente da Asia, Europa e Sud America contiene quantità tossiche pericolose di piombo, che vanno da 6 a 12 milligrammi per chilo. Neonati e bambini che consumano codesti risi potrebbero essere esposti al piombo a livelli da 30 a 60 volte superiori al limite di sicurezza tollerabile, quale stabilito dalla US Food and Drug Administration (FDA).

La rivista Time ha riferito che l'FDA utilizza un parametro per la contaminazione noto come PTTI (dose totale di assunzione tollerabile) che rappresenta il livello massimo di esposizione a una sostanza prima che possa avere effetti potenzialmente tossici o avversi sulla salute. Per gli agenti tossici chimici, perché sia considerato un rischio per la salute, il livello di contaminazione deve essere dieci volte il PTTI. Tuttavia, i ricercatori della Monmouth University hanno trovato i livelli di piombo nel riso esaminato da 2-12 volte superiori a dieci volte il PTTI. Questo indica un livello di contaminazione che può quasi certamente provocare effetti negativi sulla salute.

Il riso proveniente da Taiwan e dalla Cina conteneva i più alti livelli di piombo. Grandi tracce sono state rinvenute anche nelle importazioni da Thailandia, Bhutan, India, Italia e Repubblica ceca. Il riso si contamina sia quando si pianta che quando è raccolto, allorché il suolo o l'acqua utilizzata per l'irrigazione sono contaminati. L'esposizione al piombo può colpire lo sviluppo cognitivo dei bambini e bloccarne la crescita, mentre tra gli adulti può causare danni renali, malattie cardiache e carenza di calcio. Molti anni fa il piombo era stato eliminato dalla benzina venduta nell'UE, al fine di evitare l'esposizione a siffatte sostanze tossiche.

1. Quali passi sta attualmente effettuano la Commissione per monitorare i livelli di piombo nel riso europeo esportato e nel riso importato da paesi in questione, come la Cina e Taiwan?

2. La Commissione è disposta a esaminare i risultati con i ricercatori della Monmouth University e con la US Food and Drug Administration?

3. La Commissione è preoccupata per la possibilità che il consumo di riso contaminato da piombo abbia già avuto effetti negativi per la salute negli Stati membri dell'UE?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(14 giugno 2013)

Il regolamento (CE) n. 1881/2006 ([1]) stabilisce già i tenori massimi di piombo a livello dell'UE per i prodotti alimentari. I risultati del monitoraggio del piombo nei prodotti alimentari da parte degli Stati membri sono valutati dall'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare (EFSA). Nel suo studio più recente, l'EFSA ha esaminato 114 206 risultati analitici per il piombo nei prodotti alimentari nell'arco di un periodo di nove anni. I livelli di piombo negli alimenti sono notevolmente diminuiti tra il 2003 e il 2010 (diminuzione fino al 23 %, probabilmente a seguito della graduale eliminazione del piombo da vernici, benzina e tubature dell'acqua).

Nell'Unione europea, la più importante categoria di prodotti alimentari collegata all'esposizione al piombo comprende pane e panini, tè, acqua corrente, patate e prodotti a base di patate, prodotti a base di latte fermentato, birra e bevande tipo birra. L'importanza di questi prodotti alimentari naturalmente varia a seconda delle fasce d'età, in base ai diversi modelli di consumo. I lavori futuri utilizzeranno l'ultima relazione EFSA per riesaminare alcuni dei tenori massimi vigenti.

Infine, il citato paper relativo allo studio condotto dalla Monmouth University è ricordato dall'autore a causa dei risultati contrastanti.

([1]) Regolamento (CE) n. 1881/2006 della Commissione, del 19 dicembre 2006, che definisce i tenori massimi di alcuni contaminanti nei prodotti alimentari (GU L 364 del 20.12.2006, pag. 5).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004610/13
to the Commission
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: Alleged presence of lead in rice imports

On April 11 2013 a number of news sources reported that analysis by researchers at Monmouth University, New Jersey, has shown that rice from Asia, Europe and South America contains dangerous toxic amounts of lead, ranging from 6 to 12 milligrams per kilo. Infants and children who consume such rice could be exposed to lead at levels 30 to 60 times higher than the tolerable safety limit, as set by the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA).

Time magazine has reported that the FDA uses a standard for contamination known as provisional total tolerable intake (PTTI). This represents the maximum level of exposure to a substance before potentially toxic or adverse health effects might occur. For chemical toxicants to be considered a health risk, the level of contamination must be ten times the PTTI. However, the researchers at Monmouth University found the lead levels in the rice examined to be two to twelve times higher than ten times the PTTI. This indicates a level of contamination that can almost certainly cause adverse health effects.

Rice from Taiwan and China contained the highest levels of lead. Large traces were also found in imports from Thailand, Bhutan, India, Italy and the Czech Republic. Rice becomes contaminated when it is harvested and planted, as either the soil or the water used for irrigation is contaminated. Exposure to lead can affect the cognitive development of children and stunt their growth, while among adults it can cause kidney damage, heart disease and calcium deficiency. Many years ago lead was removed from petrol sold in the EU in order to prevent such toxic exposure.

1. What steps is the Commission currently taking to monitor lead levels in exported European rice and in rice imported from countries affected, such as China and Taiwan?

2. Is the Commission prepared to investigate the findings with researchers from Monmouth University and the US Food and Drug Administration?

3. Is the Commission concerned about the possibility that the consumption of lead-contaminated rice has already had adverse health effects within EU Member States?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(14 June 2013)

Regulation (EC) No 1881/2006 ([1]) already establishes maximum levels for lead at EU level for the relevant food commodities. The outcome of the monitoring of lead in food by the Member States is evaluated by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). In the most recent study, EFSA examined 114 206 analytical results for lead in food collected during a nine-year period. Food lead levels have significantly decreased between 2003 and 2010 (decrease by up to 23%, probably due to the effect of phasing out lead in paint, petrol and water pipes).

In the European Union, the most important food category related to lead exposure include bread and rolls, tea, tap water, potatoes and potato products, fermented milk products and beer & beer-like beverages. The importance of these food commodities of course varies between age groups due to different consumption patterns. Future work will use the last EFSA report to review some of these existing maximum levels.

Finally, the cited paper of the Monmouth University study is recalled by the author due to conflicting results.

([1]) Commission Regulation (EC) No 1881/2006 of 19 December 2006 setting maximum levels for certain contaminants in foodstuffs (OJ L 364, 20.12.2006, p. 5).

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004611/13
à la Commission
Louis Michel (ALDE) et Michèle Striffler (PPE)
(24 avril 2013)

Objet: Aide humanitaire et reconstruction d'Haïti

Le 12 janvier 2010, un violent séisme a ravagé Haïti. Depuis lors, de nombreux acteurs internationaux, dont l'Union européenne, se mobilisent pour venir en aide à la population haïtienne. Beaucoup de choses ont été réalisées: de nombreuses vies ont été sauvées et une grande partie des personnes qui vivaient dans les camps de fortune a été relogée. Certes, les défis restent immenses, néanmoins, la reconstruction du pays avance.

Toutefois, un problème de taille persiste: la gestion de l'aide humanitaire et de l'aide au développement, notamment celles de l'Union européenne. En Haïti, l'UE (Commission européenne et EM) est le premier donateur d'aide humanitaire au développement. L'UE est très active sur le terrain par le biais de sa délégation et des experts de la DG ECHO. L'aide humanitaire de la DG ECHO est mise en œuvre par ses partenaires humanitaires. La Commission passe également par des organisations internationales pour mettre en œuvre des projets spécifiques pour la reconstruction.

Des sommes importantes sont allouées par la Commission européenne à des organisations internationales pour qu'elles participent à la reconstruction du pays. Des problèmes importants de contrôle de l'utilisation des fonds, de transparence et d'efficacité ont été constatés. Un exemple frappant est celui du PNUD, le Programme des Nations unies pour le Développement, qui manque de transparence et peut donc agir comme bon lui semble.

Il est impératif que la totalité des fonds alloués pour la reconstruction d'Haïti soit utilisée à cette fin. Le nécessaire doit être fait pour qu'un maximum de transparence soit de mise dans ce domaine.

Face à cette situation, que compte faire la Commission afin de maximiser la transparence relative à l'aide que verse l'UE à certaines organisations pour venir en aide à la population haïtienne? Quelles mesures la Commission a-t-elle entreprises suite au rapport d'initiative de la Commission Cocobu (Marin Ehrenhauser) sur «le contrôle budgétaire de l'aide humanitaire de l'UE gérée par ECHO»?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Georgieva au nom de la Commission
(19 juin 2013)

La Commission a pris acte du rapport de la Cocobu sur le contrôle budgétaire. Si l'aide humanitaire demeure essentielle pour répondre aux besoins humanitaires criants des groupes les plus vulnérables de la population haïtienne, la coordination et la sensibilisation au sein de la Commission et avec le service européen pour l'action extérieure (SEAE) ainsi que d'autres donateurs en faveur du développement ont encore été renforcées pour favoriser la transition vers le processus de reconstruction (LARD ([1])). Concrètement, les services de la Commission ont adopté une approche commune en matière de programmation pour ce qui est de la sécurité alimentaire, du logement et de la réduction des risques de catastrophe, afin de faciliter le lien avec des initiatives à plus long terme, compatibles avec les stratégies du gouvernement.

Un certain nombre d'actions ont été entreprises afin d'augmenter la transparence et l'efficacité de l'utilisation des fonds versés par l'UE, notamment une révision de l'accord-cadre financier et administratif (ACFA), un renforcement des ressources humaines de la délégation de l'UE en Haïti pour assurer une surveillance plus approfondie des activités mises en place par les organisations internationales, et une révision du contrat-cadre de partenariat.

Ces actions viennent compléter le dispositif de vérifications et de contrôles des opérations humanitaires actuellement en place, qui comprend des mécanismes stricts de sélection et de contrôle de la qualité destinés aux partenaires, des systèmes rigoureux d'identification des actions à financer, fondés sur les besoins, et un suivi rapproché des projets par l'intermédiaire d'un réseau mondial d'acteurs sur le terrain, d'évaluations externes, d'évaluations régulières des partenaires et d'audits financiers.

([1]) LARD = lien entre l'aide d'urgence, la réhabilitation et le développement.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004611/13
to the Commission
Louis Michel (ALDE) and Michèle Striffler (PPE)
(24 April 2013)

Subject: Humanitarian aid and the rebuilding of Haiti

On 12 January 2010, Haiti was devastated by a massive earthquake. A number of international organisations, including the European Union, have been working tirelessly since then to help the Haitian people. Much has been achieved in that time: countless lives have been saved and housing has been found for most of the people who were previously living in makeshift camps. Huge challenges remain, of course, but the country is steadily being rebuilt.

One significant problem has still to be addressed, however: the management of humanitarian and development aid, particularly that provided by the European Union. The EU, consisting in this case of the Commission and the Member States, is now the largest provider of humanitarian aid for development in Haiti. It maintains an active presence on the ground through the work of its delegation and various experts from DG ECHO (the European Community Humanitarian Aid Office), whose aid is disbursed by humanitarian organisations based in Haiti. The Commission also works with international organisations to set up specific rebuilding projects.

The Commission allocates large sums to these organisations, which they can then use to help rebuild the country. However, major problems have come to light in connection with the monitoring of the use of these funds, transparency and aid effectiveness. One striking example is provided by UNDP, the United Nations Development Programme, which is not subject to scrutiny and can thus act in whatever way it chooses.

It is vital that all funds allocated for reconstruction in Haiti should be used for that purpose alone. Every effort must be made to ensure maximum transparency in this area.

What does the Commission intend to do to maximise transparency as regards the use of the aid allocated to certain organisations by the EU in order to enable them to provide assistance to the people of Haiti? What steps has the Commission taken in response to the own-initiative report drawn up by the Committee on Budgetary Control (rapporteur: Martin Ehrenhauser) on the budgetary control of EU humanitarian aid managed by ECHO?

Answer given by Ms Georgieva on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2013)

The Commission has taken note of the COCOBU Report on Budgetary Control. While humanitarian aid continues to be essential to meet acute humanitarian needs of the most vulnerable populations in Haiti, coordination and advocacy within the Commission and with the European External Action Service (EEAS) as well as other development donors has been further strengthened to facilitate the transition to the reconstruction process (LRRD ([1])). Concrete examples include a common approach amongst Commission services in the programming of food security, housing and Disaster Risk Reduction to facilitate the link with longer-term initiatives, consistent with the government's strategies.

A number of actions to increase transparency and effectiveness in the use of EU funds has been undertaken including a review of the Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA), human resource reinforcement of the EU Delegation in Haiti allowing for more thorough monitoring of the activities implemented by international organisations, as well as a review of the framework Partnership Agreement.

This complements the existing set-up of checks and controls of humanitarian operations currently in place, including strict selection and quality control mechanisms for partners, strict needs based systems for the identification of the actions to be funded, close project monitoring through field network worldwide, external evaluations and regular assessment of partners and financial audits.

([1]) LRRD = Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-004614/13
an die Kommission
Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)
(25. April 2013)

Betrifft: Alkoholhaltiges, spätes Mittagessen mit der Hauptbelastungszeugin im Fall Dalli

Während eines Gerichtsverfahrens in Malta berichtete die maltesische Hauptbelastungszeugin von einem Mittagessen mit dem im Dienst befindlichen OLAF-Generaldirektor, nach ihrer Vernehmung. Sie sagte aus, dass sie bei diesem Essen unter Alkoholeinfluss gedrängt worden sei, das Protokoll mit ihrem Interview zu unterschreiben.

1. Kann die Kommission garantieren, dass die Art und Weise, in welcher der Generaldirektor das Verhör der Zeugin bzw. Betroffenen führte, im Einklang mit den vom Generaldirektor selbst gesetzten Regeln für solche Verhöre, den Anweisungen an die Mitarbeiter für Untersuchungsverfahren (ISIP) stattfand?

2. Es ist nicht klar, wo das Interview stattgefunden hat: War es in einem Schlafzimmer des Hotels oder einem Konferenzraum?

3. Wann begann das Interview, wann endete es?

4. Wie lange dauerte das anschließende Essen?

5. Wer hat es bezahlt?

6. Wie viel Wein wurde (von wem) getrunken?

7. Was wurde beim Essen besprochen? Wurde dort über den Fall gesprochen?

8. Welches Lokal wurde aufgesucht?

9. Warum war der Generaldirektor von OLAF der Meinung, dass er und die Zeugin bzw. Betroffene nach dem Interview eine (gemeinsame) „Erholungspause" brauchen?

10. Um was für eine Bootsfahrt, zu der der Generaldirektor so dringend musste, dass er die Zeugin zur Eile gedrängt hatte, handelte es sich?

11. Welche Ermittlungsschritte wurden aufgrund dieser (von der Zeugin bzw. Betroffenen nicht vollständig genehmigten) Erklärung getätigt? Die Zeugin bzw. Betroffene gibt vor Gericht an, dass sie später, als sie die Erklärung nüchtern nochmals gelesen hatte, einige Dinge geändert haben wollte, weil es nicht ihre Aussage korrekt wiedergab. Welche Aussagen waren das?

12. Warum reagierte der Generaldirektor ärgerlich/aufgeregt, als die Zeugin bzw. Betroffene diese Änderung verlangte?

13. Was meinte der Generaldirektor genau, als er bezüglich eines angeblichen Bedrohungspotentials der Zeugin bzw. Betroffenen, u. a. von Gesundheitskommissar Dalli sprach?

14. Was meinte der Generaldirektor, als er auf seine „Erfahrungen" in Italien hinsichtlich solcher Bedrohungspotentiale hinwies?

15. Warum hat der Generaldirektor der Zeugin bzw. Betroffenen keine Kopie ihrer Aussagen überreicht? Ist das der Normalfall?

16. Woher wusste OLAF, dass die maltesische Zeugin bzw. Betroffene in Portugal ist?

17. Warum wurde sie nicht zu einer Vernehmung eingeladen?

18. Warum wurde ihr in Portugal in einem Hotel aufgelauert?

19. Entspricht das den Vernehmungsmethoden von OLAF?

Antwort von Herrn Šemeta im Namen der Kommission
(30. Mai 2013)

Die Frage des Herrn Abgeordneten bezieht sich auf die Details einer unabhängigen OLAF-Untersuchung.

Das OLAF hat bereits öffentlich abgestritten, dass es im Laufe der betreffenden Untersuchung auf irgendeine Weise Druck ausgeübt habe oder selber unter Druck gesetzt worden sei. Außerdem hat das OLAF erklärt, dass allen befragten Personen Zugang zum Befragungsprotokoll gewährt worden sei und sie sich dazu äußern konnten. Die betreffende Person sei mehrmals innerhalb eines Zeitraums von mehreren Monaten befragt worden und habe nach einer Einsicht in das Entwurfsprotokoll die Aussagen aus der ersten Befragung bestätigt. Die allgemeinen Vorschriften seien stets eingehalten worden, einschließlich der Regel, dass Befragte Recht auf Erfrischungs- und Erholungspausen haben.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004614/13
to the Commission
Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: Alcohol-fuelled late lunch with the principal witness in the Dalli case

During court proceedings in Malta the principal Maltese witness against Mr Dalli has recounted how, after being questioned, she had lunch with the current Director General of OLAF. She testified that during the meal she was pressurised, under the influence of alcohol, to sign the statement recording her interview.

1. Can the Commission give an assurance that the way in which the Director General conducted the examination of this witness followed the rules for such questioning laid down in the Instructions to Staff on Investigative Procedures (ISIP), rules which the Director General himself established?

2. It is not clear where this interview took place. Was it in one of the hotel's bedrooms or in a conference room?

3. When did the interview begin and when did it end?

4. How long did the meal that followed last?

5. Who paid for it?

6. How much wine was drunk (and by whom)?

7. What was discussed over the meal? Was the case discussed then?

8. Which restaurant was this at?

9. Why did OLAF's Director General think that he and the witness needed to take a 'break' (together) after the interview?

10. What was the boat trip the Director General had to take so urgently that he pressurised the witness to hurry up?

11. What steps in the investigation were taken on the basis of this statement, which was not entirely authorised by the witness? The witness stated in court that when she read the statement again later, in a sober frame of mind, she wanted to change some things because they did not faithfully reflect what she had said. What were these things?

12. Why did the Director General become so angry/flustered when the witness asked for these changes to be made to her statement?

13. What exactly did the Director General mean when he alleged that there might be a threat to the witness from Health Commissioner Dalli, among others?

14. What did the Director General mean when he referred to his 'experiences' in Italy in regard to said potential threats?

15. Why did the Director General not give the witness a copy of her statement? Is that normal practice?

16. How did OLAF learn that the Maltese witness was in Portugal?

17. Why was she not invited for questioning?

18. Why was she waylaid in a hotel in Portugal?

19. Is this how OLAF normally carries out its questioning?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2013)

The Honourable Member's questions refer to the detail of an independent OLAF investigation.

OLAF has already publicly denied that any pressure was exerted on it or by it during the course of the investigation in question. OLAF has also stated that all persons interviewed were given the opportunity to review the interview record and make comments; that, in this case the person in question was interviewed several times over a period of months and having reviewed the draft record, confirmed the evidence given at the first interview; and that applicable and normal standards were respected at all times, including on rest and refreshment for interviewees.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004615/13
aan de Commissie
Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)
(25 april 2013)

Betreft: Zonnepanelen en groene energie in Hongarije

De Europese Unie heeft zich ten doel gesteld de CO_2-uitstoot vóór 2020 met 20 % te verminderen, en om deze doelstelling te halen richt zij zich op duurzame energie. De vermindering van de uitstoot van broeikasgassen helpt ons bovendien om minder afhankelijk te worden van de import van gas en olie.

Tot onze verbazing stellen wij vast dat de investeringskosten en prijzen voor zonnepanelen, omvormers e.d. in Hongarije vergelijkbaar zijn met die in België, terwijl de gemiddelde levensstandaard en inkomens er veel lager liggen. Daarnaast moedigt de Hongaarse regering het investeren in groene energie voor particulieren helemaal niet aan. Zij heeft zelfs op 1 januari 2013 de prijzen van elektriciteit en gas met 10 % verminderd om daarmee elk debat rond kernenergie te counteren en de centrale in Paks uit te breiden, terwijl elektriciteitsmaatschappijen daarentegen bitter weinig betalen voor elektriciteitsproductie via zonnepanelen. Dit belemmert beginnende ondernemers en dwingt hen om hun benodigdheden ergens anders goedkoper te zoeken, zoals in China waar zonnepanelen een derde goedkoper zijn. Dit is nefast voor de lokale productie en werkgelegenheid, en biedt geen duurzame oplossing.

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van deze wanpraktijken in Hongarije?

2. Wat kan de Commissie doen om er een einde aan te maken?

Antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie
(17 juni 2013)

Krachtens Richtlijn 2009/28/EG inzake hernieuwbare energie is het de verantwoordelijkheid en de plicht van de lidstaten om doeltreffende maatregelen te nemen om ervoor te zorgen dat het aandeel hernieuwbare energie zich ten minste op het niveau van het indicatieve traject voor de 2020-doelstelling bevindt. In 2011 lag Hongarije op schema voor dit traject ([1]). Er loopt echter een inbreukprocedure tegen Hongarije omdat het de volledige omzetting van de richtlijn niet heeft gemeld.

Dat de prijzen voor verhandelbare industriële goederen zoals zonnepanelen of omvormers in de hele EU vergelijkbaar zijn, is normaal in een eengemaakte markt en wijst niet noodzakelijk op wanpraktijken van de lidstaat met betrekking tot de steun voor hernieuwbare energiebronnen. Om de lidstaten bij te staan bij het ontwerpen en hervormen van hun steunregelingen voor hernieuwbare energie, bereidt de Commissie voor deze regelingen richtsnoeren voor die medio 2013 worden bekendgemaakt. In haar mededeling van november 2012 „De interne energiemarkt doen werken" heeft de Commissie onlangs opnieuw duidelijk gesteld dat de regulering van de energieprijzen moet worden afgebouwd voor zover zij niet met de EU-wetgeving strookt.

([1]) Voor het traject van Hongarije bedraagt de tussentijdse doelstelling voor 2011/2012 6,04 %. In 2011 bedroeg het aandeel hernieuwbare energie in Hongarije 8,1 % van het eindverbruik van energie. Om in 2020 de doelstelling van 13 % te kunnen bereiken, zal de jaarlijkse gemiddelde groei van het aandeel hernieuwbare energie nog moeten stijgen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004615/13
to the Commission
Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: Solar panels and green energy in Hungary

The European Union has set itself the target of reducing CO_2 emissions by 20% by 2020 and is committed to sustainable energy in order to achieve this target. In addition, the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions helps us to be less dependent on imported oil and gas.

We, therefore, note with surprise that investment costs and prices for solar panels, inverters etc. in Hungary are similar to those in Belgium, whereas the average standard of living and incomes in Hungary are much lower. Moreover, the Hungarian Government is not at all encouraging investment in green energy for individuals. It even reduced the prices of electricity and gas by 10% on 1 January 2013 in order to stifle any debate on nuclear energy and to expand the plant in Paks while, on the other hand, electricity companies pay precious little for electricity generation through solar panels. This hinders nascent entrepreneurs and forces them to seek their equipment cheaper elsewhere, such as China where solar panels are a third cheaper. This is detrimental to local production and employment and does not offer any sustainable solution.

1. Is the Commission aware of such malpractices in Hungary?

2. What can the Commission do to put an end to them?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2013)

Under the Renewable Energy Directive 2009/28/EC, it is the responsibility and obligation of the Member States to have in place efficiently designed measures to ensure that the share of renewable energy is at least at the level of the indicative trajectory towards the 2020 target. In 2011, Hungary was on track as regards this trajectory ([1]). However, an infringement case against Hungary is open for not notifying full transposition of the directive.

Similarity of prices across the EU for tradable industrial goods such as solar panels or inverters is natural in an internal market and does not necessarily constitute a malpractice in the support of renewables by a Member State. In order to help Member States to design and reform their support schemes for renewable energy, the Commission is currently preparing guidance for such schemes to be published by mid-2013. Regarding regulation of energy prices, the Commission made clear, most recently in its communication of November 2012 'Making the internal energy market work', that it should be phased out as far as it is not in compliance with EC law.

([1]) For Hungary this trajectory includes the interim target of 6,04% in 2011/2012. In 2011, Hungary had a renewable energy share in final energy consumption of 8.1%. The annual average growth in the renewable energy share will have to increase in order to reach the 13% target in 2020.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004616/13
aan de Commissie
Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE) en Esther de Lange (PPE)
(25 april 2013)

Betreft: Wijzigingen in Nederlandse Zorgverzekeringswet in strijd met het vrij verkeer van patiënten

De Nederlandse overheid stelt in een wetsvoorstel ([1]) voor om Nederlandse zorgverzekeraars (ziekenfonds) de mogelijkheid te geven om de kosten voor een medische behandeling, ook in het buitenland, niet meer te vergoeden indien een verzekerde zich laat behandelen door een zorgverlener (arts enz.), waarmee de zorgverzekeraar geen contract heeft afgesloten. Wettelijk verzekerde patiënten hebben het recht om op grond van o.a. de arresten Kohl (C-120/95) en Decker (C-158/96) zonder voorafgaande toestemming gebruik te maken van een extramurale behandeling in een andere lidstaat.

1. Hoe verhoudt het Nederlandse wetsvoorstel zich tot het Gemeenschapsrecht inzake het vrij verkeer van diensten/patiënten?

2. Hoe verhoudt het Nederlandse wetsvoorstel zich tot de bepalingen van Richtlijn 2011/24/EU betreffende de toepassing van de rechten van patiënten bij grensoverschrijdende zorg, die uiterlijk in oktober 2013 geïmplementeerd moet zijn?

3. Mag een zorgverzekeraar weigeren kosten te vergoeden voor een behandeling in het buitenland wanneer deze is uitgevoerd door een zorgverlener waarmee de zorgverzekeraar geen contract heeft afgesloten?

4. Indien de zorgverzekeraar de kosten voor een geplande medische behandeling in een andere lidstaat moet vergoeden, hoe hoog is dan het bedrag dat de Nederlandse zorgverzekeraar moet vergoeden? Mag dat 80 % zijn van de kosten die in Nederland vergoed zouden worden?

5. Mag er verschil zitten in de hoogte van de vergoeding die een zorgverzekeraar uitkeert voor een behandeling in het buitenland, gebaseerd op het feit of deze door een zorgverlener wordt uitgevoerd waarmee de zorgverzekeraar wel of geen contract heeft afgesloten?

Antwoord van de heer Borg namens de Commissie
(14 juni 2013)

Het Hof van Justitie van de Europese Unie heeft herhaaldelijk bevestigd dat de bepalingen van het Verdrag betreffende de werking van de Europese Unie ([2]) over het vrij verrichten van diensten patiënten bepaalde rechten geven op vergoeding van de kosten van in een andere lidstaat verstrekte gezondheidszorg. Op grond van deze regels hebben patiënten recht op vergoeding van een in een andere lidstaat ontvangen behandeling indien zij in de lidstaat waar zij verzekerd zijn, ook recht hebben op een dergelijke vergoeding. In deze gevallen dienen er geen beperkingen te bestaan op basis van de status van de zorgaanbieder in de lidstaat waar de behandeling plaatsvindt.

Deze rechtspraak van het Hof van Justitie is in Richtlijn (EU) nr. 2011/24 betreffende de toepassing van de rechten van patiënten bij grensoverschrijdende gezondheidszorg ([3]), die uiterlijk op 25 oktober 2013 moet worden omgezet, gecodificeerd. De richtlijn verduidelijkt de rechten van patiënten wat betreft toegang tot veilige en hoogwaardige medische behandelingen in het buitenland en op vergoeding daarvan. De richtlijn bepaalt dat een in het buitenland ontvangen behandeling wordt vergoed tot het bedrag dat zou worden vergoed indien de behandeling in de lidstaat van aansluiting was verleend. Bedragen mogen in mindering worden gebracht, namelijk voor eigen bijdragen, op voorwaarde dat dit ook het geval zou zijn voor gezondheidszorg die in de lidstaat van aansluiting is ontvangen van een zorgaanbieder met wie een contract is gesloten.

Zorgverzekeraars mogen de toegang tot grensoverschrijdende gezondheidszorg niet beperken en terugbetaling niet weigeren op grond van het feit dat zij geen contract hebben met een bepaalde zorgaanbieder in een andere lidstaat van de EU. Ook is discriminatie met betrekking tot de hoogte van de vergoeding verboden; die mag daarom niet van de status van de zorgaanbieder afhankelijk zijn. Een wetsvoorstel zoals dat in de vraag wordt beschreven, zou niet met de rechtspraak van het Hof van Justitie en Richtlijn (EU) nr 2011/24 in overeenstemming zijn.

([1]) Wijziging van onder meer de Wet marktordening gezondheidszorg i.v.m. het tijdig signaleren van risico's voor continuïteit van zorg alsmede i.v.m. het aanscherpen van procedures met het oog op kwaliteit en bereikbaarheid van zorg (Tweede Kamer nr. 33 253).
([2]) PB C 83 van 30 maart 2010.
([3]) PB L 88 van 4.4.2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004616/13
to the Commission
Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE) and Esther de Lange (PPE)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: Inconsistencies between the Dutch Health Insurance Act and the free movement of patients

The Dutch Government has tabled a bill ([1]) which will make it possible for Dutch health insurers (health insurance funds) to stop providing compensation for the costs of medical treatments, including those carried out abroad, if an insured person is treated by a healthcare professional (doctor etc.) with whom the insurer does not have a contract. Statutorily insured patients have the right of access, without prior consent, to outpatient treatment in another Member State on the basis of, *inter alia*, the judgments in cases Kohl (C120/95) and Decker (C158/96).

1. How does the Dutch bill square with Community law on the free movement of services/patients?

2. How does the Dutch bill square with the provisions of Directive 2011/24/EU on the application of patients' rights in cross-border healthcare, which must be implemented by October 2013 at the latest?

3. Is a health insurer allowed to refuse compensation for a treatment abroad when it is carried out by a healthcare professional with whom the insurer does not have a contract?

4. If the health insurer is required to cover the costs of a planned medical treatment in another Member State, how high is the amount that the Dutch insurer must cover? Can that be 80% of the costs that would be covered in the Netherlands?

5. Can the amount of compensation which a health insurer pays for treatment abroad vary, based on whether or not it is carried out by a healthcare professional with whom the insurer does not have a contract?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(14 June 2013)

The Court of Justice of the European Union has confirmed in several cases that the provisions of the Treaty on the Functioning of European Union ([2]) on the freedom to provide services give patients certain rights to reimbursement of the costs of healthcare received in another Member State. Under these rules patients are entitled to be reimbursed for a treatment received in another Member State if that treatment is one to which they are entitled in their Member State of affiliation. In these cases there should be no restrictions regarding the status of the provider in the Member State of treatment.

The said jurisprudence of the Court of Justice has been codified in Directive 2011/24/EU on the application of patients' rights in cross-border healthcare ([3]), due to be transposed by 25 October 2013, which clarifies patients' rights to access safe and good quality treatment across EU borders, and be reimbursed for it. It states that the level of reimbursement of a treatment received abroad should be up to the cost of that treatment in the Member State of affiliation. Deductions may be made, i.e. for co-payments, provided that these would also have been made with regard to healthcare received in the Member State of affiliation from a contracted provider.

Health insurers cannot restrict access to cross-border healthcare and reject reimbursement on the grounds that they do not have a contract with a given provider of healthcare in another EU Member State. Neither should there be any discrimination with regard to the level of reimbursement; therefore it should not vary depending on the status of the provider. A bill such as the one described in the question would not be in compliance with the case-law of the Court of Justice of European Union or with Directive 2011/24/EU.

([1]) Amendments *inter alia* to the Dutch Healthcare Market Regulation Act in connection with the timely identification of risks to the continuity of care and in connection with the tightening of procedures in order to ensure the quality and accessibility of care (Dutch Lower House Document No 33 253).
([2]) OJ C 83, 30.3.2010.
([3]) OJ L 88, 04.4.2011.

(Slovenska različica)

Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-004617/13
za Komisijo
Ivo Vajgl (ALDE)
(25. april 2013)

Zadeva: Ukrepi za zaščito čebel in drugih žuželk pred določenimi pesticidi za večjo prehransko varnost EU

Evropska komisija je 15. marca letos predlagala dvoletno-prepoved uporabe razširjenih pesticidov, neonikotinoidov, ki ogrožajo čebele in druge žuželke, ki oprašujejo. Predlog ni dobil potrebne večine, proti sta med drugim glasovali Velika Britanija in Nemčija. Škodljivosti neonikotinoidov potrjuje več znanstvenih raziskav, na primer raziskava Evropske agencije za prehransko varnost (EFSA) iz leta 2012, pa tudi študija, ki jo je 9. aprila 2013 predstavil Greenpeace. Neonikotinoidi so lahko za čebele in druge opraševalce smrtonosni, že majhni odmerki pa znižujejo njihovo odpornost na bolezni in zajedavce, slabšajo zdravje in zmanjšujejo možnosti njihovega preživetja.

Dejstvo je, da je pridelava hrane močno odvisna od čebel in drugih žuželk, ki imajo ključno vlogo pri opraševanju rastlin, a jih uporaba pesticidov življenjsko ogroža, s tem pa tudi prihodnost kmetijstva. Kot opozarja Greenpeace, je tretjina evropske hrane pridelana s pomočjo opraševanja insektov, zato „*je lahko propad čebelje populacije usoden za kmetijstvo in resno ogroža evropsko prehransko varnost*".

Zanima me, kako namerava Komisija nadaljevati prizadevanja za prepoved uporabe čim več čebelam in drugim opraševalcem škodljivih pesticidov?

Prav tako me zanima, katere konkretne ukrepe bo Komisija sprejela v letu 2013, da bi spodbudila čim hitrejši prehod iz intenzivnega v ekološko kmetijstvo, saj tudi to lahko zavaruje čebele pred pomori in slabim zdravjem?

Odgovor komisarja Tonia Borga v imenu Komisije
(14. junij 2013)

Komisija je 14. in 15. marca Stalnemu odboru za prehranjevalno verigo in zdravje živali predstavila predlog za znatno omejitev uporabe neonikotinoidov tiametoksama, klotianidina in imidakloprida, vendar osnutek ukrepa ni prejel podpore kvalificirane večine. Komisija je ukrep predložila odboru za pritožbe. Odbor za pritožbe do 29. aprila 2013 ni podal mnenja. Komisija je 24. maja 2013 sprejela akt v skladu s členom 6(3) Uredbe (EU) št. 182/2011 ([1]).

V okviru zakonodajne reforme skupne kmetijske politike, ki je v obravnavi, je predlaganih več splošnih ukrepov za spodbujanje bolj trajnostnega kmetijstva. V zvezi s čebelami bo leta 2013 Komisija še naprej sofinancirala čebelarske programe držav članic v skladu z oddelkom VI Uredbe Sveta (ES) št. 1234/2007 o vzpostavitvi skupne ureditve kmetijskih trgov in o posebnih določbah za nekatere kmetijske proizvode ([2]) o posebnih določbah za sektor čebelarstva. Čebelarske programe izvajajo države članice ter vključujejo ukrepe za obvladovanje bolezni, zlasti varooze, in obnovo staležev čebel.

([1]) UL L 55, 28.2.2011.
([2]) UL L 299,16.11.2007, str. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004617/13
to the Commission
Ivo Vajgl (ALDE)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: Measures to protect bees and other insects against certain pesticides to improve food security in the EU

On 15 March 2013 the Commission proposed a two-year ban on the use of pesticides called neonicotinoids, which are toxic to bees and other pollinators. That proposal failed to gain the required majority, with the UK and Germany among those who voted against. The toxicity of neonicotinoids has been confirmed by several scientific studies, including research carried out in 2012 by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) and a Greenpeace study published on 9 April 2013. Neonicotinoids can be lethal to bees and other pollinators. Even small doses lower their resistance to disease and parasites, impair their health and reduce their chances of survival.

Food production is highly dependent on bees and other insects, which play a vital role in pollinating plants, but the lives of those insects, and therefore the future of farming, are endangered by pesticides. Greenpeace points out as that one-third of European food is produced with the help of pollinating insects, 'a collapse in bee populations would put agriculture at risk, with dire consequences for European food security'.

How does the Commission intend to continue its efforts to achieve a ban on as many as possible of the pesticides which are toxic for bees and other pollinators?

What specific measures will the Commission adopt in 2013 to encourage a transition from intensive to ecological agriculture as quickly as possible, as that too could protect bees against death and disease?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(14 June 2013)

On 14-15 March, the Commission presented to the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health a proposal to significantly restrict the use of the three neonicotinoids thiamethoxam, clothianidin and imidacloprid. However, the draft measure did not get a qualified majority. The Commission referred the measure to the Appeal Committee. On 29 April 2013, the Appeal Committee failed to deliver an opinion. In accordance with Article 6(3) of Regulation (EU) No 182/2011 ([1]), the Commission adopted the act on 24 May 2013.

Several general measures to promote a more sustainable agriculture are proposed in the legislative reform of the common agricultural policy currently under discussion. Regarding bees, in 2013, the Commission will continue to co-finance Member States' apiculture programmes in line with section VI on special provision for the apiculture sector of Council Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 ([2]) establishing a common organisation of agricultural markets and on specific provisions for certain agricultural products. The apiculture programmes are implemented by the Member States and include measures to control diseases, in particular varroa, and to restock hives.

([1]) OJ L 55, 28.2.2011.
([2]) OJ L 299,16.11.2007, p. 1.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-004618/13
till kommissionen
Marita Ulvskog (S&D)
(25 april 2013)

Angående: EU:s cabotageregler

Sveriges television visade den 20 mars 2013 en dokumentär om den svenska åkeribranschen. I programmet kan man bland annat se hur transportörer och speditörer pressar ner priserna till en nivå som omöjliggör för en svensk åkare att konkurrera om de har chaufförer som får betalt enligt svenska regler och villkor.

Med andra ord har EU:s cabotageregler gett upphov till en situation där marknaden snedvrids. Resultatet blir att priserna pressas ner till nivåer som är omöjliga att möta för ett företag som följer svenska regler och avtal.

Samtidigt som utländska chaufförer i många fall tvingas arbeta under oacceptabla villkor.

Är kommissionen medveten om att detta program sänts och om de villkor som presenteras? Om inte så finns dokumentären att se på http://www.svtplay.se/video/1099762/del-9.

Vad kommer kommissionären göra för att säkerställa att dagens regler för cabotage inte bidrar till oacceptabla löner och arbetsvillkor för chaufförer från Sverige och från andra länder när de arbetar inom Sverige? Hur skall man se till att chaufförerna får ta del av de villkor och löner de har rätt till då de kör i till exempel Sverige?

Om kommissionen menar att lägre transportpriser är vägen framåt för EU, hur förväntar sig då kommissionen att transportbranschen skall kunna säkra nödvändiga investeringar i mer miljö- och klimatvänlig utrustning, bättre arbetsvillkor för att locka nya människor till yrket, betalning av vägtullar och dyrare oljepriser, trafiksäkerhet och uppfyllandet av kör- och vilotider, när man samtidigt också måste ta hänsyn till att chaufförernas löner också bestäms av den generella löneutvecklingen på arbetsmarknaden?

Har kommissionen för avsikt att se till att EU:s vägtransportmarknad baseras på lika och rättvisa villkor för alla och inte på ett lapptäcke av nationella bestämmelser, tolkningar och regler som transportköpare och speditörer kan utnyttja på ett sätt som vi sett i programmet på Sveriges television?

Svar från Siim Kallas på kommissionens vägnar
(11 juni 2013)

Bestämmelerna om rätten att bedriva godstransporter på väg fastställs i förordning (EG) nr 1072/2009 ([1]). Hit hör bestämmelser om cabotage som innebär att transportörer som inte har säte i landet får genomföra inrikestransporter i en annan medlemsstat än den där de är registrerade. Vid internationella vägtransporter som omfattar cabotage måste transportörerna uppfylla vissa sociala villkor, bland annat i fråga om arbetstider, körtider och viloperioder, och, förekommande fall, bestämmelserna i direktiv 96/71/EG om utstationering av arbetstagare ([2]) eller förordning (EG) nr 593/2008 ([3]) om avtalsförpliktelser.

Cabotage utgör mindre än 2 % av vägtransportvolymen i EU ([4]) och kommer asannolikt inte att medföra någon betydande snedvridning av marknaden. Kommissionen är emellertid medvetenom att vissa av bestämmelserna ovan tillämpas inkonsekvent. Därför samarbetar kommissionen med medlemsstaterna, som har ansvar för att genomföra dessa bestämmelser, för att se till att de tilläämpas korrekto ch samstämmigt i praktiken. Utöver den rapport om situationen på marknadne för godstransporter på väg som ska läggas fram i slutet av året överväger kommissionen en översyn av förordnng (EG) nr 1072/2009 i syfte att förbättra efterlevnaden av bestämmelserna.

([1]) Europaparlamentets och rådets förordning (EG) nr 1072/2009 av den 21 oktober 2009 om gemensamma regler för tillträde till den internationella marknaden för godstransporter på väg (EUT L 300, 14.11.2009).
([2]) Europaparlamentets och rådets direktiv 96/71/EG av den 16 december 1996 om utstationering av arbetstagare i samband med tillhandahållande av tjänster (EGT L 18, 21.1.1997).
([3]) Europaparlamentets och rådets förordning (EG) nr 593/2008 av den 17 juni 2008 om tillämplig lag för avtalsförpliktelser (Rom I) (EUT L 177, 4.7.2008).
([4]) Källa: Eurostat.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004618/13
to the Commission
Marita Ulvskog (S&D)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: EU cabotage rules

On 20 March 2013, the Swedish national television broadcaster *Sveriges television* showed a documentary about the Swedish haulage industry. The programme revealed, among other things, how carriers and freight forwarders suppress prices to a level that makes it impossible for a Swedish haulier to compete if it has drivers that are paid according to Swedish terms and conditions.

In other words, the EU cabotage rules have given rise to a situation in which the market is being distorted. This will result in prices being suppressed to levels that are impossible for a company that abides by Swedish rules and agreements to compete with.

At the same time, foreign drivers are in many cases forced to work under unacceptable conditions.

Is the Commission aware that this programme was broadcast and of the conditions that were shown? If not, the documentary can be viewed at http://www.svtplay.se/video/1099762/del-9.

What will the Commissioner do to ensure that the current cabotage rules do not contribute to unacceptable wages and working conditions for drivers from Sweden and for those from other countries who work in Sweden? How can we ensure that drivers have access to the conditions and wages they are entitled to when driving in Sweden, for example?

If the Commission believes that lower transport prices are the way forward for the EU, how does it then expect the transport industry to be able to guarantee the necessary investments in more environmentally sound and climate-friendly equipment, better working conditions in order to attract more people into the profession, payment of road toll charges and higher oil prices, traffic safety and compliance with driving and rest times when, at the same time, they must also take account of the fact that the drivers' wages are also determined by general trends in this regard the labour market?

Does the Commission intend to ensure that the EU road transport market is based on fair and equal conditions for all and not on a patchwork of national provisions, interpretations and rules that shippers and freight forwarders can exploit in the way that we have seen in the programme on *Sveriges television*?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2013)

The provisions on access to the road haulage market are set out in Regulation (EC) No 1072/2009 ([1]). This includes the provisions on cabotage according to which non-resident hauliers can perform domestic transport in a Member State other than the one where they are registered. When performing international road transport including cabotage, hauliers must comply with certain social provisions including those on working time, driving time and rest periods, and where relevant with Directive 96/71/EC on posting of workers ([2]) or Regulation (EC) No 593/2008 ([3]) on contractual obligations.

Cabotage represents under 2% of road goods transport volumes in the EU ([4]) and is unlikely to cause significant market distortions. The Commission is nonetheless aware of inconsistent enforcement of certain of the provisions listed above. Work is ongoing with Member States who are responsible for implementing these provisions to promote efficient and consistent enforcement. In addition to the report on the situation of the road haulage market due by the end of this year, the Commission is considering a revision of Regulation (EC) No 1072/2009 with the aim of improving enforcement of the rules.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1072/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 October 2009 on common rules for access to the international road haulage market, OJ L 300, 14.11.2009.

([2]) Directive 96/71/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 1996 concerning the posting of workers in the framework of the provision of services, OJ L 18, 21.1.1997.

([3]) Regulation (EC) No 593/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 June 2008 on the law applicable to contractual obligations (Rome I) OJ L 177, 4.7.2008.

([4]) *Source:* Eurostat.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004619/13
à la Commission
Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)
(25 avril 2013)

Objet: Cohérence de la directive «Oiseaux» sur le territoire de l'UE

Conformément au régime dérogatoire prévu à l'article 9 de la directive 2009/147/CE concernant la conservation des oiseaux sauvages, les autorités néerlandaises accordent régulièrement des permis pour la capture et l'abattage des oies, afin d'éviter de graves dommages aux cultures ou pour des raisons de sécurité et de santé publique.

En France, au contraire, l'arrêté permettant le prélèvement à quinze oies par département pour treize départements, pour la période du 1er au 10 février 2012, a été annulé par le Conseil d'État comme étant contraire à l'article 9, paragraphe 1, de la directive du 30 novembre 2009 concernant la conservation des oiseaux sauvages.

La Commission pourrait-elle proposer un accord entre la France et les Pays-Bas qui satisferait les deux parties quant au prélèvement d'un nombre limité d'oies en France et entraînerait une diminution des dégâts occasionnés par les oies et des mesures d'abattage aux Pays-Bas?

Réponse donnée par M. Potočnik au nom de la Commission
(4 juin 2013)

La Commission a été informée que les autorités néerlandaises ont délivré des permis d'abattage des oies pour prévenir des dommages importants aux cultures ou pour des raisons de santé et de sécurité publiques. Ces permis ont été accordés au titre du régime dérogatoire prévu à l'article 9 de la directive 2009/147/CE ([1]) concernant la conservation des oiseaux sauvages.

La Commission n'a pas été informée des motifs invoqués par la France pour autoriser l'abattage de 15 oies dans chacun des 13 départements entre le 1er et le 10 février 2012. Le Conseil d'État français a rejeté cette mesure car elle n'était pas justifiée au titre du régime dérogatoire précité.

Il appartient aux États membres de s'assurer qu'une dérogation aux dispositions des articles 5 à 8 de la directive 2009/147/CE est parfaitement conforme aux règles prévues à l'article 9 de la directive, y compris les dispositions en matière de coopération bilatérale dans ce contexte.

([1]) JO L 20 du 26.1.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004619/13
to the Commission
Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: Consistent application of the Birds Directive across the EU

Under the derogations laid down in Article 9 of Directive 2009/147/EC on the conservation of wild birds, the Dutch authorities regularly issue permits for the capture and slaughter of geese, in order to prevent serious damage to crops or on the grounds of public health and safety.

In France, on the other hand, the decree that allowed 15 geese to be taken in each of 13 departments between 1 February and 10 February 2012 was repealed by the Council of State for running counter to Article 9(1) of the directive of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds.

Could the Commission propose an agreement between France and the Netherlands which would be acceptable to both parties as regards the taking of a limited number of geese in France, and which would reduce the damage caused by geese and cut down slaughter in the Netherlands?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(4 June 2013)

The Commission is aware of the permits for killing of geese that have been issued by the Dutch authorities in order to prevent serious damage to crops or on the grounds of public health and safety. These permits have been granted under the derogation regime of Article 9 of Directive 2009/147/EC ([1]) on the conservation of wild birds.

The Commission is not aware of the reasons invoked by France for allowing the killing of 15 geese in each of 13 departments between 1 February and 10 February 2012. The French Council of State has rejected this measure for not being justified under the derogation regime mentioned above.

It is for the Member States to ensure that any derogation from the provisions of Articles 5 to 8 of Directive 2009/147/EC are fully in accordance with the rules of Article 9 of the directive, including arrangement for bilateral cooperation in this context.

([1]) OJ L 20, 26.1.2010.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004620/13
à la Commission
Robert Goebbels (S&D)
(25 avril 2013)

Objet: Subventions de la Commission à certaines ONG

Si je comprends bien la réponse de la Commission du 22.4.2013 à ma question (E-000614/2013), l'organisation «Friends of the Earth» aurait «l'intention d'inclure le coût» de la publication incriminée dans le cadre des «dépenses admissibles au titre d'une convention de subvention bien plus vaste», conclue entre la DG Développement et l'organisation «Milieu Defensie», dont «Friends of the Earth» ne serait en sorte qu'un sous-traitant.

Quelle est l'enveloppe globale de la convention de subvention avec «Milieu Defensie»?

La DG Développement a-t-elle conclu d'autres conventions de subventions de ce genre et, si oui, lesquelles et pour quels montants?

«Friends of the Earth» bénéficie-t-elle d'une convention, voire de subventions séparées?

La publication visée par ma question se dit soutenue par la DG Développement et la DG Environnement. Quelles sont les dotations financières (conventions de subventions, subsides et autres crédits) de la DG Environnement avec «Milieu Defensie» et avec «Friends of the Earth»?

Réponse donnée par M. Piebalgs au nom de la Commission
(12 juin 2013)

La contribution de la Commission au projet «Making Extractive Industry work for Climate and Development» est de 1 000 000 d'euros.

La subvention mentionnée ci-dessus s'inscrit dans le programme destiné aux acteurs non étatiques (ANE) et aux autorités locales (AL) — objectif 2 «Development Éducation and Awareness Raising (DEAR)» (Sensibilisation et éducation au développement).

Depuis 2007, quatre appels à propositions ont été lancés pour le programme DEAR:

— 2007: montant total approximatif des subventions: 28 000 000 d'euros; subventions accordées: 37 à des ANE et 7 à des AL;

— 2008-2009: montant total: 61 000 000 d'euros; subventions accordées: 80 à des ANE et 15 à des AL;

— 2010: montant total: 32 000 000 d'euros; subventions accordées: 35 à des ANE et 10 à des AL;

— 2011-2012: montant total: 63 000 000 d'euros; subventions accordées: 72 à des ANE et 11 à des AL.

Un autre appel à propositions sera publié en septembre 2013 pour le même programme.

Dans le cadre de l'appel à propositions lancé en 2010 pour le programme «NSA-LA» — objectif 3 «Coordination», «Friends of the Earth (FoE)-Europe» a reçu une subvention de 498 000 euros pour le projet «Building Sustainable Civil Society Networks». FoE-Europe est également partenaire du projet «Mobilise for Extractive Industries Transformation», une action de sensibilisation visant à promouvoir une contribution positive des industries extractives européennes au développement durable et à la réalisation des OMD. Pour ce projet, «Milieu Defensie» a obtenu une subvention de 1 000 000 d'euros, dans le cadre de l'appel à propositions de 2011-2012 pour le programme DEAR.

FoE-Europe a aussi reçu des subventions de fonctionnement de la Commission, octroyées à la suite d'appels à propositions annuels en vertu du règlement (CE) n° 614/2007 du Parlement européen et du Conseil concernant l'instrument financier pour l'environnement (LIFE+), qui s'adresse aux ONG environnementales européennes ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/ngos/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004620/13
to the Commission
Robert Goebbels (S&D)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: Commission grants for certain non-governmental organisations

If I have understood the Commission's answer of 22 April 2013 to my question (E-000614/2013) correctly, Friends of the Earth 'intends to submit the cost of the publication as eligible expenditure under a much wider grant agreement between the EU Commission Development and Cooperation DG and "Milieu Defensie"', of which Friends of the Earth is therefore only a sub-contractor.

How much is the grant agreement with 'Milieu Defensie' worth in total?

Has DG Development concluded any other grant agreements of this kind and, if so, which ones and for how much?

Is there any agreement with Friends of the Earth, even for separate grants?

The publication referred to in my question was supported by DG Development and DG Environment. What financial allocations (grant agreements, subsidies and other funding) has DG Environment granted 'Milieu Defensie' and Friends of the Earth?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2013)

The Commission contribution to the project 'Making Extractive Industry work for Climate and Development' is EUR 1 million.

The grant mentioned above is part of the programme for Non-State Actors (NSA) and Local Authorities (LA) — objective 2 'Development Education and Awareness Raising (DEAR)'.

Since 2007, there have been 4 calls for proposals for the DEAR programme:

— 2007: approximate total amount of the grants: EUR 28 million, awarded grants: 37 to NSA and 7 to LA,

— 2008-2009: total amount: EUR 61 million, awarded grants: 80 NSA and 15 LA,

— 2010: total amount: EUR 32 million, awarded grants: 35 NSA and 10 LA,

— 2011-2012: total amount EUR 63 million, awarded grants: 72 NSA and 11 LA.

Another call for proposals within the same programme will be published in September 2013.

In the framework of the 2010 call for proposals for the programme NSA-LA — objective 3 'Coordination', Friends of the Earth (FoE)-Europe received a grant of EUR 498 000.00 for the project 'Building Sustainable Civil Society Networks'. FoE-Europe is also a partner in the project 'Mobilise for Extractive Industries Transformation — Awareness raising action to promote a positive contribution of European Extractive Industries to sustainable development and achieving the MDG', awarded with a grant of EUR 1 million to Milieu Defensie in the framework of the 2011-2012 call for proposals for the DEAR programme.

FoE-Europe has also received operating grants from the Commission, awarded following annual calls for proposals under Regulation (EC) No 614/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the Financial Instrument for the Environment (LIFE+) targeting European non-governmental environmental organisations ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/ngos/index_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004621/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(25 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Turbine marine per energia pulita

Entro la fine dell'anno entrerà in funzione al largo delle coste dell'Australia del Sud, di fronte alla cittadina di Port Macdonnel, il più grande generatore al mondo, capace di produrre energia pulita dal moto delle onde con un megawatt di potenza, in grado di fornire elettricità pulita a mille case. Il matematico australiano fondatore della società che produce questo impianto innovativo ha impiegato quasi 16 anni prima di giungere alla soluzione tecnologica ottimale. Ma come sempre, quando si tratta di novità, le difficoltà per lo sviluppo industriale sono rappresentate dai costi (28 cent. di dollaro per KW, di fronte ai 5 cent. di dollaro per KW prodotto da un impianto di carbone). Niente da fare, allora? No, dice un ingegnere con esperienza nel nucleare e nel petrolifero: questo tipo di tecnologia diventerà competitiva e il costo del KW scenderà a 10 cent. di dollaro non appena si raggiungerà nel mondo una potenza installata di 75 megawatt. Se le previsioni si realizzeranno nel giro di 10-20 anni il mondo energetico sarà rivoluzionato, dato che le zone di mare ondoso non mancano sul nostro pianeta. Si pensa che questa tecnologia possa giungere a competere con quella eolica nel giro di tre anni e con le fonti fossili entro cinque-sette anni. La realizzazione di questo primo impianto è stata possibile grazie all'aiuto finanziario del governo di Canberra. Il governo irlandese ha espresso il suo interesse per questa tecnologia e conta di aumentare sensibilmente la propria quota di energia rinnovabile passando dall'attuale 14 al 40 per cento entro il 2020. Anche altri paesi sono interessati alla novità: Stati Uniti, Messico, Spagna, Francia, Portogallo e Regno Unito. Gli europei sono leader nella produzione di generatori d'energia da moto ondoso, ma al massimo si è arrivati a 750 kilowatt. Le rinnovabili dunque avanzano e fanno bene sperare per il futuro, a condizione che anche la cultura, oltre che l'economia, si renda conto dei vantaggi per l'ambiente e quindi per la salute umana.

Può la Commissione far sapere:

1. Se ha previsioni da fare in ordine allo sviluppo di questa tecnologia in Europa?

2. Se ha preventivato eventualmente incentivi per promuovere tale sviluppo?

3. Qual è ora la percentuale di energia pulita prodotta nell'Unione, rispetto al fabbisogno necessario?

Risposta di Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(17 giugno 2013)

1. Vi sono attualmente nell'UE 10 MW di capacità installata nei sistemi di energia prodotta dal moto ondoso e dalle maree, con un incremento di più del doppio rispetto ai 4 MW esistenti quattro anni fa. Questi progetti sono ancora, per la maggior parte, nella fase pre-commerciale mentre altri progetti, per un totale di 2 GW, sono attualmente in preparazione. La capacità installata attualmente raggiunge i 250 MW se si considera anche il sistema a barriera di La Rance in Francia, che è operativo dal 1966. Si ritiene che l'energia prodotta dagli oceani abbia il potenziale per fornire un importante contributo al futuro mix energetico europeo, dato che si tratta di un settore ancora agli inizi, anche se ciò non dovrebbe valere per l'immediato futuro quanto piuttosto per il periodo 2035-2050. L'Associazione europea dell'energia oceanica prevede che la capacità di energia oceanica istallata in Europa raggiunga i 3,6 GW entro il 2020 e i 188 GW entro il 2050.

2. Negli ultimi 20 anni, l'UE ha sovvenzionato la ricerca sull'energia oceanica e ha promosso diversi progetti dimostrativi tra cui alcuni per la realizzazione di prototipi. Nel complesso, sono stati finanziati 48 progetti nell'ambito dei programmi di ricerca sull'energia. Il contributo finanziario concesso ammonta a 78 milioni di euro circa. Questi progetti comprendono dispositivi con capacità nominale pari a 2 MW e fanno parte di una serie di dispositivi con capacità totale fra 3 e 6 MW, che dovrebbero entrare in funzione a partire dal 2016. Si prevede che il sostegno a questo settore continuerà anche nell'ambito del futuro programma Orizzonte 2020, che si trova attualmente nella fase legislativa.

3. La direttiva sulle energie rinnovabili stabilisce che l'UE raggiunga una quota del 20 % di energia rinnovabile nel suo consumo energetico finale entro il 2020. Nell'UE la quota attuale di fonti energetiche rinnovabili è del 13 % (dati Eurostat 2011), mentre la quota di energia rinnovabile nella produzione di energia elettrica è pari al 21,7 % (dati Eurostat 2011).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004621/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: Marine turbines for clean energy

The largest generator in the world will be deployed off the South Australian coast, near the town of Port MacDonnell, by the end of the year. It will be capable of generating one megawatt of clean energy from wave motion, and of providing clean electricity to 1 000 homes. The Australian mathematician who founded the company that produces this innovative plant took almost 16 years to attain the optimum technological solution. However, as always when it comes to innovation, its industrial development is hindered by costs (AUD 0.28 per kWh, compared with AUD 0.05 per kWh produced by a coal-powered plant). So it is hopeless then? 'No', says an engineer with experience in the nuclear and oil industries: this kind of technology will become competitive and the cost per kWh will fall to AUD 0.10 as soon as an installed capacity of 75 megawatts is reached in the world. If the predictions come to fruition within 10-20 years, the energy sector will be revolutionised, given that areas of wavy sea are not lacking on our planet. It is thought that this technology could come to compete with wind-power technology within three years and with fossil sources within five-seven years. The production of this first plant was possible thanks to financial aid provided by the Australian Government. The Irish Government has expressed an interest in this technology and expects to considerably increase its renewable energy share, from 14% to 40% by 2020. Other countries are also interested in this innovation: the United States, Mexico, Spain, France, Portugal and the United Kingdom. Europeans are leaders in the manufacture of wave energy converters, but the maximum attained is 750 kilowatts. Therefore, renewables are making progress and bode well for the future, provided that not only the economy but also society realises the advantages for the environment and consequently for human health.

Can the Commission state:

1. whether it can make any predictions regarding the development of this technology in Europe;

2. whether it has planned any incentives to promote this development;

3. what the current percentage of clean energy produced in the EU is, compared with its actual requirements?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2013)

1. There are currently 10 MW of installed capacity in the EU in wave and tidal stream technologies, over a two-fold increase from the 4 MW in place four years ago. These projects are for the large part in a pre-commercial phase. Additional projects totalling 2 GW are in the pipeline. The current installed capacity rises to 250 MW if the La Rance tidal range system in France, in operation since 1966, is included. It is recognised that ocean energy has the potential to make a substantial contribution to the future European energy mix, given that it is still a young sector. However, this is not expected for the immediate future but rather for the period 2035-2050. The European Ocean Energy Association estimates the installed ocean energy capacity in Europe to reach 3.6 GW by 2020 and 188 GW by 2050.

2. The EU has funded ocean energy related research and demonstration projects including prototype devices in the past 20 years. In total, 48 projects have been supported in the framework of the energy research programmes. The allocated support is about EUR 78 million. These projects included devices with a nameplate capacity as large as 2MW constituting part of a variety of devices of total capacity between 3 and 6 MW which are expected to become operational in 2016. Support to the sector is expected to continue within the future Horizon 2020 programme currently in the legislative process.

3. The Renewable Energy Directive requires the EU to reach a 20% share of renewable energy in its final energy consumption by 2020. The current share of renewable energy in the EU is 13% (2011 Eurostat data). The share of renewable energy in the EU electricity production was 21.7% (2011 Eurostat data).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004622/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR) e Susy De Martini (ECR)
(25 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Primato dell'energia eolica in USA

La *pole position* dell'energia eolica è stata raggiunta nel 2012 negli Stati Uniti: 6 519 MW di eolico, contro i 6 335 MW di nuove centrali elettriche a gas. Questi risultati non sono frutto del caso o di pure scelte tecnologiche. Il merito è degli incentivi pubblici, erogati sotto forma di crediti fiscali (2,2 centesimi di dollaro per kilowattora prodotto, per una durata di 10 anni, per i progetti entrati in funzione entro il 1° gennaio 2013). È il denaro del contribuente che ha fatto il miracolo, e non la libera concorrenza. Le polemiche infuriano, perché anche negli USA si pratica l'austerità e si teme il *fiscal cliff*. Cancellare ora gli incentivi significherebbe — secondo l'industria eolica americana — perdere 37 mila posti di lavoro. Si è proposta allora una fase di graduale eliminazione degli incentivi da qui al 2019.

La Commissione:

1. ha un'opinione sull'utilità e l'opportunità degli incentivi in Europa nello specifico settore dell'eolico per produrre energia elettrica risparmiando sugli idrocarburi ed eliminando l'inquinamento da carbone?

2. Può comunicarci quali sono gli Stati membri che amministrano incentivi per l'eolico e per altre forme di energie alternative?

3. Con quali risultati?

Risposta di Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(6 giugno 2013)

La Commissione ritiene che specifici regimi nazionali di incentivazione per le energie rinnovabili, ivi inclusi quelli che prevedono interventi finanziari, abbiano favorito un aumento della quota di energia prodotta dalle fonti rinnovabili nell'Unione.

Tutti gli Stati membri gestiscono uno o più programmi di incentivazione per le energie rinnovabili. Una panoramica degli incentivi specifici di ogni Stato membro, ivi comprese le informazioni sulle tecnologie utilizzate, è disponibile sul seguente sito web: www.res-legal.eu.

Tali regimi di incentivazione dato notevole impulso alla quota di energia prodotta da fonti rinnovabili, all'innovazione, alle economie di scala ed alle conseguenti riduzioni dei costi per le diverse tecnologie nel settore delle energie rinnovabili. La quota crescente di energia rinnovabile prodotta nell'Unione riveste un'importanza fondamentale per affrontare l'elevata dipendenza dalle importazioni di energia, nonché riducendo le emissioni di gas a effetto serra e l'inquinamento ambientale. Tali programmi di sostegno devono tuttavia mirare ad evitare sovracompensazione e successive modifiche ad effetto retroattivo che determinino la sfiducia degli investitori, come è effettivamente avvenuto in alcuni casi. L'estate prossima la Commissione intende fornire alcune linee guida che aiutino a stabilire regimi di sostegno in modo efficiente ed efficace in termini di costi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004622/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR) and Susy De Martini (ECR)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: Wind energy dominates in the United States

Wind energy took pole position in 2012 in the United States: 6 519 MW were generated from wind, compared with the 6 335 MW from new gas-fired power plants. These results were not achieved by chance or because of technological choices alone. They were achieved thanks to government incentives, paid in the form of tax credits (USD 0.022 per kilowatt hour produced, over a 10-year period, for projects begun by 1 January 2013). Taxpayers' money — not free competition — performed this miracle. Debate rages, because austerity is also being practised in the US, and people fear the fiscal cliff. Scrapping the incentives now would — according to the US wind industry — result in 37 000 job losses. A phase-out of the incentives between now and 2019 has therefore been proposed.

1. Does the Commission have an opinion on whether incentives are useful and appropriate in Europe in the specific sector of wind energy, in order to produce electricity while reducing hydrocarbons and eliminating carbon pollution?

2. Can it say which Member States provide incentives for wind energy and for other forms of alternative energy?

3. What has been the outcome of this?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2013)

The Commission is of the view that specific national incentive schemes for renewable energy, including schemes providing financial support, have been instrumental in increasing the share of renewable energy in the EU.

All Member States operate one or more incentive schemes for renewable energy. An overview of the specific incentives by Member State, including information on supported technologies, can be found on the following website: www.res-legal.eu.

The schemes have led to significant growth in the production of energy from renewable sources, innovation, economies of scale and subsequent cost reductions in several renewable energy technologies. The growing share of renewable energy in the EU is instrumental in addressing the high energy import dependency, reducing green-house gas emissions as well as environmental pollution. However, support schemes should avoid overcompensation and subsequent retroactive changes that damage investor confidence, as has been the case in certain instances. The Commission plans to issue guidance on how to design support schemes in an efficient and cost effective way this summer.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004623/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(25 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: I derivati, ovvero armi di distruzione di massa

Il finanziere Warren Buffet ha utilizzato la definizione in oggetto per il comparto dei «derivati» a causa del loro potenziale destabilizzante per l'economia mondiale. È infatti noto che, contro un PIL mondiale stimato intorno ai 70 mila miliardi di dollari, la massa dei derivati ha raggiunto nel 2012 il livello di 639 mila miliardi, cioè più di nove volte la ricchezza prodotta nel mondo intero. Da anni si chiedono nuove regole per smaltire, o almeno mettere in quarantena, l'enorme e spropositata massa di titoli tossici; tuttavia fino ad ora ben poco è stato intrapreso in tal senso, fatta eccezione per le norme dell'UE appena entrate in vigore, che dovrebbero dare buoni risultati a proposito della trasparenza delle contrattazioni ma assai meno per quanto si riferisce alla rischiosità insita nei risultati. Anche negli Stati Uniti qualcosa si muove. I vertici della Jp Morgan, un istituto che gestisce una quantità abnorme di titoli spazzatura, sono stati chiamati a rispondere dinanzi al Congresso dell'avventurosa e altamente rischiosa conduzione della loro banca. Di fronte al rischio tuttora elevato che la «bomba di distruzione di massa» scoppi da un momento all'altro, si chiede alla Commissione di rispondere ai quesiti di seguito riportati.

1. Può indicare chi è contrario all'introduzione di norme più severe per spegnere la miccia che può portare alla deflagrazione?

2. Non ritiene utile e opportuno proporre nuove regole ai partner mondiali per allentare il rischio incombente?

3. Quali sono le opposizioni all'interno dell'Unione al tentativo di risolvere il problema dei derivati? Da chi sono portate avanti?

4. Può pubblicare la classifica degli Stati della zona euro detentori di derivati, indicando la loro percentuale rispetto al corrispondente PIL nazionale?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(21 giugno 2013)

L'adozione del regolamento (UE) n. 648/2012 sugli strumenti derivati OTC, le controparti centrali e i repertori di dati sulle negoziazioni («regolamento EMIR») in data 4 luglio 2012, rappresenta un passo importante per un miglior controllo dei rischi generati dall'utilizzo di contratti derivati OTC.

Tale regolamento ha introdotto l'obbligo di compensazione centrale per i contratti derivati OTC standardizzati e, per i contratti non standardizzati, l'applicazione di tecniche di attenuazione del rischio, tra cui gli scambi di garanzie reali. Tali obblighi attenueranno il rischio di credito di controparte e i rischi sistemici.

Questa riforma permette di realizzare gli obiettivi individuati dai leader del G20 nel settembre 2009 e, nella fase di attuazione di tali obiettivi, le autorità internazionali di regolamentazione hanno istituito diversi gruppi di lavoro per armonizzare le norme vigenti in ciascun paese.

Durante la negoziazione del regolamento EMIR è emerso un consenso di massa in merito agli obiettivi di questa riforma, ma è stata espressa preoccupazione circa il costo della riforma per l'economia reale. Di conseguenza, durante la negoziazione sono state inserite nel testo alcune esenzioni a beneficio di taluni utenti finali dei contratti derivati — come le società — e un'esenzione transitoria per i fondi pensione.

Le statistiche sui contratti derivati OTC in essere sono pubblicate regolarmente dalla Banca dei regolamenti internazionali (BRI) ([1]). Tali statistiche soddisfano la richiesta espressa dall'onorevole deputato poiché includono i dati che misurano il grado di concentrazione dei mercati dei derivati OTC in ciascuna giurisdizione.

([1]) http://www.bis.org/publ/otc_hy1305.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004623/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: Derivatives, or weapons of mass destruction

The financier Warren Buffett described derivatives as weapons of mass destruction because of their potential to destabilise the world economy. Indeed, it is a known fact that, while the gross world product in 2012 was estimated to be around USD 70 trillion, the total amount of derivatives reached USD 639 trillion, in other words more than nine times the wealth produced worldwide. For years there have been calls for new rules to dispose of, or at least quarantine, the huge and excessive amount of toxic assets. However, so far little has been done along those lines; the one exception is the EU rules that have recently entered into force, which should yield good results in terms of the transparency of trading but which will have much less of an impact with regard to performance-related risks. Some movement is evident in the United States, too. The heads of JP Morgan, an institution which manages an abnormal amount of junk bonds, have been called before Congress to answer for the reckless and highly risky way in which they run their bank. Given that there is still a high risk that the 'bomb of mass destruction' will explode at any time:

1. Can the Commission say who opposes the introduction of stricter rules to remove the detonator that may cause this bomb to go off?

2. Does it not believe that it would be useful and appropriate to propose new rules to its international partners in order to reduce the impending risk?

3. What objections have been raised within the EU to the attempt to resolve the derivatives problem? Who has raised them?

4. Can it publish the list of euro-area countries that hold derivatives, and specify their percentage in relation to the corresponding national GDP?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(21 June 2013)

The adoption of Regulation (EU) No 648/2012 on OTC derivatives, central counterparties and trade repositories ('EMIR') on 4 July 2012, is a major step to better control the risks generated by the use of OTC derivatives contracts.

The introduction by EMIR of an obligation to centrally clear standardised OTC derivatives contracts and apply risk mitigation techniques — which include exchanges of collateral — to non-standardised contracts will mitigate counterparty credit and systemic risks.

This reform implements G20 leaders' objectives defined in September 2009. Throughout the implementation of these objectives, international regulators have set-up numerous working groups to harmonise the rules applied in each country.

During the negotiation of EMIR, there was a broad consensus as to the objectives of this reform. Concerns have been expressed about the cost of this reform for the real economy. As a result, certain exemptions benefiting to certain final users of these contracts — i.e. corporates and a transitional exemption for pension funds — have been included in the text during the negotiation.

Statistics on outstanding OTC derivative contracts are regularly published by the Bank for International Settlements (BIS) ([1]). These statistics address the concern of the Honourable Member since they include data measuring the degree of concentration of OTC derivative markets in each jurisdiction.

([1]) http://www.bis.org/publ/otc_hy1305.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004624/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(25 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Cosa nasconde la contraffazione

È evidente che la contraffazione crea disoccupazione, annienta l'economia sana, fa svanire ingenti capitali e non versa quattrini nelle casse del fisco, cioè dello Stato. Sono molto gravi i dati relativi a tale fenomeno. Per il Ministero italiano dello Sviluppo economico il mercato del falso sottrae ogni anno all'economia sette miliardi di euro e crea 110 mila disoccupati, vale a dire circa 300 al giorno. Soltanto a Prato, i cinesi incassano in nero un miliardo di euro all'anno.

Ciò che non si vuol capire è che dietro a ogni extracomunitario che offre oggetti contraffatti, c'è la criminalità organizzata, che gestisce e sfrutta questi miseri venditori abusivi. Vi sono interi distretti industriali che si dedicano alla produzione, distribuzione e commercializzazione di tali beni. Bisogna capire anche che esiste un sistema di pagamento in nero di questa gigantesca quantità di merce. Al titolare di un'importante rete d'agenzie di *money transfer* sono stati contestati «trasferimenti illecitamente riciclati in Cina» per un valore di 5,4 miliardi. È impressionante il numero di queste agenzie in Italia: 39.000 sportelli di money transfer che trasferiscono 7,5 miliardi di euro all'anno, contro 5.900 sportelli del gruppo bancario più importante del paese. A parte il valore delle rimesse, che si può calcolare attorno ai mille euro al mese per famiglia (141 per gli indiani) che cosa coprono i 2.000 euro trasferiti dai cinesi? Che cosa nascondono queste notevoli cifre trasferite mensilmente in Cina?

Ciò premesso, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. a parte i più o meno esaurienti controlli alle dogane, è in grado di cifrare il valore della contraffazione per l'intera Unione europea, tanto di quella importata che di quella prodotta al suo interno?

2. Ha effettuato un controllo in collaborazione con gli Stati membri, sul valore dei trasferimenti avvenuti tramite le agenzie di *money transfer*?

3. Per evitare che il commercio nei nostri paesi dei prodotti contraffatti (dagli oggetti in vetro ai monili, dai giocattoli al prosciutto di Parma cinese, dal «parmigiano grana padano» tedesco agli orologi di lusso, dai pezzi di ricambio automobilistici agli scooter, dai prodotti di pelletteria alle calzature, ecc.) arricchisca altri paesi, quali iniziative intende proporre per combattere questo fenomeno in aumento?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(3 luglio 2013)

La Commissione pubblica una relazione annuale sulla tutela dei diritti di proprietà intellettuale (DPI) da parte delle autorità doganali dell'UE. Stando all'ultima relazione pubblicata ([1]), i casi registrati nel 2011 sono stati più di 90 000, per un totale di oltre 110 milioni di articoli e un valore stimato delle vendite al dettaglio superiore a 1,2 miliardi di EUR. Tale stima non tiene conto delle merci contraffatte importate sfuggite al controllo degli uffici doganali e al momento non sono disponibili dati consolidati sulle contraffazioni prodotte all'interno dell'Unione europea.

La Commissione, in collaborazione con l'Osservatorio sulle violazioni dei diritti di proprietà intellettuale, sta conducendo una serie di studi per valutare con maggiore precisione il valore delle contraffazioni e il danno arrecato. Sono in corso iniziative per migliorare la raccolta dei dati.

Per quanto riguarda i trasferimenti di denaro, l'impossibilità di distinguere le operazioni legali da quelle illecite non consente di disporre di dati al riguardo. Negli ultimi anni sono stati compiuti molti sforzi per contrastare più efficacemente il riciclaggio di denaro nell'UE e nel mondo.

Per rafforzare i poteri delle dogane, la Commissione ha proposto un nuovo regolamento, approvato dai legislatori, concernente la tutela dei diritti di proprietà intellettuale da parte delle autorità doganali. Insieme agli Stati membri si è inoltre impegnata a rafforzare la tutela di tali diritti alle frontiere tramite l'attuazione di un nuovo piano d'azione adottato dal Consiglio. Nell'ambito di un pacchetto di riforme volto a modernizzare la normativa sui marchi dell'UE, la Commissione ha proposto anche di rafforzare i diritti dei titolari di marchi permettendo loro di impedire a terze parti di introdurre merci contraffatte sul territorio doganale dell'UE ([2]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/customs/customs_controls/counterfeit_piracy/statistics/2012_ipr_statistics_en.pdf

([2]) Le proposte, adottate dalla Commissione a fine marzo 2013, consentirebbero di colmare le lacune nell'attuale legislazione in materia di merci in transito. I titolari dei diritti potrebbero impedire l'introduzione a scopi commerciali sul territorio dell'Unione di merci di paesi terzi recanti marchi di fabbrica identici a quelli registrati nell'Unione europea, indipendentemente dal fatto che si tratti di merci immesse in libera pratica.

La Commissione ha avviato, in collaborazione con l'Osservatorio, campagne di sensibilizzazione per rendere i cittadini maggiormente consapevoli dei danni causati dalla contraffazione. Gli Stati membri stanno portando avanti iniziative analoghe, soprattutto nell'ambito del nuovo ciclo programmatico dell'UE 2013-2017 per contrastare la criminalità organizzata e le forme gravi di criminalità internazionale, in cui una delle priorità riguarda il problema dei prodotti contraffatti nocivi per la salute e la sicurezza.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004624/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: The hidden side of counterfeiting

It is clear that counterfeiting leads to job losses, destroys a healthy economy, swallows up vast sums of money and contributes nothing to the exchequer, which is to say the state's coffers. The figures on this issue are appalling. According to the Italian Ministry of Economic Development, the counterfeit goods market costs the Italian economy EUR 7 billion every year and puts 110 000 people out of work, equivalent to 300 every day. In Prato alone, Chinese counterfeiters make EUR 1 billion per year in illegal profits.

What people do not realise is that behind every non-EU national selling counterfeit goods there is organised crime, controlling and exploiting these wretched hawkers. There are whole industrial districts dedicated to the production, distribution and marketing of such goods. People also need to realise that there is an illicit payment system for this enormous quantity of goods. The owner of a major network of money transfer agencies has been charged with illegally laundering money transfers in China to the tune of EUR 5.4 billion. There is a remarkable number of these agencies in Italy: 39 000 money transfer outlets transferring EUR 7.5 billion per year, compared with the 5 900 branches of the largest banking group in the country. Apart from the value of the transfers, which can be put at around EUR 1 000 per month per household (141 for Indians), what does the EUR 2 000 transferred by Chinese nationals really hide? What lies behind these considerable sums transferred to China every month?

1. Leaving aside inconsistently thorough customs checks, can the Commission say how much counterfeiting costs the European Union as a whole, in terms of both imported counterfeit goods and counterfeit goods produced within the EU?

2. Has it worked with the Member States to verify the value of transfers made through money transfer agencies?

3. In order to prevent other countries from growing rich from the sale of counterfeit goods in Italy (from glassware to jewellery, from toys to Chinese Parma ham, from German *parmigiano grana padano* cheese to luxury watches, from spare parts for cars to scooters, from leather goods to footwear, and so on), what steps will the Commission propose to combat this growing phenomenon?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(3 July 2013)

The Commission publishes an annual report on EU customs enforcement of intellectual property rights (IPR). In the latest report ([1]) there were more than 90 000 cases in 2011 comprising more than 110 million articles of an estimated retail value above EUR 1,2 billion. This does not include imported counterfeit goods that are not detected and currently there are no consolidated data on domestically produced counterfeit goods.

The Commission, in cooperation with the Observatory on IP infringements, undertakes currently studies to better assess the value of counterfeits and the harm they cause. Efforts are underway to improve data gathering.

Regarding money transfers there are no data as it is not possible to easily isolate illegal transfers from legal ones. Great efforts have been undertaken in the last years to improve the fight against money laundering in the EU and globally.

To strengthen customs powers the Commission proposed a new Regulation concerning customs enforcement of IPR which was approved by the legislators. The Commission and the Member States are also engaged in IPR enforcement at the borders by implementing the new Action Plan adopted by the Council. As part of a reform package to modernise the EU trade mark law, the Commission has also proposed to strengthen trade mark owners' rights by entitling them to prevent third parties from bringing counterfeit goods in the customs territory of the EU ([2]).

The Commission has initiated, with the Observatory, campaigns to increase citizens' awareness of detrimental effects of counterfeiting. Member States are undertaking similar actions notably within the new EU policy cycle 2013-17 for organised and serious international crime whereby counterfeiting harmful to health and safety is a priority.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/customs/customs_controls/counterfeit_piracy/statistics/2012_ipr_statistics_en.pdf

([2]) The Commission adopted the proposals end of March 2013. These proposals would fill the existing gap in current legislation with regard to goods in transit. Right holders would be entitled to prevent goods from third countries bearing a trade mark which is essentially identical to a trade mark registered in the European Union in respect of those goods, from being brought in the context of commercial activity into the customs territory of the Union regardless of whether they are released for free circulation.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004625/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(25 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: La crisi dell'industria metalmeccanica

Ridurre le imposte che gravano sul costo del lavoro, senza toccare gli stipendi netti; rendere più chiare le norme fiscali che regolano le transazioni che i gruppi industriali compiono a livello internazionale; introdurre un sistema di detrazioni che renda più vantaggiosi gli investimenti nella ricerca: sono questi gli interventi che un economista universitario suggerisce nell'immediato per evitare il crollo dell'industria metalmeccanica italiana, in particolare quella del bianco nel settore delle lavatrici. La Candy, ad esempio, vende nel Nord Europa modelli fatti in Cina, non a Brugherio, in Brianza, perché quelli cinesi costano 20 euro in meno l'uno.

Di fronte alla rarefazione dei mercati in Europa, all'elevato costo del lavoro a carico delle imprese, anche per ragioni fiscali, produrre in Europa diventa sempre più difficile. La conseguenza è la dislocazione verso aree meno costose e la moltiplicazione degli esuberi di personale, con l'aumento della disoccupazione e l'impoverimento dell'economia locale. Il fenomeno dello *spread*, tra l'altro, se rimarrà elevato, contribuirà a far mancare alle imprese le risorse finanziarie necessarie per gli investimenti innovativi.

Ciò premesso, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. condivide i tre interventi proposti dall'economista citato?

2. In che modo si possono conciliare le rigide imposizioni comunitarie a tutela dell'euro per i paesi con forte debito pubblico, con gli interventi proposti che allevierebbero le conseguenze della crisi? In altri termini, quali proposte suggerisce per conciliare la rigidità dell'austerità con la necessità di ripresa e sviluppo?

4. Non ritiene che, se non ripartirà la domanda, il solo traguardo possibile sarà la decrescita?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(11 luglio 2013)

La Commissione ha indicato nella sua analisi annuale della crescita per l'anno 2013 che i regimi fiscali dovrebbero essere più efficaci, più equi e meno pregiudizievoli per la crescita.

Gli incentivi fiscali sono molto diffusi tra gli Stati membri per aumentare gli investimenti nella ricerca e nello sviluppo tecnologico (R&S). La comunicazione «Per un utilizzo più efficace degli incentivi fiscali a favore della R&S» nonché il documento di lavoro che l'accompagna offrono orientamenti per mettere a punto in modo ottimale questi incentivi.

Nell'ambito del semestre europeo, la Commissione contempla l'opportunità di formulare raccomandazioni per le economie nazionali in generale, e non per i singoli settori industriali. Le misure fiscali suggerite dalla Commissione hanno lo scopo di trovare un equilibrio tra l'incremento delle entrate e il rilancio della crescita invece di aumentare le aliquote fiscali. Inoltre, l'aggiornamento della comunicazione sulla politica industriale, recentemente adottato, sottolinea il fatto che le misure capaci di creare o di aumentare la domanda di innovazione promuovendo la diffusione dell'innovazione nelle catene di approvvigionamento globale o fornendo degli incentivi sul piano normativo, possono ottimizzare l'incidenza della politica d'innovazione per promuovere la crescita e creare posti di lavoro in Europa. La Commissione ha stabilito sei task force per i settori industriali importanti che, tra l'altro, proporranno delle misure per rilanciare la domanda di innovazione. Inoltre, la Commissione ha recentemente invitato le parti interessate a considerare come si potrebbero ridurre gli ostacoli alla domanda di innovazione in Europa in settori specifici. L'attuazione di una strategia volta a rilanciare la domanda forma così un elemento importante della politica industriale della Commissione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004625/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: Crisis in the metalworking industry

Reducing the tax burden on labour, without affecting net wages; clarifying the tax rules governing the international transactions of industrial groups; and introducing a system of deductions that makes investment in research more attractive: these are the measures that one university economist suggests should be taken immediately in order to prevent the collapse of the Italian metalworking industry, in particular the production of white goods in the washing machine sector. Candy, for example, sells models in northern Europe that have been made in China, not in Brugherio, in Brianza, because the Chinese-made models cost EUR 20 less each.

In the face of thin markets in Europe and of the increased labour costs that companies have to bear, including for tax reasons, it is becoming increasingly difficult to manufacture in Europe. The upshot of this is a shift to cheaper regions and an increase in staff redundancies, leading to higher unemployment and impoverished local economies. If the high spread phenomenon, *inter alia*, continues, it will help deprive companies of the financial resources they need for innovative investment.

1. Does the Commission agree with the three measures proposed by the aforementioned economist?

2. How can the rigid EU taxes imposed on countries with a large public debt in order to protect the euro be reconciled with the proposed measures, which would mitigate the effects of the crisis? In other words, how does the Commission propose to reconcile the inflexibility of austerity with the need for recovery and development?

3. Does it not believe that, if demand does not increase, the only possible objective will be degrowth?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(11 July 2013)

The Commission indicated in its 2013 Annual Growth Survey that tax systems should be made more effective, fairer and less detrimental to growth.

Tax incentives are widely used by Member States to increase R&D investment. The communication and accompanying Staff Working Document on 'Towards a more effective use of tax incentives in favour of R&D' offers guidance on the optimal design of such incentives.

Within the European Semester, the Commission considers recommendations for national economies as a whole, rather than isolated industry sectors. The tax measures suggested by the Commission herein try to strike a balance between boosting revenue and reigniting growth instead of increasing tax rates. Moreover, the recently adopted update to the Industrial Policy Communication highlights that measures which have the potential to create or increase demand for innovation, promoting the uptake of innovation in global supply chains or providing regulatory incentives, can leverage the impact of innovation policy to foster growth and job creation in Europe. The Commission established six Task Forces for important industry sectors that will, *inter alia*, propose measures to restore demand for innovation. Furthermore, the Commission recently invited stakeholders to consider ways of reducing barriers to demand for European innovation in specific sectors. The implementation of a policy that aims at restoring demand is therefore an important element of the Commission's industrial policy.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004626/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(25 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Blocco del metabolismo delle cellule tumorali

Un gruppo di lavoro tutto italiano ha di recente dimostrato che è possibile bloccare farmacologicamente il metabolismo delle cellule tumorali, colpendole selettivamente. La ricerca, pubblicata sulla rivista medica «The Journal of the National Cancer Institute», nasce da un progetto multidisciplinare che ha unito competenze cellulari e molecolari nel campo oncologico e biochimico e apre nuove prospettive terapeutiche nella lotta contro i tumori. L'intuizione alla base dello studio è che le cellule tumorali, a causa della loro velocità di crescita e delle specifiche alterazioni metaboliche che le caratterizzano, siano strettamente dipendenti dal metabolismo degli acidi grassi per produrre, tra l'altro, le membrane delle cellule figlie. Bloccare il metabolismo di tali grassi con un farmaco apposito impedisce di generarne di nuovi e quindi di proliferare.

La Commissione:

1. è al corrente dei risultati di questa ricerca?

2. Gli organismi dell'Unione interessati alla ricerca scientifica e al riconoscimento dei farmaci conoscono questo studio e i risultati conseguiti fino ad ora?

3. Hanno un'opinione sulle prospettive terapeutiche che potrebbero risultare da questa ricerca?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(14 giugno 2013)

1.-2. La Commissione è a conoscenza dello studio che valuta l'efficacia terapeutica del nuovo inibitore ST1326 nelle linee cellulari e nel modello tumorale di un topo, come segnalato dall'onorevole deputato ([1]).

3. Come menzionato nella pubblicazione, i risultati presentati sono stati ottenuti nelle linee cellulari e nei modelli animali. Sono necessarie ulteriori ricerche per accertare che si verifichino gli stessi effetti anche nell'uomo e per constatare le possibilità terapeutiche a cui porterebbe tale approccio.

Nel dicembre 2012, il gruppo di lavoro oncologico dell'Agenzia europea per i medicinali ha approvato le nuove «linee guida per la valutazione dei medicinali antitumorali nell'uomo» che costituiranno il quadro di riferimento per l'approvazione di ogni presentazione di nuovi prodotti in futuro.

([1]) Pacilli et al. (2013) J Natl Cancer Inst. 105(7): pagg. 489-98.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004626/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: Blocking the metabolism of tumour cells

An all-Italian working group recently demonstrated that it is possible to pharmacologically block the metabolism of tumour cells, by acting on them selectively. The research, published in *The Journal of the National Cancer Institute*, is the product of a multidisciplinary project which brought together cellular and molecular expertise in the field of oncology and biochemistry, and which opens up new treatment possibilities in the fight against tumours. The study is based on the intuition that the growth speed and specific metabolic alterations of tumour cells make them strictly dependent on the metabolism of fatty acids to produce, among other things, the cell membranes of daughter cells. Blocking the metabolism of these fats with a specially designed drug prevents the cells from generating new fats and thus proliferating.

1. Is the Commission aware of the findings of this research?

2. Are the EU bodies concerned with scientific research and the recognition of drugs aware of this study and the results obtained to date?

3. Do they have an opinion on the treatment possibilities which this research could lead to?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(14 June 2013)

1 and 2. The Commission is aware of the publication assessing the therapeutic potential of a novel inhibitor ST1326 in cell lines and in a mouse cancer model as mentioned by the Honourable Member ([1]).

3. As mentioned in the publication, the results presented were obtained in cell lines and animal models. Further research is needed to ascertain their translatability to humans and the therapeutic possibilities this approach could lead to.

In December 2012, the Oncology Working Party of the European Medicines Agency approved the new 'Guideline on the evaluation of anticancer medicinal products in man'. This will be the framework for approval of any submission of new products in the future.

([1]) Pacilli et al. (2013) J Natl Cancer Inst. 105(7):489-98.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004627/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Chrysoula Paliadeli (S&D)
(25 Απριλίου 2013)

Θέμα: Euronews στα ελληνικά

Με ανακοίνωσή της στις 18 Δεκεμβρίου 2012, η Ελληνική Ραδιοφωνία και Τηλεόραση ΑΕ προέβη στην προσωρινή διακοπή της επίγειας ψηφιακής μετάδοσης του σήματος του πολύγλωσσου τηλεοπτικού σταθμού Euronews, επικαλούμενη προβλήματα στη συμφωνία με την Euronews ΑΕ ως προς το εγχείρημα μετάδοσης του προγράμματος του Euronews στην ελληνική γλώσσα. Η ΕΡΤ σταμάτησε επίσης και την εκπομπή της αγγλικής και γαλλικής έκδοσης του Euronews, παρόλο που είναι μέτοχος και ιδρυτικό μέλος του ειδησεογραφικού καναλιού.

Οι πράξεις αυτές της ΕΡΤ ΑΕ κρίθηκαν αρνητικά τον Φεβρουάριο του 2013 από το Εθνικό Συμβούλιο Ραδιοτηλεόρασης, μετά από σχετική προσφυγή της Euronews ΑΕ, ενώ μέχρι σήμερα δεν υπάρχει καμία εξέλιξη στο ζήτημα.

Την άνοιξη του 2012, μετά από διαβουλεύσεις της ΕΡΤ, όπως και του Ραδιοφωνικού Ιδρύματος Κύπρου, με τη διοίκηση του Euronews, είχε αποφασιστεί η δημιουργία της ελληνικής έκδοσης του Euronews, για την οποία εξασφαλίστηκε χρηματοδότηση από την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή, καθώς, σύμφωνα με πληροφορίες, δεσμεύτηκε να χρηματοδοτήσει τη λειτουργία του καναλιού με 21 εκατ. ευρώ για τρία χρόνια.

Δεδομένης της εμπλοκής της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής στην υπόθεση και της ευαισθησίας της για την προώθηση έγκυρης πληροφόρησης σε ευρωπαϊκό πλαίσιο και λαμβάνοντας υπόψη τα παραπάνω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Είχε εμπλακεί στη δημιουργία της ελληνικής έκδοσης του Euronews; Αν ναι με ποιον τρόπο;

2. Με ποια πράξη πραγματοποιήθηκε η παραχώρηση ευρωπαϊκών κονδυλίων για τη δημιουργία του Euronews στα ελληνικά;

3. Το αναφερόμενο ποσό των 21 εκατ. ευρώ για τη δημιουργία της ελληνικής έκδοσης ανταποκρίνεται στην πραγματικότητα;

4. Γνωρίζει αν έχει ήδη δαπανηθεί μέρος του ως άνω ποσού για την προετοιμασία της;

5. Έχει τη νομική δυνατότητα να παρέμβει στη διευθέτηση του ζητήματος;

Απάντηση της κ. Reding εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(7 Ιουνίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή υπέγραψε τον Μάιο 2012 ειδική συμφωνία επιχορήγησης με το Euronews για τη συγχρηματοδότηση της έναρξης μιας νέας ελληνικής υπηρεσίας Euronews σύμφωνα με το ψήφισμα του ΕΚ για την επέκταση της γλωσσικής κάλυψης του Euronews ([1]).

Η Επιτροπή έλαβε την εν λόγω απόφαση κατόπιν του ενδιαφέροντος που εκφράστηκε από τις ελληνικές και τις κυπριακές αρχές μέσω των δημόσιων ραδιοτηλεοπτικών οργανισμών ΕΡΤ και ΡΙΚ σε κοινή επιστολή τους που υπογράφηκε τον Μάρτιο 2012, με την οποία αναλάμβαναν τη δέσμευση να παράσχουν ελεύθερη επίγεια ψηφιακή μετάδοση του Euronews στα ελληνικά.

Η συμφωνία επιχορήγησης καλύπτει τη δημιουργία της ελληνικής υπηρεσίας (3,3 εκατομμύρια ευρώ) καθώς επίσης και την παραγωγή και εκπομπή προγραμμάτων στα ελληνικά για περίοδο έξι μηνών (1,7 εκατομμύρια ευρώ). Το ποσό που είχε καταναλωθεί από τη χρηματοδότηση μέχρι τις 31/12/2012 ήταν 1,35 εκατομμύρια ευρώ. Το μεγαλύτερο μέρος του δαπανήθηκε σε επιτόπιες επενδύσεις και σε προσλήψεις στα νέα γραφεία του Euronews στην Αθήνα.

Η χρηματοδότηση της Επιτροπής παρέχεται σε ετήσια βάση. Επομένως δεν υφίσταται υπογεγραμμένη συμφωνία που να καλύπτει περίοδο τριών ετών. Αν πρόκειται να ανανεωθεί η χρηματοδότηση για το εν λόγω σχέδιο, το κόστος εκτιμάται σε 3,5 εκατ. ευρώ/έτος, ποσόν το οποίο είναι σαφώς κατώτερο του προϋπολογισμού που αναφέρθηκε από την κ. βουλευτή.

Η Επιτροπή επί του παρόντος αναλύει το δυνητικό πεδίο ενεργειών σε επίπεδο ΕΕ αναφορικά με την διακοπή της επίγειας μετάδοσης του Euronews στην Ελλάδα.

([1]) Ψήφισμα του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, της 7ης Σεπτεμβρίου 2010, σχετικά με τη δημοσιογραφία και τα νέα μέσα ενημέρωσης — δημιουργία δημόσιας σφαίρας στην Ευρώπη, P7_TA(2010)0307.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004627/13
to the Commission
Chrysoula Paliadeli (S&D)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: Euronews in Greek

In a communication of 18 December 2012, the Hellenic Broadcasting Corporation (ERT) temporarily stopped the digital terrestrial broadcasting of the multilingual television channel Euronews, claiming that it had problems with the agreement concluded with Euronews on broadcasting the programme in Greek. ERT also stopped broadcasting the English and French versions of the Euronews programme, despite being a shareholder and founding member of the news channel.

ERT's actions were criticised in February 2013 by the National Radio and Television Council, following an appeal by Euronews, but there have been no further developments in the matter.

In the spring of 2012, following negotiations between ERT, the Cyprus Broadcasting Corporation, and Euronews management, it was decided that a Greek version of the Euronews programme would be created, financed by the European Union which, according to reports, agreed to finance the operation of the channel with EUR 21 million over three years.

Given the European Union's involvement in the case and its concern for providing up-to-date information on Europe, and taking the above into consideration, will the Commission answer the following:

1. Is it involved in creating the Greek version of Euronews? If so, in what way is it involved?

2. How were EU funds for creating the Euronews channel in Greek granted?

3. Is the amount of EUR 21 million for creating the Greek version of the programme realistic?

4. Does it know whether part of this amount has already been spent on preparing the programme?

5. Does it have the legal authority to settle this matter?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(7 June 2013)

The Commission signed a specific grant agreement with Euronews in May 2012 to co-finance the launch of a new Greek Euronews service in line with the EP resolution calling for an extension of Euronews' linguistic coverage ([1]).

The Commission took this decision following the interest expressed by the Greek and Cypriot authorities through the public broadcasters ERT and CyBC in a joint letter signed March 2012, whereby they committed to providing free-to-air terrestrial digital transmission to Euronews in Greek.

The grant agreement covers the setting-up of the Greek service (3.3 million EUR) as well as the production and broadcast of programmes in Greek for a period of six months (1.7 million EUR). The funding consumed as of 31/12/2012 is 1.35 million EUR. Most of it has been spent on local investment and recruitment for Euronews' new office in Athens.

Commission funding is provided on an annual basis. There is thus no signed agreement covering a period of three years. If funding were to be renewed for this project, the costs are estimated at 3.5 million EUR/year, a sum which falls well below the budget mentioned by the Honourable Member.

The Commission is currently analysing the potential scope for action at EU level as regards the cessation of terrestrial transmission of Euronews in Greece.

([1]) European Parliament resolution of 7 September 2010 on journalism and new media — creating a public sphere in Europe, P7_TA(2010)0307.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004628/13
aan de Commissie (Vicevoorzitter / Hoge Vertegenwoordiger)
Marietje Schaake (ALDE)
(25 april 2013)

Betreft: VP/HR — Onbeantwoorde vraag: „De sancties tegen Iran die de toegang tot levensreddende geneesmiddelen blokkeren"

Op 25 februari 2013 heb ik een vraag ingediend bij de hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter over „De sancties tegen Iran die de toegang tot levensreddende geneesmiddelen blokkeren" (E-002021/2013).

De termijn voor het beantwoorden van deze vraag is verstreken op 22 april 2013.

Waarom heeft de hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter zich niet gehouden aan het Reglement?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(7 juni 2013)

Vraag E-002021/2013 is door het Parlement officieel ingediend bij de Commissie op 11 maart 2013. De termijn voor het beantwoorden ervan was 25 april 2013. Het antwoord is officieel bij het Parlement ingediend op 24 april 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004628/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Marietje Schaake (ALDE)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Unanswered question: 'Sanctions against Iran blocking access to life-saving medicine'

On 25 February 2013, I submitted a question to the Vice-President/High Representative about 'Sanctions against Iran blocking access to life-saving medicine' (E-002021/2013).

The deadline for answering this question lapsed on 22 April 2013.

Why has the Vice-President/High Representative failed to comply with the Rules of Procedure?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(7 June 2013)

The Question E-002021/2013 was officially submitted by the Parliament to the Commission on 11 March 2013 with the deadline for transmitting the answer of 25 April 2013. The reply was officially transmitted to the Parliament on 24 April 2013.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-004629/13
til Kommissionen
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(25. april 2013)

Om: Godkendelse af kompensation for randzoner

Ministeriet for Fødevarer, Landbrug og Fiskeri udsendte den. 22. marts 2013 en pressemeddelelse, hvor der stod: »Som ventet har EU-Kommissionen nu over for Fødevareministeriet bekræftet, at kompensationsordningen for randzonerne er gyldig. Ordningen giver danske landmænd økonomisk kompensation for de 10 meter randzoner, de har udlagt« ([1]). I den danske presse er der efterfølgende opstået debat om, hvorvidt den danske fødevareministers udtalelse var korrekt, og om Kommissionens godkendelse af den danske kompensationsordning er endelig.

Kommissionen bedes på baggrund af overstående oplyse, om den på nuværende tidspunkt kan garantere, at Danmark i henhold til Kommissionens forordning nr. 1974/2006 kan benytte landdistriktsudviklingsmidler til udbetaling af kompensation for udlægning af randzoner med tilbagevirkende kraft, selvom Danmark endnu ikke har implementeret EU's vandrammedirektiv?

Kommissionen bedes herunder bekræfte, om den på nogen måde har meddelt de danske myndigheder, at den vil godkende eller har til hensigt at godkende, at Danmark kan benytte landdistriktsudviklingsmidler til udbetaling af kompensation for udlægning af randzoner med tilbagevirkende kraft i henhold til Kommissionens forordning nr. 1974/2006?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Dacian Cioloş
(11. juni 2013)

Vandområdeplanerne, som var gældende i Danmark, er af proceduremæssige årsager blevet annulleret af Natur- og Miljøklagenævnet. På nuværende tidspunkt har de danske myndigheder endnu ikke opstillet nogen nye planer.

Efter artikel 26a i forordning (EF) nr. 1974/2006 ([2]) kan der i henhold til artikel 38, stk. 1, i forordning (EF) nr. 1698/2005 ([3]) kun gives støtte til omkostninger og indkomsttab, som skyldes krav, der er i overensstemmelse med indsatsprogrammerne for vandområdeplanerne. Derudover fastsætter artikel 34, stk. 1, i samme forordning, at der kun kan foretages betalinger til landbrugsområder, »hvis der er opstillet og gennemført en relevant vandområdeplan i de pågældende områder.«

Da der således ikke foreligger gyldige vandområdeplaner, er det ikke muligt for Kommissionen at garantere, at Danmark kan benytte landdistriktsudviklingsmidler til udbetaling af kompensation for udlægning af randzoner.

Det skal imidlertid bemærkes, at det danske landdistriktsprogram (LDP) indeholder en godkendt foranstaltning for udbetaling af kompensation til landbrugere for randzoner, som er gennemført i overensstemmelse med de nu annullerede vandområdeplaner. Kommissionen finder, at der kan foretages udbetaling til landbrugere i henhold til denne foranstaltning efter Danmarks vedtagelse af nye vandområdeplaner, forudsat at visse betingelser er opfyldt. Denne holdning er blevet meddelt de danske myndigheder i brev af 26. februar 2013 (ARES(2013)253663).

([1]) http://www.fvm.dk/Default.aspx?ID=18486&PID=165776&NewsID=7977.
([2]) EUT L 368 af 23.12.2006.
([3]) EUT L 277 af 21.10.2005.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004629/13
to the Commission
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: Approval of compensation for buffer strips

On 22 March 2013 the Danish Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Fisheries issued the following press release (unofficial translation): 'As expected, the European Commission has now confirmed to the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Fisheries that the compensation scheme for buffer strips is valid. The scheme provides financial compensation to Danish farmers for the 10 metre buffer strips they have set up' ([1]). A debate subsequently arose in the Danish press as to whether the statement by the Danish Minister for Food, Agriculture and Fisheries was correct and whether the Commission's approval of the Danish compensation scheme is final.

In view of the above, can the Commission say whether it is able to guarantee at this point in time that Denmark, under Commission Regulation (EC) No 1974/2006, can use rural development funds to pay compensation for setting up buffer strips with retroactive effect, even though Denmark has not yet implemented the EU Water Framework Directive?

Can the Commission also confirm whether it has in any way informed the Danish authorities that it will approve or intends to approve Denmark's use of rural development funds to pay compensation for setting up buffer strips, with retroactive effect, under Commission Regulation (EC) No 1974/2006?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2013)

The river basin management plans which were in place in Denmark have been annulled on procedural grounds by a national board of appeals. At the current time, no new management plans have yet been established by the Danish authorities.

According to Article 26a of Regulation (EC) No 1974/2006 ([2]), support pursuant to Article 38(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005 ([3]) shall be provided only for cost incurred and income foregone resulting from requirements that are in accordance with the programmes of measures of the river basin management plans. Furthermore, Article 34 (1) of the same Regulation specifies that agricultural areas are eligible for payments only 'if a relevant river basin management plan is established and implemented in those areas'.

It follows that it is not possible for the Commission in the absence of valid river basin management plans to guarantee that Denmark can use rural development funds to pay compensation for setting up buffer strips.

However, it should be noted that the Danish Rural Development Programme (RDP) does contain an approved measure for the payment of compensation to farmers for buffer zones implemented in line with the now annulled river basin management plans. The Commission considers that compensation could be paid to farmers under this measure following the adoption of new river basin management plans by Denmark, provided certain conditions are fulfilled. This position has been communicated to the Danish authorities in a letter of 26 February 2013 (ARES(2013)253663).

([1]) http://www.fvm.dk/Default.aspx?ID=18486&PID=165776&NewsID=7977
([2]) OJ L 368, 23.12.2006.
([3]) OJ L 277, 21.10.2005.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-004640/13
adresată Comisiei
Corina Crețu (S&D)
(25 aprilie 2013)

Subiect: Impactul îmbătrânirii populației

Populația Uniunii Europene este afectată de un proces progresiv de îmbătrânire. Dintr-un total de 503,7 milioane de locuitori, ponderea persoanelor cu vârste de peste 65 de ani se ridica la 18% în 2012, conform Eurostat.

Acest fenomen are efecte asupra creșterii economice, pieței forței de muncă, transferului de proprietate, sănătății, componentei familiei, achiziționării de locuințe și asupra migrației.

Îmbătrânirea populației va determina sporirea numărului solicitanților de pensii de stat și asigurări sociale și o creștere a ratei de dependență a vârstnicilor, fenomen care va contribui în mod semnificativ la majorarea cheltuielilor din bugetul de stat pentru serviciile de sănătate și pensii.

Ce măsuri alternative creșterii vârstei de pensionare are în vedere Comisia pentru reducerea ratei de dependență a vârstnicilor, care în prezent a crescut de la 21,1% în 1992 la 26,8% în 2012?

Care sunt recomandările Comisiei pentru a împiedica majorarea taxelor și impozitelor, situație care ar putea descuraja lucrătorii și firmele care doresc să facă investiții determinând o scădere a productivității și recesiunea economică?

Răspuns dat de dl. Andor în numele Comisiei
(17 iunie 2013)

În conformitate cu articolul 153 din TFUE, statele membre sunt responsabile cu definirea propriilor sisteme de securitate socială, cu condiția să respecte anumite principii de bază, cum ar fi tratamentul egal și nediscriminarea. Rolul UE este de a susține și de a completa activitățile statelor membre prin facilitarea învățării reciproce și a schimbului de bune practici în cadrul „metodei deschise de coordonare". În 2012, în Cartea albă intitulată „O agendă pentru pensii adecvate, sigure și viabile" (COM (2012) 55final), Comisia a prezentat propuneri menite să garanteze caracterul adecvat și durabil al pensiilor, în contextul mai puțin favorabil al ratelor de dependență a vârstnicilor.

Cartea albă insistă pe necesitatea unui echilibru mai bun între durata vieții profesionale și durata pensionării. Aceasta se referă nu numai la o ieșire mai târzie de pe piața muncii, ci poate însemna și o rată de participare mai ridicată pe piața muncii în rândul femeilor și al tinerilor. Aceste măsuri nu ar reduce ratele de dependență a persoanelor vârstnice, coeficientul cel mai des utilizat, ci ar reduce raportul de dependență *economică*, care este un factor mult mai important pentru durabilitatea unei protecții sociale corespunzătoare.

Pentru a contribui la menținerea caracterului adecvat al pensiilor, în condițiile în care sistemele legale de pensii de tip redistributiv suferă din ce în ce mai mult de lipsă de fonduri, Cartea albă propune, de asemenea, ca statele membre să le ofere cetățenilor mai multe oportunități pentru a acumula pensii complementare sigure și eficiente.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004640/13
to the Commission
Corina Crețu (S&D)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: Impact of an ageing population

The European Union's population is being affected by a gradual ageing process. According to Eurostat, citizens aged over 65 years represented 18% of the total population of 503.7 million in 2012.

This trend has an impact on economic growth, the labour market, the transfer of property, health, family composition, the purchase of residential property and migration.

An ageing population will increase the number of applicants for state pensions and social security, as well as the old-age dependency ratio. This trend will result in a substantial rise in state budget expenditure for healthcare services and pensions.

What alternative measures to raising the retirement age is the Commission considering to reduce the old-age dependency ratio, which has now increased from 21.1% in 1992 to 26.8% in 2012?

What recommendations can the Commission make to prevent taxes and duties being raised, which could discourage workers and companies looking to invest, and would lead to falling productivity and economic recession?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2013)

According to Art 153 TFEU, Members States are responsible for the design of their social security systems, provided they respect certain basic principles such as equal treatment and non-discrimination. The role of the EU is to support and complement Member States' activities through facilitating mutual learning and exchange of best practise in the context of the 'open method of coordination'. The Commission presented its proposals for ensuring the future adequacy and sustainability of pensions in the context of less favourable old-age dependency ratios in its 2012 White Paper 'An Agenda for Adequate, Safe and Sustainable Pensions' (COM(2012)55final).

The White Paper insists on the need for a better balance between time spent in work and in retirement. This refers not only to retiring later from the labour market, but can also mean a higher labour market participation of women and young people. Such measures would not reduce the commonly used demographic old-age dependency ratios, but it would reduce the *economic* dependency ratio, which is much more significant for the sustainability of adequate social protection.

In order to support pension adequacy in the context of the typically declining generosity of statutory pay-as-you-go pensions, the White Paper also suggests that Member States enhance opportunities for citizens to accumulate safe and efficient supplementary pensions.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-004641/13
adresată Consiliului
Corina Crețu (S&D)
(25 aprilie 2013)

Subiect: Măsuri pentru combaterea evaziunii fiscale în Uniunea Europeană

E inadmisibil faptul că, în vreme ce cetățenii europeni suportă povara crizei economice, se tergiversează adoptarea unui set de norme comune împotriva companiilor și persoanelor fizice care se sustrag de la plata taxelor, în special prin specularea standardelor diferite, de la o țară la alta, în materie de legislație fiscală. Uniunea Europeană are obligația de a corecta, într-o manieră unitară, permisivitatea legislativă care favorizează frauda masivă. Această problemă transfrontalieră are nevoie de o soluție europeană și de o cooperare globală mai eficientă.

Are în vedere Consiliul să adopte propunerile Comisiei Europene, pentru introducerea, la nivelul UE, a unui Cod al contribuabililor și a Numărului de identificare fiscală, precum și pentru combaterea paradisurilor fiscale și a planificării fiscale agresive, care abuzează de convențiile privind evitarea dublei impuneri?

Răspuns
(22 iulie 2013)

În concluziile sale privind evaziunea fiscală și frauda fiscală din 14 mai 2013, Consiliul a sprijinit eforturile suplimentare la nivel național, al UE, al G8, al G20, al OCDE și mondial privind schimbul automat de informații și îmbunătățirea implementării și aplicării standardelor de informare privind uzufructul relevante în scopuri fiscale ([1]).

Codul contribuabililor și numărul de identificare fiscală au fost analizate împreună cu o întreagă serie de propuneri transmise de Comisie Consiliului. În concluziile sale din 14 mai 2013, Consiliul și-a confirmat concluziile din 13 noiembrie 2012, în care își stabilește prioritățile pentru anii care vor veni în domeniul impozitării directe și indirecte.

La 14 mai 2013, Consiliul a adoptat mandatul de negociere cu Elveția, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Andorra și San Marino în vederea extinderii schimbului de informații la aceste țări terțe în domeniul impozitării veniturilor din economii. Această nouă evoluție ar trebui să permită Directivei privind impozitarea veniturilor din economii, în forma sa revizuită, care ar acoperi lacune importante existente în actuala versiune, să fie adoptată curând.

Unele state membre au anunțat un instrument-pilot de schimb multilateral, cu scopul de a asigura transparența printr-un angajament ferm față de schimbul automat de informații între administrații. Aceste state membre sugerează faptul că schimbul automat de informații ar trebui să devină noul standard internațional. Cu ocazia reuniunii Consiliului European din 22 mai 2013, Comisarul Semeta a anunțat faptul că, valorificând lucrările în curs de desfășurare din UE și impulsul creat recent prin inițiativa unui grup de state membre, Comisia intenționează să propună modificări la Directiva privind cooperarea administrativă în iunie pentru a acoperi întregul spectru al veniturilor.

În cele din urmă, în concluziile sale din 22 mai 2013, Consiliul European a subliniat importanța adoptării de măsuri eficiente pentru a combate evaziunea fiscală și frauda fiscală și pentru a soluționa planificarea fiscală agresivă.

([1]) 9405/13.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004641/13
to the Council
Corina Crețu (S&D)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: Measures for combating tax evasion in the European Union

It is unacceptable that while Europe's citizens are bearing the brunt of the recession, there is a delay in adopting a set of common rules penalising companies and private individuals who evade the payment of tax, especially by exploiting the differences between the fiscal legislative provisions of Member States. It is the European Union's duty to rectify in a cohesive manner the lax legislation which is conducive to large-scale fraud. This cross-border problem requires a European solution and more effective global cooperation.

Does the Council intend to adopt the Commission's proposals aimed at introducing at EU level a Taxpayers' Code and a Tax Identification Number, as well as at tackling tax havens and 'aggressive tax planning', which misuse double taxation conventions?

Reply
(22 July 2013)

In its conclusions on tax evasion and tax fraud of 14 May 2013, the Council supported further efforts at national, EU, G8, G20, OECD and global level on automatic exchange of information and on improving the implementation and enforcement of standards of beneficial ownership information that is relevant for tax purposes ([1]).

The Taxpayers' Code and the Tax Identification Number have been examined together with a whole range of proposals submitted by the Commission to the Council. In its 14 May 2013 Conclusions, the Council confirmed its Conclusions of 13 November 2012, in which it sets out its priorities for the years to come in the field of direct and indirect taxation.

On 14 May 2013 the Council adopted the mandate for negotiations with Switzerland, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Andorra and San Marino with a view to extending exchange of information to these third countries in the area of savings interest taxation. This new development should allow the revised Savings Directive, which would close important loopholes in the existing Savings Directive, to be adopted soon.

A Pilot Multilateral Exchange Facility was announced by some Member States, with the aim of ensuring transparency by means of a strong commitment to exchange information automatically between administrations. These Member States suggest that automatic exchange of information should become the new international standard. At the European Council meeting of 22 May 2013, Commissioner Semeta announced that, building on ongoing work in the EU and on the momentum recently created by this initiative taken by some Member States, the Commission intends to propose amendments to the directive on administrative cooperation in June so as to cover a full range of incomes.

Finally, in its conclusion of 22 May 2013, the European Council underlined the importance of taking effective steps to fight tax evasion and tax fraud and to tackle aggressive tax planning.

([1]) 9405/13.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-004642/13
komissiolle
Mitro Repo (S&D)
(25. huhtikuuta 2013)

Aihe: Romanien syrjinnän jatkuminen Euroopan unionin jäsenvaltioissa

Useat ihmisoikeusjärjestöt ovat todenneet, ettei Euroopan unioni tee riittävästi romanien syrjinnän lopettamiseksi jäsenvaltioissaan.

EU:n jäsenvaltioissa asuu noin kuusi miljoonaa romania, joista joidenkin tilastojen mukaan jopa kahdeksan kymmenestä elää köyhyydessä ja vain yhdellä seitsemästä on edes toisen asteen koulutus.

Romaneihin kohdistetut ihmisoikeusloukkaukset vaihtelevat yleisestä syrjinnästä yhteiskunnassa aina pakkohäätöihin ja väkivaltaisiin hyökkäyksiin. Romanit ovat räikeästi aliedustettuina kaikilla yhteiskunnan aloilla.

Syrjinnän salliminen on vastoin EU-lainsäädäntöä. Euroopan unioni on arvoyhteisö, joka perustuu vapauden, demokratian ja ihmisoikeuksien kunnioittamiseen. Syrjintä kielletään vuoden 2 000 rasismi- ja työsyrjintädirektiivien nojalla sekä vuoden 2009 EU:n perusoikeuskirjassa. Euroopan unionin liittyminen Euroopan ihmisoikeussopimuksen sopimusosapuoleksi on vireillä.

Kansainvälisten sekä unionin omien ihmisoikeusvelvoitteiden mukaisesti jäsenvaltioiden viranomaiset ja poliisi ovat velvoitettuja ehkäisemään sekä tutkimaan romaneihin kohdistuneita iskuja ja väkivallantapauksia tehokkaasti.

1. Katsooko komissio, että se on tehnyt riittävästi romanien syrjinnän lopettamiseksi?

2. Katsooko komissio, että EU:n jäsenvaltiot ovat tehneet riittävästi romanien syrjinnän lopettamiseksi?

3. Mitä uusia toimia komissio aikoo toteuttaa romaneihin kohdistuvan syrjinnän poistamiseksi unionin alueella?

4. Mihin toimenpiteisiin komissio aikoo ryhtyä niiden jäsenvaltioiden kohdalla, joissa on voimassa romaneja syrjivää lainsäädäntöä ja/tai käytäntöjä?

Viviane Redingin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(21. kesäkuuta 2013)

Euroopan unioni on antanut lainsäädäntöä, luonut toimintapolitiikkoja ja ottanut käyttöön taloudellisia toimenpiteitä kaikkien EU:n kansalaisten, myös romanien, perusoikeuksien suojelun ja edistämisen varmistamiseksi ([1]). Yhdessä ne muodostavat kattavan kokonaisuuden, jonka täytäntöönpano on komissiolle etusijalla.

Rodusta riippumatonta yhdenvertaista kohtelua koskevassa direktiivissä 2000/43/EY kielletään rotuun tai etniseen alkuperään perustuva syrjintä useilla aloilla, kuten työolot ja -ehdot, koulutus, terveydenhuolto ja asuminen. Kaikki jäsenvaltiot ovat saattaneet tämän direktiivin osaksi kansallista lainsäädäntöään. On siis jäsenvaltioiden tehtävä varmistaa, että direktiiviä sovelletaan asianmukaisesti. Komissio on tarkastanut, että jäsenvaltioiden lainsäädännöt ovat yhdenmukaisia direktiivin kanssa. Komissio myös seuraa tiiviisti direktiivin täytäntöönpanoa ja soveltamista kaikissa jäsenvaltioissa ja antaa siitä kertomuksen myöhemmin tänä vuonna. Lisäksi komissio on jo ilmoittanut puuttuvansa nimenomaan romanien integraatioon liittyviin oikeudellisiin kysymyksiin.

Syrjinnän torjuminen vakuuttavasti on yksi ennakkoedellytyksistä romanien integraatiota edistävien kansallisten strategioiden panemiseksi onnistuneesti täytäntöön. Komissio raportoi aiheesta seuraavassa kesällä 2013 julkaistavassa edistymiskertomuksessaan. Komissio hyväksyi vuonna 2011 EU:n kehyksen romanien integraatiota edistäville kansallisille strategioille. Kehyksessä painotetaan sen varmistamista, että romaneja ei syrjitä vaan kohdellaan kuin keitä tahansa EU:n kansalaisia, jotka voivat nauttia kaikista EU:n perusoikeuskirjaan kirjatuista perusoikeuksista.

([1]) Ks. http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/roma/index_fi.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004642/13
to the Commission
Mitro Repo (S&D)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: Continued discrimination against Roma in the EU Member States

Several human rights organisations have observed that the European Union is not doing enough to halt discrimination against Roma in its Member States.

There are some six million Roma living in the EU Member States. Of these, according to some statistics, as many as eight out of ten are living in poverty and only one in seven even has secondary-level education.

Human rights violations against Roma vary from general discrimination in society to compulsory evictions and violent attacks. Roma are glaringly under-represented in all areas of society.

It is against EC law to permit discrimination. The European Union is a community of values, based on respect for freedom, democracy and human rights. Discrimination is banned under the directives on racism and on discrimination at work, both from the year 2000, and under the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU. The EU's application for accession as a party to the European Convention on Human Rights is pending.

In accordance with international, and the EU's own, human rights obligations, the authorities and police of the Member States have a responsibility to prevent and investigate attacks and violent incidents against Roma in an effective manner.

1. Does the Commission consider that it has done enough to halt discrimination against Roma?

2. Does the Commission consider that the EU Member States have done enough to halt discrimination against Roma?

3. What new activities does the Commission propose to implement to eliminate discrimination against Roma on the EU's territory?

4. What measures does the Commission propose to take towards those Member States in which laws are in force and/or practices are prevalent which discriminate against Roma?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(21 June 2013)

The European Union has put in place a comprehensive set of legal, policy and financial measures in order to ensure that the fundamental rights of all EU citizens, including Roma, are effectively promoted and protected ([1]). The Commission first and foremost focuses on the effective implementation of these measures.

Directive 2000/43/EC on Racial Equality prohibits discrimination on the basis of racial or ethnic origin in a number of areas, including employment, education, healthcare and housing. This directive has been transposed into national law in all Member States and it is up to the Member States to ensure that the directive is correctly applied. The Commission has examined the conformity of national laws with the directive and continues to closely monitor its implementation and application in all Member States. The Commission will report on the application of this directive later this year and has already announced that it will address the legal issues with a particular emphasis on aspects relevant to Roma integration.

Fighting discrimination convincingly is one of the preconditions for the successful implementation of the National Roma Integration Strategies on which the Commission will report in its next progress report to be adopted in summer 2013. As already emphasised in the EU Framework for the National Roma Integration Strategies adopted by the Commission in 2011, the Member States need to ensure, that Roma are not discriminated against but treated like any other EU citizens with equal access to all fundamental rights as enshrined in the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/roma/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004644/13
to the Commission
Jill Evans (Verts/ALE)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: Decontamination of EU-protected wetlands

I have received a letter from a constituent regarding potential contamination of the Loughor Estuary and Burry Inlet, which are protected by EU regulations. They qualify under Article 4(2) of Directive 79/409/EEC as they support large numbers of migratory birds.

Near the estuary, there is a decommissioned zinc oxide works on a site which is currently contaminated. The local council gave planning permission for a housing and retail development to be built on the site, but this was refused by the Welsh Assembly Government on the grounds that the site lies on a C2 floodplain, and as such remains contaminated and unaccounted for.

The issue at stake is that if this site were to be flooded, contaminated water could endanger an area protected by EC law. Private developers obviously do not want to foot the bill for decontaminating the area if they cannot build there, and the Welsh Government cannot really afford to do so.

Does the Welsh Government or any other body have a legal responsibility to decontaminate the site? What support is available to undertake such work?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(14 June 2013)

There is no specific EU-legislation tackling so-called 'historical pollution', i.e. pollution having taken place before 30 April 2007, when the Environmental Liability Directive (ELD, 2005/35/EC ([1])), implementing the polluter-pays principle, took effect. As from May 2007, soil contamination causing land damage may be subject to the provisions of the ELD.

However, even historical pollution is subject to the polluter pays principle if the polluter is known.

The Floods Directive (2007/60/EC ([2])) obliges Member States (MS) to develop flood hazard and risk maps by 22 December 2013. On this basis, Flood Risk Management Plans should be developed by 22 December 2015 in which MS should define appropriate objectives for the management of flood risk, focusing on the reduction of potential adverse consequences including for the environment. Measures should be set accordingly. The plans should be subject to public consultation.

The Commission presented a proposal for a Soil Framework Directive ([3]) in 2006 which would require an identification of contaminated sites, including 'historic' ones. Such proposal has not yet been adopted by the co-legislators.

On the potential impact on migratory birds using the Natura 2000 site nearby, the only relevant provision under EU nature legislation would be Article 6 of the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC ([4])). It deals with the conservation management of Natura 2000 sites, which among others require that MS take appropriate steps to avoid the deterioration of the respective site.

As regards the possible use of EU-funds for decontamination works I invite you to contact the managing authority of the European Regional Development Fund programme ([5]).

([1]) OJ L 143, 30.4.2004.
([2]) OJ L 288, 6.11.2007.
([3]) COM(2006) 232.
([4]) OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.
([5]) The Welsh European Funding Office http://wefo.wales.gov.uk/?lang=en.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-004645/13
til Kommissionen
Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(25. april 2013)

Om: Forskning inden for clostridium difficile

Clostridium difficile er blevet den mest almindelige infektion, som erhverves i sundhedsvæsenet i Den Europæiske Union, og denne infektion forekommer i omtrent én ud af 436 hospitalsindlæggelser. Dette medfører længere hospitalsindlæggelser, varige sundhedsmæssige følger og tilmed dødsfald.

1. Hvor meget har Den Europæiske Union ydet i støtte til forskningen til forebyggelse og bekæmpelse af *clostridium difficile*-infektioner?

2. I hvilket omfang støtter EU udvekslingen af bedste praksis med hensyn til infektionsbekæmpelsesforanstaltninger vedrørende infektioner erhvervet i sundhedsvæsenet generelt og især *clostridium difficile*?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Máire Geoghegan-Quinn
(7. juni 2013)

1. Kommissionen er fuldt ud opmærksom på behovet for at fremme forskning i infektionssygdomme erhvervet i sundhedsvæsenet (HAI'er) såsom dem, der forårsages af »Clostridium difficile«. Flere projekter, der finansieres gennem FP6 og FP7 ([1]) — såsom MOSAR ([2]) (10 mio. EUR) og PROHIBIT ([3]) (3 mio. EUR) — har (haft) til formål at identificere indgreb og bedste praksis, der skal reducere antallet af HAI'er.

Derudover støtter Kommissionen forskningsprojekter, der specifikt koncentrerer sig om »Clostridium difficile«, som for eksempel HYPERDIFF ([4]) (3 mio. EUR). Dette projekt undersøger virulensfaktorer, som er afgørende for epidemiologien såvel som udviklingen af diagnostik. Kommissionen er ved at lægge sidste hånd på en tilskudsaftale til projektet CD-VAX (6 mio. EUR), som har til formål at udvikle en ny vaccine mod »Clostridium difficile«.

2. Udvekslingen af bedste praksis med hensyn til foranstaltninger til generel bekæmpelse af HAI'er er en del af de tiltag, der er gennemført på EU-niveau i henhold til Rådets henstilling om patientsikkerhed, som omfatter forebyggelse og bekæmpelse af infektionssygdomme erhvervet i sundhedsvæsenet ([5]). Medlemsstaterne anmodes om at indføre en række foranstaltninger for at minimere risikoen for patienter i behandling ved bl.a. at dele og fremme bedste praksis med hensyn til fremme af sundhedspersonales uddannelse og træning udi forebyggelse af og kontrol med HAI'er. Detaljerede analyser af foranstaltningerne for forebyggelse og kontrol med infektioner af »Clostridium difficile« findes i det arbejdsdokument fra Kommissionens tjenestegrene, som er tilknyttet Kommissionens beretning om gennemførelse af Rådets henstilling ([6]).

([1]) Det sjette og det syvende rammeprogram for forskning, teknologisk udvikling og demonstration (FP6, 2002-2006; FP7, 2007-2013)
([2]) http://www.mosar-sic.org
([3]) https://plone.unige.ch/prohibit/
([4]) http://www.clostridium-difficile.com/
([5]) EUT C 151 af 3.7.2009.
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/patient_safety/docs/council_2009_report_swd_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004645/13
to the Commission
Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: Clostridium difficile research

Clostridium difficile has become the most common healthcare-associated infection (HAI) in the European Union, occurring in approximately 1 out of every 436 hospitalisations. This leads to longer periods of hospitalisation, lasting health consequences or even death.

1. How much funding is provided by the European Union to support research into preventing and combating *Clostridium difficile* infections?

2. To what extent is the EU supporting the exchange of best practice in infection control measures relating to HAIs in general, and *Clostridium difficile* in particular?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(7 June 2013)

1. The Commission is fully aware of the need to encourage research on the prevention of healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) like the ones caused by *Clostridium difficile*. Multiple FP6 and FP7 ([1]) funded research projects — such as MOSAR ([2]) (EUR 10 million) and PROHIBIT ([3]) (EUR 3 million) — aim(ed) to identify interventions and best practises leading to a reduction of HAIs.

In addition, the Commission supports research projects that focus specifically on *Clostridium difficile* like HYPERDIFF ([4]) (EUR 3 million), which studies virulence factors crucial for the epidemiology as well as for the development of diagnostics. Currently, the Commission is in the final stages of preparing a grant agreement for a project called CD-VAX (EUR6 million), which aims to develop a novel vaccine for *Clostridium difficile*.

2. The exchange of best practices with respect to infection control measures relating to HAIs in general is part of the actions implemented at EU level under the Council Recommendation on Patient Safety, which includes the Prevention and Control of Healthcare-Associated Infections ([5]). Member States are asked to put in place a series of measures with a view to minimising harm to patients receiving healthcare, including *inter alia* also sharing and promoting best practices with respect to the promotion of the education and training of healthcare workers on the prevention and control of HAIs. Detailed analyses of measures taken for the prevention and control of *Clostridium difficile* infections are included in the Commission Staff Working Document accompanying the report from the Commission to the Council Recommendation ([6]).

([1]) Sixth and Seventh Framework Programmes for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP6, 2002-2006; FP7, 2007-2013).
([2]) http://www.mosar-sic.org
([3]) https://plone.unige.ch/prohibit/
([4]) http://www.clostridium-difficile.com/
([5]) OJ C151, 3.7.2009.
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/patient_safety/docs/council_2009_report_swd_en.pdf

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-004646/13
til Kommissionen
Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(25. april 2013)

Om: Infektioner erhvervet i sundhedsvæsenet og medicinsk udstyr

Infektioner erhvervet i sundhedsvæsenet er et stort problem i mange europæiske sundhedsinstitutioner.

Har Kommissionen — eller en anden EU-enhed — et overblik over, hvor mange uønskede hændelser og alvorlige uønskede hændelser forårsaget af invasivt eller implanterbart medicinsk udstyr, der kan skyldes infektioner erhvervet i sundhedsvæsenet?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Tonio Borg
(11. juni 2013)

Ved Rådets direktiv 93/42/EØF om medicinsk udstyr ([1]) blev der oprettet en europæisk database for medicinsk udstyr, som samler oplysningerne om foranstaltninger, som medlemsstaterne har truffet eller overveje at træffe i tilfælde af hændelser, der involverer specifikt medicinsk udstyr. I henhold til Kommissionens afgørelse 2010/227/EU ([2]) om den europæiske database for medicinsk udstyr, hvis anvendelse har været obligatorisk siden den 1. maj 2011, skal medlemsstaterne informere om problemer vedrørende medicinsk udstyrs karakteristika og/eller ydeevne, herunder fabrikanternes korrigerende handlinger. Denne information omfatter imidlertid ikke infektioner erhvervet i sundhedsvæsenet som følge af anvendelsen af udstyr i et inficeret miljø eller genanvendelsen af medicinsk udstyr, som ikke er blevet ordentligt forarbejdet.

Europa-Kommissionen råder derfor ikke over omfattende oplysninger, når det gælder antallet af uønskede hændelser, som er forårsaget af invasivt eller implanterbart medicinsk udstyr, og som kan skyldes infektioner erhvervet i sundhedsvæsenet.

([1]) EFT L 169 af 12.7.1993, s. 1.
([2]) EUT L 102 af 23.4.2010, s. 45.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004646/13
to the Commission
Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: Healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) and medical devices

Healthcare-associated infections are a big issue in many European healthcare institutions.

Does the Commission — or any other European Union entity — have an overview over the number of adverse events and serious adverse events arising from invasive or implantable medical devices that can be attributed to HAIs?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2013)

Council Directive 93/42/EEC concerning medical devices ([1]) establishes a European Databank on Medical Devices collating the information on measures taken or contemplated by the Member States in case of incidents with specific medical devices. According to the Commission Decision 2010/227/EU ([2]) on the European Databank on Medical Devices, which is mandatory since 1 May 2011, the Member States have to provide information on problems related to the characteristics and/or performance of the medical devices themselves, including corrective actions taken by the manufacturers. This information does not however cover healthcare associated infections due to the use of devices in an infected environment, or to reuse of medical devices not having been adequately reprocessed.

The European Commission therefore does not have comprehensive data on the number of adverse incidents arising from the use of invasive or implantable medical devices and attributed to the healthcare associated infections.

([1]) OJ L 169, 12.7.1993, p. 1.
([2]) OJ L 102, 23.4.2010, p. 45.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-004647/13
til Kommissionen
Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(25. april 2013)

Om: Nationale handlingsplaner til bekæmpelse af infektioner erhvervet i sundhedsvæsenet

Infektioner erhvervet i sundhedsvæsenet udsætter europæiske borgere for risiko, samtidig med at de koster betydelige ekstra ressourcer for sundhedsvæsenet. Begrænsningen af antallet af patienter, der pådrager sig infektioner erhvervet i sundhedsvæsenet, er i varierende omfang blevet tillagt opmærksomhed i de forskellige lande. Ikke alle medlemsstater har fastlagt nationale handlingsplaner til bekæmpelse af infektioner erhvervet i sundhedsvæsenet, og blandt de medlemsstater, der har fastlagt sådanne handlingsplaner, varierer kvaliteten og grundigheden af disse planer.

Kommissionen anmodes i forbindelse med ovenstående om at besvare følgende:

1. Hvilke medlemsstater har fastlagt nationale handlingsplaner til bekæmpelse af infektioner erhvervet i sundhedsvæsenet, og hvilke har ikke fastlagt sådanne handlingsplaner?

2. Hvilke af medlemsstaterne uden nationale handlingsplaner har meddelt, at de agter at udarbejde sådanne planer?

3. Hvilke medlemsstater har efter Kommissionens mening de mest effektive nationale handlingsplaner (eller andre planer) til bekæmpelse af infektioner erhvervet i sundhedsvæsenet?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Tonio Borg
(14. juni 2013)

I 2009 vedtog Rådet en henstilling om patientsikkerhed, herunder forebyggelse og bekæmpelse af infektioner erhvervet i sundhedsvæsenet (2009/C 151/01) ([1]). Ifølge Rådets henstilling skal medlemsstaterne indføre forebyggelses- og bekæmpelsesforanstaltninger på passende niveau for at forebygge og bekæmpe infektioner erhvervet i sundhedsvæsenet.

Kommissionen offentliggjorde sin første rapport om gennemførelsen af denne henstilling i november 2012 ([2]), på grundlag af oplysninger fra medlemsstaterne.

Rapporten er ledsaget af en mere detaljeret analyse ([3]), ifølge hvilken der på tidspunktet for indberetningen fandtes handlingsplaner i 18 lande (AT, BE, BG, CZ, DE, DK, EL, ES, FR, HU, IE, IT, LT, NL, NO, PT, SK, UK) og i 11 regioner (Andalusien, Catalonien, Baskerlandet Madrid, Apulien, den selvstyrende provins Trento, Emilia-Romagna, Friuli-Venezia Giulia, Liguria, Lombardia, Piemonte).

Hertil kommer, at fem medlemsstater var i færd med at udarbejde en handlingsplan (LU, SE EE, PL, SI).

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2009:151:0001:0006:DA:PDF
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2012:0658:FIN:DA:PDF
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SWD:2012:0366:FIN:EN:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004647/13
to the Commission
Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: National action plans on combating healthcare associated infections

The issue of healthcare associated infections (HAIs) is putting European citizens at risk while at the same time costing the healthcare systems considerable extra resources. Limiting the number of patients contracting HAIs is given varying degrees of attention in the different countries. Not all Member States have national action plans to combat HAIs and, among those that do, the quality and thoroughness of such plans varies.

In connection with the above, can the Commission answer the following:

1. Which Member States have national action plans to combat HAIs and which do not?

2. Which of the Member States without national action plans have announced that they intend to develop such plans?

3. Which Member States have, in the Commission's opinion, the most effective national action plans (or other plans) to combat HAIs?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(14 June 2013)

In 2009, the Council adopted a recommendation on patient safety, which including the prevention and control of healthcare associated infections (2009/C 151/01) ([1]). The Council recommendation foresees that Member States implement prevention and control measures at appropriate level for the prevention and control of healthcare associated infections.

The Commission published its first report on the implementation of this recommendation in November 2012 ([2]), based on information provided by the Member States.

The report is accompanied by a more detailed analysis ([3]) according to which, at the time of reporting, action plans were available in 18 countries (AT, BE, BG, CZ, DE, DK, EL, ES, FR, HU, IE, IT, LT, NL, NO, PT, SK, UK) and in 11 regions (Andalusia, Basque Country, Catalonia, Community of Madrid, Apulia, Autonomous Province of Trento, Emilia-Romagna, Friuli-Venezia Giulia, Liguria, Lombardy, Piedmont).

In addition, five Member States had an action plan under preparation (LU, SE EE, PL, SI).

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2009:151:0001:0006:EN:PDF
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2012:0658:FIN:EN:PDF
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SWD:2012:0366:FIN:EN:PDF

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-004648/13
til Kommissionen
Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(25. april 2013)

Om: Risikoen for infektioner erhvervet i sundhedsvæsenet på EU's hospitaler

Infektioner erhvervet i sundhedsvæsenet er et stort problem i hele Europa, men risikoen varierer betydeligt mellem medlemsstater.

I lyset af dette bedes Kommissionen besvare følgende spørgsmål:

1. Hvad er den gennemsnitlige risiko for at få en infektion i sundhedsvæsenet under eller efter hospitalsopholdet i Den Europæiske Union?

2. Hvad er den gennemsnitlige risiko for at få en clostridium difficile-infektion i sundhedsvæsenet under eller efter hospitalsopholdet i Den Europæiske Union?

3. Hvad er den gennemsnitlige risiko for at få infektionen methicillinresistent Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) i sundhedsvæsenet under eller efter hospitalsopholdet i Den Europæiske Union?

4. Hvad er risikoen for at få en infektion i sundhedsvæsenet under eller efter hospitalsopholdet i de enkelte medlemsstater (angiv venligst data for hver medlemsstat)?

5. Hvad er den gennemsnitlige risiko for at få en clostridium difficile-infektion under eller efter hospitalsopholdet i de enkelte medlemsstater (angiv venligst data for hver medlemsstat)?

6. Hvad er den gennemsnitlige risiko for at få en MRSA-infektion under eller efter hospitalsopholdet i de enkelte medlemsstater (angiv venligst data for hver medlemsstat)?

7. Vil Kommissionen overveje foranstaltninger for at gøre det lettere for europæiske patienter at få oplysninger om tallet for infektioner erhvervet i sundhedsvæsenet i de enkelte lande og også på de enkelte hospitaler?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Tonio Borg
(14. juni 2013)

1. De foreløbige resultater af undersøgelsen om infektionssygdomme erhvervet i sundhedsvæsenet, som blev gennemført af Det Europæiske Center for Forebyggelse af og Kontrol med Sygdomme på grundlag af en stikprøve på 947 hospitaler og 231 459 patienter, viser en samlet forekomst på 5,7 % af patienter med en infektionssygdom erhvervet i sundhedsvæsenet i forbindelse med ophold på akutadelinger i Unionen, svarende til 81 089 patienter.

Risikoen for at erhverve en sådan infektion anslås til ca. 3,5 %. Det samlede antal patienter på årsbasis, der erhvervede mindst én infektionssygdom i sundhedsvæsenet på akutafdelinger i 2011-2012 i Den Europæiske Union, anslås generelt til 3,2 millioner.

2. Clostridium difficile-infektioner udgjorde 3,6 % af alle infektionssygdomme erhvervet i sundhedsvæsenet i undersøgelsen med gennemsnitligt 1,4 tilfælde pr. 1 000 udskrivelser eller 2,0 tilfælde pr. 10 000 sengedage.

3. Infektionssygdomme med methicillinresistent Staphylococcus aureus udgør 5,1 % af alle infektionssygdomme erhvervet i sundhedsvæsenet i undersøgelsen med et gennemsnit på 2,0 tilfælde pr. 1 000 udskrivelser eller 2,9 tilfælde pr. 10 000 sengedage.

4. Figur 1 i bilaget viser hyppigheden af infektionssygdomme erhvervet i sundhedsvæsenet i hvert af de 30 lande, der deltog i undersøgelsen.

5. Figur 2 visen den relative procentdel af Clostridium difficile-infektioner pr. land i procent af det samlede antal infektionssygdomme erhvervet i sundhedsvæsenet pr. land.

6. Tabellen i bilaget viser den procentmæssige andel af infektioner med methicillinresistent Staphylococcus aureus i den seneste rapport fra det europæiske overvågningsnet for antimikrobiel resistens.

7. Der blev i 2012 vedtaget nye EU-definitioner af tilfælde vedrørende infektionssygdomme erhvervet i sundhedsvæsenet med henblik på en fælles strategi for definition af fuldt ud sammenlignelige tal i de forskellige medlemsstater.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004648/13
to the Commission
Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: Risk of acquiring healthcare-associated infections at EU hospitals

Healthcare-associated infections (HAI) are a big problem throughout Europe, but the risk varies considerably among Member States.

In the light of this, can the Commission answer the following:

1. What is the average risk of acquiring an HAI during or after hospitalisation in the European Union?

2. What is the average risk of infection with *Clostridium difficile* during or after hospitalisation in the European Union?

3. What is the average risk of acquiring a meticillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) infection during or after hospitalisation in the European Union?

4. What is the risk of acquiring an HAI during or after hospitalisation in the individual Member States (please provide data for each Member State)?

5. What is the average risk of acquiring a *Clostridium difficile* infection during or after hospitalisation in the individual Member States (please provide data for each Member State)?

6. What is the average risk of acquiring an MRSA infection during or after hospitalisation in the individual Member States (please provide data for each Member State)?

7. Would the Commission consider measures to make it easier for European patients to find out the HAI-rate in different countries and even in different hospitals?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(14 June 2013)

1. The preliminary results of the survey of Healthcare Associated Infections carried out by the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control on a sample of 947 hospitals and 231 459 patients indicate an overall 5.7% prevalence of patients with a Healthcare Associated Infection in European acute care hospitals, corresponding to 81 089 patients.

The estimation of the risk to acquire such infection is around 3.5%. So the total annual number of patients with at least one Healthcare Associated Infection in European acute care hospitals in 2011-2012 in the European Union as a whole is estimated at 3.2 million.

2. *Clostridium difficile* infections represented 3.6% of all Healthcare Associated Infections in the study with an average incidence of 1.4 cases per 1 000 discharges or 2.0 cases per 10 000 patient-days.

3. Healthcare Associated Infections with meticillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* represent 5.1% of all Healthcare Associated Infections in the survey with an average incidence of 2.0 cases per 1 000 discharges or 2.9 cases per 10 000 patient-days.

4. Figure 1 of the annex presents the prevalence of Healthcare Associated Infections in each of the 30 countries that participated in the study.

5. Figure 2 shows the relative percentage of *Clostridium difficile* infections per country, as a percentage of the total number of Healthcare Associated Infections per country.

6. The table in the annex shows the percentage of *S. aureus* isolates resistant to meticillin of the latest report of the European Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance Network.

7. New EU case definitions for Healthcare Associated Infections have been adopted in 2012 in order to have a common approach to establish a fully comparable rate in the different Member States.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-004649/13
til Kommissionen
Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(25. april 2013)

Om: Overvågning af udbredelsen af clostridium difficile

Clostridium difficile er blevet den mest almindelige infektion, som erhverves i sundhedsvæsenet i Den Europæiske Union. Dette truer sundheden for borgerne og medfører yderligere omkostninger for sundhedssystemer. Da der er behov for bedre overvågning for effektivt at bekæmpe udbredelsen, bedes Kommissionen besvare følgende spørgsmål:

1. Hvilke medlemsstater har efter Kommissionens opfattelse tilstrækkelige overvågningssystemer for hospitalsinfektionen *clostridium difficile*?

2. I hvilket omfang er overvågningssystemerne for *clostridium difficile*-infektionerne udvidet til at omfatte børne- og ungdomshjem og plejehjem — og er det nuværende niveau tilstrækkeligt?

3. Hvilke medlemsstater har de mest effektive systemer, og hvad gør Kommissionen for at tilskynde til udveksling af bedste praksis på dette område?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Tonio Borg
(11. juni 2013)

1. Det Europæiske Center for Forebyggelse af og Kontrol med Sygdomme har oplyst, at de seneste oplysninger viser, at 13 medlemsstater (Belgien, Bulgarien, Danmark, Det Forenede Kongerige, Finland, Frankrig, Irland, Spanien, Sverige, Tyskland, Ungarn og Østrig) har indført national overvågning af *Clostridium difficile*-infektioner.

2. Halvdelen af ovennævnte overvågningssystemer indsamler data om tilfælde af *Clostridium difficile*-infektioner i EU. Mange af disse systemer omfatter dog kun hospitaler, hvilket vil sige, at de kun omfatter infektionstilfælde ved indlæggelse på et hospital. Andre overvågningssystemer omfatter laboratorier og indsamler også oplysninger om tilfælde fra børne- og ungdomshjem og plejehjem, som ikke fører til indlæggelse. Praktiserende læger indgår kun i 3 overvågningssystemer.

3. De mest effektive overvågningssystemer er de systemer, der sender oplysninger om *Clostridium difficile*-infektioner til de deltagende institutioner, således at resultaterne kan anvendes som en indikator og et værktøj til forebyggelse. I henhold til Europa-Parlamentets og Rådets beslutning nr. 2119/98/EF af 24. september 1998 om oprettelse af et net til epidemiologisk overvågning af og kontrol med overførbare sygdomme i Fællesskabet, udveksler Kommissionen og medlemsstaterne med støtte fra Det Europæiske Center for Forebyggelse af og Kontrol med Sygdomme løbende eksempler på bedste praksis om overvågning af og kontrol med overførbare sygdomme såsom *Clostridium difficile*-infektioner.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004649/13
to the Commission
Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: Surveillance of the spread of *Clostridium difficile*

Clostridium difficile infections have become the most common healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) in the European Union. This is threatening the health of citizens as well as engendering extra costs for healthcare systems. Since better surveillance is needed to effectively combat the spread, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Which Member States have, in the Commission's opinion, sufficient surveillance systems for hospital-acquired *Clostridium difficile* infections?

2. To what extent are surveillance systems for *Clostridium difficile* infections being expanded to include community and nursing homes — and is the current level sufficient?

3. Which Member States have the most effective systems, and what is the Commission doing to encourage the exchange of best practices in this field?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2013)

1. The European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control has reported that the most recent data indicate that 13 Member States (Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Germany, Finland, France, Hungary, Ireland, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden and United Kingdom) have implemented national surveillance of *Clostridium difficile* infections.

2. Fifty per cent of the abovementioned surveillance systems collect data on community-onset cases of *Clostridium difficile* infections. However, several of these surveillance systems are hospital-based, meaning that they only cover infection cases detected at admission to a hospital. Other surveillance systems are laboratory-based, and also capture cases from community and nursing homes that are not hospitalised. In only 3 surveillance systems, general practitioners are also involved in data collection.

3. The most effective surveillance systems are those that provide feedback about *Clostridium difficile* infection rates to the participating institutions, so that local results can be used as an indicator and a tool for prevention. Under Decision 2119/98/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 September 1998 setting up a network for the epidemiological surveillance and control of communicable diseases in the European Union, the Commission, with the scientific support of the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control, is regularly sharing best practices on communicable diseases surveillance and control, including on *Clostridium difficile* infections with Member States.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004650/13
alla Commissione
Francesco Enrico Speroni (EFD)
(25 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Attuazione dell'Atto europeo del 1976 e discriminazione in base all'età

Nella legislazione di attuazione del diritto dell'Unione, in particolare dell'Atto del 1976 e successive modificazioni in materia di elezioni del Parlamento europeo, taluni Stati membri, differenziandosi dalla maggior parte, non fanno coincidere l'acquisizione del diritto di voto, attivo e passivo, con il raggiungimento della maggiore età, ma ne richiedono una superiore.

Secondo la Commissione, tali differenze sono conformi al dettato dell'articolo 21 della Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea, per cui è vietata qualsiasi forma di discriminazione fondata sull'età?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(21 agosto 2013)

L'Atto del 1976 relativo all'elezione dei membri del Parlamento europeo ([1]) definisce i principi comuni che tutti gli Stati membri devono rispettare, ma non prevede disposizioni comuni quanto all'età di acquisizione del diritto di voto attivo e passivo. Di conseguenza, ciascuno Stato membro decide in merito a tali elementi mediante proprie norme nazionali ([2]).

Qualora la legislazione nazionale sia ricompresa nel campo d'applicazione del diritto dell'Unione, deve essere assicurato il rispetto della Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea ([3]), in particolare del divieto di discriminazione fondata sull'età di cui al suo articolo 21. Ad avviso della Commissione, le norme adottate dagli Stati membri in materia di età alla quale si acquisisce il diritto di voto attivo e passivo relativamente alle elezioni del Parlamento europeo rientrano nel campo d'applicazione del diritto dell'Unione. Tuttavia, la Commissione non è al corrente di casi in cui una normativa nazionale comporti una tale discriminazione.

La Commissione osserva che l'età per l'esercizio di voto alle elezioni del Parlamento europeo è 18 anni nella maggioranza degli Stati membri, mentre quella per candidarsi varia considerevolmente nell'Unione ([4]). Tuttavia, una differenza tra le disposizioni delle normative nazionali non costituisce di per sé una discriminazione.

([1]) GU L 278 dell'8.10.1976, pag. 5, modificato da ultimo dalla decisione 2002/772/CE, Euratom del Consiglio, del 25 giugno 2002 e del 23 settembre 2002 (GU L 283 del 21.10.2002, pag. 1).
([2]) In applicazione dell'articolo 8 dell'Atto.
([3]) Articolo 51, paragrafo 1, della Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea, come interpretato dalla Corte di giustizia.
([4]) Dai 18 anni (ad esempio in Austria, Germania, Finlandia, Slovenia e Ungheria) ai 25 anni (ad esempio a Cipro e in Italia).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004650/13
to the Commission
Francesco Enrico Speroni (EFD)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: Implementation of the European Act of 1976 and age discrimination

Under their legislation implementing EC law, in particular the 1976 Act and subsequent amendments on European Parliament elections, certain Member States grant their citizens the active and passive right to vote at an age above the age of majority. This is in contrast to the approach taken by most of the Member States.

Does the Commission believe that such differences comply with the provisions of Article 21 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, which prohibit any form of age discrimination?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(21 August 2013)

The Act of 1976 concerning the election of the members of the European Parliament ([1]) lays down the common principles to be respected in all Member States. However, the Act does not contain common provisions concerning the voting age or the age for standing as a candidate in the elections. As a consequence, each Member State governs these elements by its national provisions ([2]).

The EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, notably the prohibition of discrimination based on age laid down in Article 21, must be complied with by the Member States where national legislation falls within the scope of EC law ([3]). The Commission considers that the provisions adopted by the Member States on active and passive voting ages as regards elections to the European Parliament fall within the scope of Union law. However, the Commission has no knowledge of a case where a national legislation would contain such a discrimination.

The Commission notes that the voting age for European Parliament elections is 18 years in most of the Member States; the age required for standing as a candidate varies broadly across the EU ([4]). However, a disparity between the provisions of national legislations is not a discrimination.

([1]) OJ L 278, 8.10.1976, p. 5, last amended by Council Decision 2002/772/EC, Euratom of 25 June and 23 September 2002 (OJ L 283, 21.10.2002, p. 1).
([2]) In accordance with Article 8 of the Act.
([3]) Article 51(1) of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, as interpreted by the Court of Justice.
([4]) From 18 years (e.g. Austria, Germany, Finland, Hungary, Slovenia) to 25 years (e.g. Cyprus, Italy).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004651/13
alla Commissione
Francesco Enrico Speroni (EFD)
(25 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Esclusione dall'attività lavorativa per ragioni d'età

Per disposizioni dell'Unione e degli Stati membri, non è consentito esercitare talune professioni, come pilota di aeromobili o conducente di veicoli a motore, dopo il raggiungimento di un'età prefissata, pur se in possesso accertato delle previste idoneità psicofisiche e attitudinali, a differenza di altre attività di particolare impegno e responsabilità, come ad esempio, magistrato o chirurgo.

Secondo la Commissione, dette disposizioni sono conformi al dettato dell'articolo 21 della Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea, per cui è vietata qualsiasi forma di discriminazione fondata sull'età?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(6 giugno 2013)

Secondo quanto stabilito nell'articolo 51 della Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea gli Stati membri dell'Unione sono tenuti a rispettare tale Carta nell'attuare la normativa UE. La Carta tuttavia non estende l'ambito di applicazione del diritto UE vigente e non definisce competenze nuove per l'Unione.

La normativa UE attualmente in vigore, ossia la direttiva 2000/78/CE, tutela contro la discriminazione fondata sull'età in materia di occupazione e di condizioni di lavoro. L'articolo 4 della direttiva stabilisce che una differenza di trattamento basata sull'età non costituisce discriminazione laddove tale caratteristica costituisca un requisito essenziale e determinante per lo svolgimento dell'attività lavorativa, purché la finalità sia legittima e il requisito proporzionato. L'articolo 6 della direttiva specifica inoltre che le disparità di trattamento in ragione dell'età non costituiscono discriminazione fondata sull'età laddove esse siano oggettivamente e ragionevolmente giustificate da una finalità legittima e i mezzi per il conseguimento di tale finalità siano appropriati e indispensabili. I limiti di età che sussistono per alcune professioni a norma del diritto nazionale devono essere valutati caso per caso da un giudice nazionale al fine di stabilirne la conformità a detti criteri. Negli ultimi anni la Corte di giustizia dell'Unione europea ha emesso una serie di sentenze in merito ai criteri dell'età pensionabile obbligatoria per determinate categorie professionali, comprese quelle dei piloti (causa C-447/09, Prigge) e dei giudici (C-286/12, Commissione europea contro Ungheria).

Quest'anno la Commissione intende presentare una relazione al Parlamento europeo e al Consiglio in merito all'attuazione della presente direttiva. Tale relazione dovrà tra l'altro approfondire l'analisi delle discriminazioni fondate sull'età.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004651/13
to the Commission
Francesco Enrico Speroni (EFD)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: Exclusion from work on the grounds of age

According to EU and Member State provisions, it is not permitted to exercise certain professions, such as those of aircraft pilot or motor vehicle driver, after reaching a certain age, even if proven to be fit in terms of mental and physical health and aptitude, unlike other professions that carry particular duty and responsibility, such as those of judge or surgeon.

Does the Commission think that these provisions comply with the provisions of Article 21 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, which prohibits any kind of discrimination based on age?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2013)

According to Article 51 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU, the EU Member States have to respect the Charter when implementing EC law. However, the Charter does not extend the scope of application of existing EC law or establish any new power for the EU.

Existing EC law — Directive 2000/78/EC — protects against age discrimination in employment and occupation. Article 4 of the directive specifies that a difference in treatment based on age shall not constitute discrimination where such a characteristic constitutes a genuine and determining occupational requirement, provided that the objective is legitimate and the requirement is proportionate. Furthermore, Article 6 of the directive specifies that differences in treatment on grounds of age are not considered age discrimination if they are objectively and reasonably justified by a legitimate aim and if the means of achieving that aim are appropriate and necessary. Age limits under national law imposed on certain professions have to be assessed on a case-to-case basis by the national judge in order to evaluate whether they fulfil these criteria. In the recent past, the Court of Justice of the European Union has issued a number of rulings on the conditions of mandatory retirement ages for particular professions, including those of pilots (Case C-447/09, Prigge) and of judges (C-286/12, Commission v. Hungary).

This year, the Commission plans to present a report to the European Parliament and the Council on the implementation of this directive. This report will, amongst others, give special attention to discrimination on the ground of age.

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-004652/13
Komisi
Jan Březina (PPE)
(25. dubna 2013)

Předmět: Vliv novely směrnice o tabákových výrobcích (TPD) na růst černého trhu

Vzhledem k tomu, že Evropská komise ve svém návrhu nepočítá se zavedením standardizovaného balení, posuzovala toto opatření z hlediska usnadnění padělání legálních výrobků a pokud ano, k jakému dospěla výsledku?

Vezmu-li v úvahu navržená opatření v oblasti sledování a vyhledávání (tracking and tracing), chci Komisi položit následující otázky:

— Proč jde ve svém návrhu Komise nad rámec požadavků Rámcové úmluvy WHO o kontrole tabáku (FCTC) a zavádí sledování mezi výrobcem a prvním odběratelem?

— Má Komise povědomí o technickém řešení svého požadavku?

— Je podobné řešení ověřeno v nějaké zemi na globálním trhu?

— Má Komise povědomí o potencionálních dodavatelích takového řešení?

Systém „tracking and tracing" může podle dostupných znalostí pomoci při monitorování legální výroby a jejího potenciálního úniku do nelegální distribuce (pašování). Na druhé straně vůbec nepomáhá v segmentu padělaných cigaret, kterému návrh TPD otevírá prostor snížením možnosti užití charakteristických grafických prvků jednotlivých značek a výrobců, které zároveň plní ochrannou roli.

Jak se hodlá Komise s hrozbou nárůstu černého trhu – pašování a padělání cigaret – vypořádat?

Odpověď Tonia Borga jménem Komise
(14. června 2013)

Návrh Komise „nesnižuje možnost užití charakteristických grafických prvků". Tyto prvky však nesmí být zavádějící. Podle návrhu Komise má být 75 % povrchu hlavních ploch balení cigaret a tabáku pro ruční balení pokryto fotografií a textem zdravotního varování.

Navrhovaná opatření proti nezákonnému obchodu jsou navíc plně slučitelná s rámcovou úmluvou WHO o kontrole tabáku a protokolem o odstranění nezákonného obchodu s tabákovými výrobky, který přijala konference stran FCTC v listopadu 2012.

Cílem navrhovaných opatření v oblasti sledování a vyhledávání je zavést komplexní systém kontroly přepravy tabákových výrobků v rámci dodavatelského řetězce. Smyslem rozšíření těchto opatření až na poslední hospodářský subjekt, jenž bezprostředně předchází prvnímu maloobchodnímu prodejci, je zajistit, aby byly na trh EU uváděny pouze výrobky, které jsou v souladu s touto směrnicí.

Ve světě již existují nebo se vyvíjí technická řešení, která fungování sledovacích a vyhledávacích systémů umožňují. Mnoho zemí na celém světě tato řešení zavádí. O technických specifikacích a normách pro systém, který by byl v prostředí EU vhodný, bude v souladu s návrhem Komise rozhodnuto prostřednictvím aktů v přenesené pravomoci.

Zpřísnění kontroly legálního dodavatelského řetězce snižuje možnost, že na trh proniknou padělané výrobky. Návrh Komise kromě toho předpokládá zavedení ochranného prvku, který pomůže zabránit padělání, bude chránit legální obchod s tabákovými výrobky, zvýší informovanost spotřebitelů a zjednodušení dozor nad trhem a vymáhání práva.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004652/13
to the Commission
Jan Březina (PPE)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: Impact of the revised Tobacco Products Directive (TPD) on growth of the black market

Given that its proposal does not envisage the introduction of standardised packaging, has the Commission assessed whether or not such a measure would make the counterfeiting of legal products easier? If it has carried out such an assessment, what conclusion did it reach?

I should like to put the following questions concerning the proposed tracking and tracing measures to the Commission:

— Why does the Commission's proposal exceed the requirements of the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC) by introducing monitoring between the manufacturer and the first retail outlet?

— Is the Commission aware of a technical solution to this requirement?

— Has a similar solution been validated in any country trading on the global market?

— Does the Commission have information on who might implement this solution?

According to available information, the tracking and tracing system may be of assistance in the monitoring of legal manufacturing and of leakage to illegal distribution networks (smuggling). On the other hand, it is of no use whatsoever as far as counterfeit cigarettes are concerned. The proposed revision to the TPD will benefit counterfeiting, since it restricts the use of characteristic graphic elements which individual brands and manufacturers use and which serve a protective function.

How does the Commission intend to address the threat posed by a growing black market, smuggling and the counterfeiting of cigarettes?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(14 June 2013)

The Commission's proposal does not 'restrict the use of characteristic graphic elements', provided that such elements are not misleading. The Commission proposal is that 75% of the main surfaces of the packages of cigarettes and roll your own tobacco are covered by combined photo and text warnings.

In addition, the proposed measures against illicit trade are fully compatible with the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control and the Protocol to Eliminate Illicit Trade in Tobacco Products, adopted by the FCTC Conference of the Parties in November 2012.

The proposed tracking and tracing measures aim at a comprehensive movement control system for tobacco products along the supply chain. The extension until the last economic operator before the retail outlet is needed to ensure that only products compliant with the directive are placed on the EU market.

There are several technical solutions either in place or in development worldwide for tracking and tracing systems. Many countries around the globe are introducing such tracking and tracing solutions. The technical details and standards of such a system, appropriate to the EU context, will be decided upon through the delegated acts foreseen in the Commission proposal.

Tightening the control of the legal supply chain reduces the possibility for counterfeit products to penetrate the market. Furthermore, the Commission proposal foresees a security feature, which will help preventing counterfeiting, will protect the legal trade in tobacco products, increase consumer awareness and facilitate market surveillance and law enforcement.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-004653/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Spyros Danellis (S&D)
(25 Απριλίου 2013)

Θέμα: Αιτήσεις για άμεσες ενισχύσεις στην Ελλάδα

Στην ερώτηση P-003561/2013 που υποβάλαμε πρόσφατα στην Επιτροπή σχετικά με τις πρακτικές υποβολής αιτήσεων για την καταβολή ενιαίων άμεσων ενισχύσεων, η τελευταία απάντησε ότι «Ως μέσο απλούστευσης, δίνεται γενικά στα κράτη μέλη η δυνατότητα να επιτρέπουν ή να απαιτούν οι πάσης φύσεως ανακοινώσεις βάσει του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1122/2009 ([1]) της Επιτροπής, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των αιτήσεων ενίσχυσης, να υποβάλλονται ηλεκτρονικά τόσο από την πλευρά των γεωργών προς τις αρχές όσο και αντιστρόφως». Επίσης απάντησε ότι το άρθρο 20 του εν λόγω κανονισμού ορίζει «ότι τα κράτη μέλη μπορούν να προβλέπουν απλουστευμένες διαδικασίες εφόσον τα δεδομένα βρίσκονται ήδη στη διάθεση των αρχών, ιδίως στην περίπτωση όπου η κατάσταση δεν έχει μεταβληθεί από την τελευταία υποβολή αίτησης ενίσχυσης δυνάμει του σχετικού καθεστώτος ενίσχυσης».

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή, από το σύνολο των αιτήσεων για καταβολή άμεσων ενισχύσεων στην Ελλάδα:

1. Πόσες είναι αυτές που υποβάλλονται ηλεκτρονικά από την πλευρά των γεωργών προς τις αρχές;

2. Πόσες από αυτές υποβάλλονται εκ νέου κάθε χρόνο;

3. Πόσες από αυτές που επανυποβάλλονται κάθε χρόνο αφορούν σε δήλωση μεταβολής της κατάστασης των γεωργών από την τελευταία υποβολή αίτησης ενίσχυσης δυνάμει του σχετικού καθεστώτος ενίσχυσης και πόσες από αυτές είναι αμετάβλητες;

Απάντηση του κ. Cioloş εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(23 Μαΐου 2013)

Κατά την άσκηση των καθηκόντων της βάσει των Συνθηκών, η Επιτροπή δεν έχει πρόσβαση σε τέτοιου είδους πληροφορίες. Οι πληροφορίες που ζητούνται από το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου μπορούν να ληφθούν μόνο σε επίπεδο των αρμόδιων εθνικών αρχών.

([1]) ΕΕ L 316 της 2.12.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004653/13
to the Commission
Spyros Danellis (S&D)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: Applications for direct aid to Greece

In answer to Written Question P-003561/2013 regarding single direct payment application formalities, the Commission indicated that 'As a means of simplification, Member States are generally allowed to permit or require that any kind of communications under Commission Regulation No (EC) 1122/2009 ([1]) including aid applications both from the farmers to the authorities and vice-versa be made by electronic means', adding that, under Article 20 of that regulation, 'Member States may provide for simplified procedures where data is already available to the authorities, in particular where the situation has not changed since the latest submission of an aid application under the aid scheme concerned'.

Regarding all applications for direct aid to Greece:

1. Can the Commission indicate how many applications from the farmers to the authorities are submitted by electronic means?

2. How many applications are resubmitted annually?

3. How many applications resubmitted annually relate to situations which have changed and in how many to situations remaining unchanged since submission of the last aid application?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(23 May 2013)

In the performance of its duties under the Treaties, the Commission does not acquire information of the kind requested. The information required by the Honourable Member can only be obtained at the level of the national authorities concerned.

([1]) OJ L 316, 2.12.2009.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande P-004654/13
till kommissionen (Vice-ordföranden / Höga representanten)
Olle Schmidt (ALDE)
(25 april 2013)

Angående: VP/HR – Människohandel i Sinai

Flyktingar från Afrikas horn som söker skydd färdas ofta till Israel via Egypten. Detta innebär att de måste korsa Sinaiöknen, ett ingenmansland som den egyptiska regeringen inte verkar kunna kontrollera.

Resan genom öknen görs med bistånd av människosmugglande beduiner som utnyttjar flyktingarnas utsatta situation. Kvinnor våldtas, människor låses in i flera månader så att man ska kunna få ut ännu mer av dem och människor dödas för sina organ eller bara för att det är möjligt.

Skulle den vice ordföranden/höga representanten kunna tänka sig att bilda en aktionsgrupp med de länder som ingår i människohandelns alla led, det vill säga ursprungsländer, transitplatser och slutdestinationer, för att handskas med detta problem på ett strukturellt sätt?

Kan Europeiska unionens särskilda representant för Afrikas horn, Alexander Rondos, eller den särskilda representanten vid Afrikanska unionen, Gary Quince, ge ett tekniskt bidrag till en sådan aktionsgrupp?

Svar från den höga representanten/vice ordförande Catherine Ashton på kommissionens vägnar
(18 juni 2013)

EU sysslar med fall där flyktingar råkar ut för människosmugglare på Afrikas horn samt med rapporter om ökade kränkningar mot dem. EU samarbetar med FN:s flyktingkommissariat för att ta itu med frågan om människohandel på Sinaihalvön och den stöder FN:s initiativ om en omfattande rundabordskonferens i Sana om människohandel.

Att inrätta en arbetsgrupp med de berörda staterna är mer en uppgift för FN:s flyktingkommissariat. Europeiska utrikestjänsten och kommissionen har haft möten med FN:s flyktingkommissariat för att diskutera hur man bäst löser frågan om människohandel på Sinaihalvön. EU stöder FN:s flyktingkommissariat när den utför sitt uppdrag.

Europeiska utrikestjänsten tar sitt ansvar genom att tillsammans med berörda parter ta upp frågan i politiska dialoger.

EU har till exempel uppmanat Egypten att se till att de mänskliga rättigheterna för migranter och flyktingar respekteras fullt ut. Man har pressat de egyptiska myndigheterna att se till att principen om ”non-refoulement” iakttas för alla migranter som är i behov av internationellt skydd. I dialogen betonar vi att FN:s flyktingkommissariat bör ges full möjlighet att genomföra sitt mandat på hela Egyptens territorium, inbegripet Sinaihalvön.

Den särskilda representantens roll är att bidra till EU:s regionala insatser för utmaningarna vid Afrikas horn. Han gör detta genom att öka samstämmigheten, kvaliteten, inverkan och öppenheten i EU:s mångfacetterade insatser i regionen. Han har dock inte mandat att besluta om tekniskt bistånd.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004654/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Olle Schmidt (ALDE)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Human trafficking in Sinai

Refugees from the Horn of Africa seeking safety often travel to Israel via Egypt. This means that they have to cross the Sinai Desert, which is a no man's land over which the Egyptian Government would seem to have no control.

The journey through the desert is facilitated by Bedouins, people smugglers, who exploit the vulnerability of these refugees. Women are raped, people are locked up for months on end in order to extort even more from them, and people are killed for their organs or just because it is possible.

Would the VP/HR consider setting up an action group with states involved in the various stages of the trafficking chain, including sources, transit and destination, in order to address this problem on a structural basis?

Can the European Union Special Representative for the Horn of Africa, Mr Alexander Rondos, or the Special Representative for the African Union, Mr Gary Quince, provide such an action group with technical assistance?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(18 June 2013)

The EU is preoccupied with cases of refugee trafficking in the Horn of Africa, as well as with the reports of increased human violations against them. The EU collaborates with the UNHCR to address the issue of human trafficking in the Sinai and it supports the latter's initiative of an inclusive Round Table on human trafficking in Sana'a.

Setting up of an action group with states involved is more a role for the UNHCR. The EEAS and the Commission held meetings with the UNHCR to discuss how to best address the issue of human trafficking in the Sinai. The EU supports the UNHCR in fulfilling its mandate.

The EEAS does its part also by engaging with stakeholders and raising the issue in political dialogues.

For example the EU urged Egypt to ensure that human rights of migrants and refugees are fully respected. It has pressed the Egyptian authorities to ensure that the principle of non-refoulement is observed for all migrants in need of international protection. In the dialogue we emphasise that the UNHCR should be given full possibility to implement its mandate on the entire territory of Egypt, including the Sinai region.

The role of the EUSR is to contribute to the EU's regional approach to the interrelated challenges facing the Horn. He is doing so by enhancing the coherence, quality, impact and visibility of the EU's multifaceted action in the region. It is not within the EUSR mandate to provide technical assistance.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004655/13
a la Comisión
Dolores García-Hierro Caraballo (S&D)
(25 de abril de 2013)

Asunto: Fondo Europeo Marítimo y de la Pesca

¿Qué planes y programas tiene previstos la Comisión durante el presente año 2013 para asegurar la igualdad de la mujer en el sector de la pesca y la acuicultura del futuro reglamento del Fondo Europeo Marítimo y de la Pesca? ¿Cuál es su opinión en cuanto a la eficacia futura del FEMP en materia de género?

Respuesta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(14 de junio de 2013)

La evaluación intermedia ([1]) del Fondo Europeo de Pesca (FEP) puso de manifiesto que la contribución global de los programas de dicho Fondo a la promoción de la igualdad de oportunidades es neutra o ligeramente positiva. El informe subrayaba que, en la ejecución de los programas, no se tenían suficientemente en cuenta la integración de la perspectiva de género y la promoción de la igualdad entre hombres y mujeres. La experiencia más positiva ha sido la del eje 4, con su énfasis en el empleo femenino en las comunidades costeras y el intercambio de buenas prácticas en la promoción de la igualdad entre hombres y mujeres.

En su propuesta relativa al Fondo Europeo Marítimo y de Pesca (FEMP), la Comisión ha tenido en cuenta la experiencia del período 2007-2013 y ha tratado de reforzar la dimensión de género en el futuro Fondo. El principio de la integración de la perspectiva de género se ha aplicado a todo el ciclo de programación del FEMP, desde la programación hasta el seguimiento y la evaluación, pasando por la selección de los proyectos. Se reconoce expresamente a los cónyuges y parejas de los pescadores autónomos, que pueden beneficiarse de medidas como la formación o la conexión en red. La propuesta también prevé que la Comisión se cerciore de que los Estados miembros informen adecuadamente sobre las medidas relativas a la integración de la perspectiva de género.

Además, la Comisión velará por que la integración de la perspectiva de género y la promoción de la igualdad entre hombres y mujeres reciban un tratamiento completo en la preparación de los programas operativos del FEMP para 2014-2020.

([1]) La evaluación intermedia se puede consultar en el sitio web siguiente: http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/eff_evaluation/eff_evaluation_synthesis_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004655/13
to the Commission
Dolores García-Hierro Caraballo (S&D)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: European Maritime and Fisheries Fund

What plans and programmes does the Commission have planned for 2013 to ensure equality for women in the fisheries and aquaculture sector in the future European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) Regulation? What is its opinion on the effectiveness of the EMFF in the future in terms of gender?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(14 June 2013)

The interim evaluation ([1]) of the European Fisheries Fund (EFF) showed that the overall contribution of European Fisheries Fund programmes to the promotion of equal opportunity is neutral or marginally positive. The report stressed that gender mainstreaming and promotion of gender equality are not adequately addressed during the implementation of the programmes. The most positive experience has been Axis 4, with its emphasis on female employment in coastal communities and exchange of good practice in the promotion of gender equality.

In its proposal for the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF), the Commission has taken the experience from the 2007-2013 period into account and sought to reinforce the gender dimension in the future Fund. The principle of gender mainstreaming has been extended throughout the programming cycle of the EMFF, from programming through project selection, until monitoring and evaluation. Spouses and partners of self-employed fishermen are explicitly recognised, and can benefit from measures such as training or networking. The proposal also foresees that the Commission will ensure that Member States provide adequate reporting on arrangements ensuring the integration of the gender perspective.

Furthermore, the Commission will ensure that gender mainstreaming and the promotion of gender equality are addressed in a comprehensive manner in the preparation of the EMFF Operational Programmes 2014-2020.

([1]) The interim evaluation is available on the following website:
http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/documentation/studies/eff_evaluation/eff_evaluation_synthesis_en.pdf

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004656/13
a la Comisión
Dolores García-Hierro Caraballo (S&D)
(25 de abril de 2013)

Asunto: Formación en el sector pesquero

¿Qué acciones se han llevado a cabo en materia de formación e inserción en el sector de la pesca y la acuicultura durante los años 2010, 2011 y 2012? ¿Qué presupuesto se ha destinado a estos fines en relación con los jóvenes y las mujeres?

Respuesta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(27 de junio de 2013)

La Comisión considera esencial que se proporcione ayuda para la formación y la inserción en el sector pesquero y sectores afines, prestando especial atención a los jóvenes y a las mujeres. Según el artículo 27 del Fondo Europeo de Pesca (FEP), los Estados miembros pueden proporcionar ayuda para medidas socioeconómicas que contribuyan a la formación e inserción en el sector de la pesca y la acuicultura que impliquen la diversificación de las actividades de los pescadores, la mejora de las aptitudes profesionales, en particular de los pescadores jóvenes, y planes de reciclaje profesional en áreas distintas de la pesca marítima. El Fondo también prevé medidas que contribuyan a desarrollar la formación permanente en el sector acuícola, la pesca interior, la transformación y comercialización de productos de la pesca y la acuicultura y la adquisición de competencias dirigidas al funcionamiento de los grupos de acción local de la zonas pesqueras.

Como la aplicación de esas medidas corre a cargo de los Estados miembros, en virtud de la gestión compartida, la Comisión debería llevar a cabo una encuesta específica para conseguir la información pedida por Su Señoría. Para obtenerla, la Comisión proyecta incluir preguntas específicas en ese sentido en la encuesta que prevé enviar próximamente a los Estados miembros.

La formación y la inserción son importantes aspectos de la ayuda de la UE al sector pesquero y a los sectores afines, como lo demuestra la propuesta de la Comisión sobre el nuevo Fondo Europeo Marítimo y de Pesca.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004656/13
to the Commission
Dolores García-Hierro Caraballo (S&D)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: Training in the fisheries sector

What measures were taken with regard to training and integration in the fisheries and aquaculture sector in 2010, 2011 and 2012? What budget was earmarked for young people and women in this regard?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2013)

The Commission considers that it is essential to provide support for training and integration in the fisheries and related sectors and that particular attention is needed regarding younger people and women. Under Article 27 of the European Fisheries Fund (EFF) Member States may provide support for socioeconomic measures contributing to training and integration in the fisheries and aquaculture sector when they involve the diversification of fishers' activities, the upgrading of their professional skills, in particular for young fishers, and retraining outside sea fishing. The fund also provides for measures to contribute to life long learning in aquaculture, inland fishing, processing and marketing of fishery and aquaculture products, as well as the acquisition of skills for the running of Fishery Local Action Groups.

As the implementation of these measures is carried out by the Member States under shared management, the Commission would have to launch a specific enquiry to obtain the specific information requested by the Honourable Member. To get this information, the Commission intends to include specific questions to this end into the next enquiry it intends to send to Member States in the near future.

Training and integration remain important aspects of the EU support to the fisheries and related sectors as demonstrated by the Commission proposal for a new European Maritime and Fisheries Fund.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004658/13
a la Comisión
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(25 de abril de 2013)

Asunto: Análisis de la Comisión en el procedimiento para la prevención y corrección de desequilibrios macroeconómicos

El pasado 10 de abril la Comisión presentó una Comunicación con los resultados de las revisiones en profundidad de las economías de trece Estados miembros llevadas a cabo como dispone el Reglamento (UE) n° 1176/2011 relativo a la prevención y corrección de los desequilibrios macroeconómicos. Este ejercicio, parte del Semestre Europeo, es el paso previo a la adopción de recomendaciones específicas para cada país.

Tratar los desequilibrios económicos de manera conjunta es necesario porque la creciente interdependencia en el seno de la Unión lleva a que las políticas económicas de un Estado miembro tengan externalidades y efectos de arrastre en el resto. Sin embargo, las asunciones del cuadro de indicadores macroeconómicos, pese a los reiterados llamamientos del Parlamento, no tratan con una simetría inteligente la situación de aquellos países con déficits respecto de los que presentan superávits. Todo ello impide ir a la raíz de los problemas generando una incoherencia incompatible con la corrección de los desequilibrios.

La actual realidad económica de la UE se caracteriza por: 1) en términos agregados, una caída masiva de la demanda; 2) una política de austeridad fiscal impuesta en los últimos años, que ha exacerbado la crisis de empleo e inversiones sin haber reducido significativamente los niveles de deuda; 3) la Unión Económica y Monetaria, en términos agregados, tiene superávits por cuenta corriente al tiempo que desequilibrios internos.

¿Comparte la Comisión este diagnóstico? De ser así, ¿va a reflejarlo en el número de países afectados por el procedimiento de desequilibrios macroeconómicos sometidos a recomendaciones específicas? ¿Va a adoptar nuevas medidas y recomendaciones para luchar contra la falta de demanda económica, los altos niveles de desempleo, la caída de las inversiones y el sobreendeudamiento? ¿Cómo va a asegurar que en el seno de la Unión Europea se desarrollen unas políticas adecuadas para conducir a una situación de equilibrio?

Respuesta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión
(7 de junio de 2013)

El ajuste fluido de los desequilibrios macroeconómicos de cara a un reequilibrio sostenible en la zona del euro y en la EU, en general, es un objetivo del procedimiento de desequilibrio macroeconómico. Los exámenes exhaustivos llevados a cabo en trece Estados miembros han detectado desequilibrios de diversa naturaleza y gravedad. Estos exámenes definen como desequilibrios los niveles altos de endeudamiento exterior, público o privado, y reconocen que el desapalancamiento repercutirá en el crecimiento en algunos países.

La propuesta de la Comisión sobre las recomendaciones específicas por países, cuya publicación está prevista el 29 de mayo de 2013, se centrará en subsanar los desequilibrios detectados, teniendo en cuenta la dimensión de la zona del euro (y de la UE) y fomentando al mismo tiempo las medidas dirigidas a promover el crecimiento y el empleo.

Para limitar el coste económico y social del ajuste, es deseable que el reequilibrio se produzca tanto en los Estados miembros con grandes déficits por cuenta corriente y deuda externa como en los que registran superávits elevados. En los países con balanza deficitaria ya se ha procedido a un amplio ajuste, que era necesario debido a los riesgos para la sostenibilidad de su deuda. En cambio, los superávits se mantienen relativamente altos en algunos Estados miembros, pero existen condiciones favorables para la intensificación de la demanda interior en la mayoría de los países con balanza excedentaria. Las previsiones de primavera de los servicios de la Comisión apuntan a una reducción gradual de los excedentes en los dos próximos años ([1]). Los diferentes ritmos de evolución de los salarios y de saneamiento fiscal entre los países con superávit y con déficit que ha recomendado la Comisión ayudan a calibrar sus contribuciones al reequilibrio. No obstante, no hay motivos para prever una simetría completa en el reequilibrio ([2]).

([1]) «European Economic Forecast — Spring 2013», European Economy, 2 (2013).
([2]) Su Señoría puede consultar sobre este tema el informe «Current Account Surpluses in the EU», European Economy 9 (2012).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004658/13
to the Commission
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: Procedure for preventing and correcting macroeconomic imbalances: Commission analysis

On 10 April 2013, the Commission issued a communication containing the results of in-depth reviews under Regulation (EU) No 1176/2011 on the prevention and correction of macroeconomic imbalances. This process, which forms part of the European Semester, is the first step towards adopting country-specific recommendations.

It is essential to take a joint approach to addressing economic imbalances, as increased interdependence within the Union means that economic policies pursued in any one Member State have spillover effects on the rest. However, despite repeated appeals from Parliament, the assumptions put forward by the table of macroeconomic indicators do not make an intelligently symmetrical comparison between the situation of countries with deficits and that of those with surpluses, making it impossible to get to the root of the problems and creating an incoherency which is incompatible with any correction of these imbalances.

The EU's current economic situation is characterised by (1) in aggregate terms, a massive slump in demand; (2) imposition of a fiscal austerity policy over the last few years which has exacerbated the employment and investment crisis without significantly reducing debt levels; (3) an economic and monetary union in which, in aggregate terms, current account surpluses exist alongside internal imbalances.

Does the Commission agree with this diagnosis? If so, does it see this as reflected by the number of countries subject to the Macroeconomic Imbalances Procedure (MIP) for which specific recommendations are given? Will it adopt new measures and recommendations to stimulate economic demand and combat high unemployment levels, falling investments and over-indebtedness? How does it intend to ensure the development within the EU of policies capable of creating a balanced situation?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(7 June 2013)

The smooth adjustment of macroeconomic imbalances leading to a sustainable rebalancing in the euro area, and more generally in the EU, is an objective of the Macroeconomic Imbalance Procedure. The in-depth reviews (IDRs), undertaken for 13 Member States, have identified imbalances of varying nature and gravity. The IDRs identify the high levels of external, public or private indebtedness as imbalances and acknowledge that deleveraging will weigh on growth in a number of countries.

The Commission proposal for country-specific recommendations to be published on 29 May 2013, will focus on resolving the identified imbalances, taking into account the euro area (and EU) dimension while encouraging measures to promote growth and boost employment.

To limit the economic and social cost of adjustment, it is desirable that rebalancing takes place in Member States with high current account deficits and external debts, as well as those with high surpluses. Large adjustment has already occurred in the deficit countries. This was necessary due to the risks to their debt sustainability. In contrast, in a number of Member States, surpluses remain relatively high; but favourable conditions for stronger domestic demand are in place in most surplus countries. The Commission services' spring forecast points to gradual declines in surpluses over next two years ([1]). The different paces of fiscal consolidation and wage developments between the surplus and deficit Member States, which the Commission has recommended, help in calibrating their contributions to the rebalancing. However, there is no reason to expect full symmetry in the rebalancing ([2]).

([1]) 'European Economic Forecast — Spring 2013,' European Economy, 2 (2013).
([2]) On this issue, the Honourable Member of Parliament may wish to consult the report 'Current Account Surpluses in the EU,' European Economy, 9 2012).

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004659/13
a la Comisión
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(25 de abril de 2013)

Asunto: Lucha contra el fraude fiscal, protección de chivatos y límites a las cláusulas de confidencialidad

La evasión y el fraude fiscal no solo dañan las finanzas públicas y provocan un reparto injusto de la carga fiscal, sino que también distorsionan el funcionamiento de los mercados y de la competencia lesionando la sostenibilidad del crecimiento y el empleo.

Teniendo en cuenta sus repercusiones sobre los intercambios comerciales y el buen funcionamiento del mercado interior, ¿qué iniciativas va a adoptar la Comisión para garantizar y estimular la protección de chivatos y organizaciones de denunciantes que faciliten información relevante para las autoridades fiscales, especialmente en el caso de jurisdicciones que no acepten el intercambio automático de información? ¿Va a formular alguna propuesta para declarar la ilegalidad de las cláusulas de confidencialidad en acuerdos laborales, de prestación de servicios o entre empresas que impidan o restrinjan la transmisión de información fiscalmente relevante a las autoridades fiscales?

Respuesta del Sr. Šemeta en nombre de la Comisión
(7 de junio de 2013)

La Comisión considera que la lucha contra el fraude y la evasión fiscales revisten una importancia crucial. En diciembre de 2012, la Comisión adoptó un plan de acción que incluye 34 medidas para reforzar la lucha contra el fraude y la evasión fiscales ([1]) a fin de garantizar los ingresos tributarios, hacer más justos los sistemas fiscales y mejorar el funcionamiento del mercado interior.

La Comisión no considera que las cuestiones relacionadas con la protección de los informadores y las organizaciones de denunciantes que proporcionan información a las autoridades fiscales, ni la prohibición de cláusulas de confidencialidad en los contratos de empleo u otros acuerdos restrictivos de la transmisión de información a las autoridades tributarias, sean pertinentes en la actualidad para el correcto funcionamiento del mercado interior. Por consiguiente, la Comisión no tiene previsto intervenir en esos ámbitos.

([1]) COM(2012) 722 final, 6.12.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004659/13
to the Commission
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: Combating tax fraud: protection of informers and limits on confidentiality clauses

Tax fraud and evasion not only harm public finances and create an unfair distribution of the tax burden, they also distort competition and the operation of the markets, adversely affecting the sustainability of growth and employment.

Given the repercussions this has on trade exchanges and the proper functioning of the internal market, what steps does the Commission intend to take to safeguard and encourage protection for informers and whistle-blowing organisations which provide relevant information to the tax authorities, particularly in relation to jurisdictions which do not allow the automatic exchange of information?

Does it intend to put forward any proposal to ban confidentiality clauses in employment and service provision agreements, or agreements between companies, which prevent or restrict the forwarding of tax-related information to the fiscal authorities?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(7 June 2013)

The Commission considers the fight against tax fraud and tax evasion to be of the utmost importance. In December 2012, the Commission adopted an Action Plan containing 34 measures to strengthen the fight against tax fraud and tax evasion ([1]) in order to secure tax revenues, make tax systems fairer, and improve the functioning of the internal market.

The Commission does not see that issues related to the protection of informers and whistle-blowing organisations which provide information to the tax authorities, and the banning of confidentiality clauses in employment agreements or other agreements restricting the forwarding of information to the tax authorities are currently of relevance for the proper functioning of the internal market. Consequently, the Commission does not intend to intervene in these areas.

([1]) COM(2012) 722 final, 6.12.2012.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004660/13
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(25. April 2013)

Betrifft: Anhäufung fauler Kredite bei Euro-Banken

Nach einer von der Wirtschaftsprüfungsgesellschaft Ernst & Young im Februar vorgenommenen Berechnung türmen sich bei den Euro-Banken Kredite in Höhe von insgesamt 918 Milliarden EUR, welche Unternehmen und Privatleute wegen der Wirtschaftsflaute nicht mehr fristgerecht zurückzahlen können. Italien und Spanien sollen besonders betroffen sein.

1. Ist der Kommission diese Studie bekannt?

2. Was wird auf EU-Ebene diesbezüglich unternommen?

Antwort von Herrn Rehn im Namen der Kommission
(19. Juni 2013)

1. Die Kommission weiß, dass zum Umfang notleidender Kredite in der EU zahlreiche, oftmals voneinander abweichende Analystenschätzungen vorliegen, die sie weder bestätigen noch als unzutreffend zurückweisen kann.

2. Aus diesem Grund bemühen sich die Kommission und andere maßgebliche Behörden weiter um Entwicklung und Pflege robuster Diagnoseinstrumente, die die Bestimmung des tatsächlichen Umfangs dieser Kredite in den Bankbilanzen ermöglichen und der Entscheidungsebene den notwendigen Input für Gegenmaßnahmen liefern.

Die Kommission unterstützt die Arbeiten von EBA, nationalen Behörden und EZB zur Ausgestaltung und Durchführung von qualitativen Überprüfungen der Bankaktiva, Stresstests und Bilanzbewertungen in koordinierter Weise, um so Vertrauen in die Ergebnisse sicherzustellen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004660/13
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: The accumulation of bad debt in euro banks

According to a calculation by auditors Ernst & Young in February, loans totalling EUR 918 billion have been amassed with the euro banks that businesses and private borrowers can no longer repay in good time because of the economic downturn. Italy and Spain are said to be particularly badly affected.

1. Is the Commission aware of this study?

2. What steps are being taken at EU level in this respect?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2013)

1. The Commission is aware that there are always many, often divergent, estimates from analysts as to the levels of non-performing loans in the EU, which it can neither confirm nor refute.

2. It is for this reason, therefore, that the Commission and other relevant authorities are continuing efforts to develop and maintain a robust diagnostic to determine actual levels in bank balance sheets, to inform decision-making on remedial actions.

The Commission is supporting the work of the EBA, national authorities and the ECB to design and implement Asset Quality Reviews, stress tests, and balance sheet assessments, in a coordinated way to ensure confidence in results.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004661/13
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(25. April 2013)

Betrifft: Schweiz — Zuwanderungsbegrenzung für EU-Bürger

Im Zuge der anhaltenden Wirtschaftskrise nahmen vermehrt arbeitsuchende Europäer Kurs auf die Schweiz. In den vergangenen Jahren wanderten jährlich zwischen 60 000 und 80 000 Menschen mehr in die Schweiz ein als aus, was einem Bevölkerungswachstum von einem Prozent jährlich entspricht. Deshalb hatte Bern bereits im Vorjahr die Personenfreizügigkeit für die acht mittelosteuropäischen Neumitglieder (EU-8) ausgesetzt.

Am 24. April 2013 beschloss die Regierung in Bern eine Begrenzung des Zugangs zum Schweizer Arbeitsmarkt (Langzeit-Aufenthaltsbewilligungen für fünf Jahre) für Bürger aus den 17 alten EU-Mitgliedsländern, darunter auch aus Deutschland. Für kurzzeitige Arbeitsaufnahmen soll es keine Limitierung geben. Dabei wird die sogenannte Ventilklausel angewandt, welche im Abkommen der Schweiz mit den EU-Staaten enthalten ist. Als Voraussetzung für die Anwendung des Abkommens, welches eine Deckelung vorsieht, gilt, dass die Zahl der Aufenthaltsbewilligungen in einem Jahr mindestens zehn Prozent über dem Durchschnitt der vergangenen drei Jahre liegt.

1. Welche Übergangsregelungen wurden diesbezüglich hinsichtlich Rumänien und Bulgarien vereinbart?

2. Wurde eine Art Ventilklausel auch bei Abkommen mit anderen Staaten vereinbart? Falls ja, mit welchen?

3. Wird die Kommission die souveräne Entscheidung des Schweizer Bundesrats respektieren?

4. Sieht die Kommission tatsächlich den von der Außenbeauftragten kritisierten Widerspruch der beschlossenen Maßnahmen zum Abkommen, da sie zwischen unterschiedlichen Gruppen von Mitgliedstaaten unterscheiden?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(19. Juni 2013)

Die Möglichkeit zur Wiedereinführung mengenmäßiger Begrenzungen der Freizügigkeit von Unionsbürgern in der Schweiz ist in Artikel 10 Absatz 4 des Abkommens über die Freizügigkeit von Personen unter bestimmten Bedingungen vorgesehen. Das Abkommen, das diese Möglichkeit vorsieht, wurde durch das Protokoll zu dem Abkommen vom 26. Oktober 2004 auf die zehn Mitgliedstaaten, die der EU 2004 beigetreten sind, ausgeweitet. Die Möglichkeit besteht in Bezug auf alle Mitgliedstaaten (außer für Bulgarien und Rumänien) für einen Zeitraum von 12 Jahren nach Inkrafttreten des Abkommens (das Abkommen ist am 1. Juni 2002 in Kraft getreten).

Für Bulgarien und Rumänien ist in dem Protokoll zu dem Abkommen vom 27. Mai 2008 vorgesehen, dass die Bestimmungen von Artikel 10 Absatz 4 des Abkommens (die sogenannte Ventilklausel) nach Ablauf der Übergangszeit (d. h. ab dem 1. Juni 2014) und bis zu 10 Jahre nach Inkrafttreten dieses Protokolls (das Protokoll ist am 1. Juni 2009 in Kraft getreten) für Staatsangehörige Bulgariens und Rumäniens gelten.

Unter uneingeschränkter Achtung der Souveränität der Schweiz beabsichtigt die Kommission, die Unvereinbarkeit der am 24. April 2013 vom Schweizer Bundesrat beschlossenen Maßnahmen in dem durch das Abkommen eingerichteten Gemeinsamen Ausschuss zur Sprache zu bringen.

Wie in der Erklärung der Hohen Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin vom 24. April 2013 dargelegt, stehen die vom Bundesrat angenommenen Maßnahmen im Widerspruch zu dem Abkommen über die Freizügigkeit von Personen, da dabei zwischen unterschiedlichen Gruppen von Mitgliedstaaten unterschieden wird, während Artikel 10 Absatz 4 des Abkommens nach Ablauf der entsprechenden Übergangszeiten unterschiedslos für alle Mitgliedstaaten gilt (außer für Bulgarien und Rumänien, deren Übergangszeit noch nicht abgelaufen ist).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004661/13
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: Switzerland — immigration restrictions for EU citizens

During the course of the ongoing economic crisis, increasing numbers of Europeans have looked to Switzerland in search of employment. In recent years, between 60 000 and 80 000 more people moved to Switzerland each year than emigrated from the country in the same period. This corresponds to a growth in population of one per cent each year. Last year, this led Bern to restrict freedom of movement for the eight new Central European Member States (EU-8).

On 24 April 2013, the government in Bern decided to restrict access to the Swiss labour market (long-term residence permits for five years) for citizens from the 17 old EU Member States, including Germany. There will be no limit applied to short-term employment. In this case, the so-called safety valve clause included in the Agreement between Switzerland and the EU Member States will be invoked. The prerequisite for the application of the Agreement, which provides for a cap, is that the number of residence permits in a given year must be at least 10 per cent higher than the average for the previous three years.

1. What transitional arrangements have been agreed in this regard in relation to Romania and Bulgaria?

2. Has any kind of safety valve clause been agreed with other States, and if so which?

3. Does the Commission intend to respect the sovereign will of the Swiss Federal Council?

4. Does the Commission actually recognise the contradiction between the agreed measures and the Agreement, as criticised by the High Representative, because they distinguish between different groups of Member States?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2013)

The possibility to reintroduce quantitative restrictions to the free movement of EU citizens in Switzerland is provided for by Article 10(4) of the Agreement on the Free Movement of Persons, under certain conditions. The Agreement, including that possibility, was extended to the ten Member States which acceded to the EU in 2004 by virtue of the Protocol to the Agreement of 26 October 2004. This possibility exists as regards all the Member States (except for Bulgaria and Romania) until 12 years after the entry into force of the Agreement (the Agreement entered into force on 1 June 2002).

As regards Bulgaria and Romania, the Protocol to the Agreement of 27 May 2008 provides that at the end of the transitional period (i.e. from 1 June 2014) and up to 10 years after entry into force of that Protocol (the Protocol entered into force on 1 June 2009), the provisions of Article 10(4) of the Agreement (so-called 'safeguard clause') shall apply to the nationals of Bulgaria and Romania.

In full respect of Switzerland's sovereignty, the Commission intends to raise the incompatibility of the measures decided on 24 April 2013 by the Swiss Government within the Joint Committee established by the Agreement.

As indicated by the HR/VP in her statement of 24 April 2013, the measures adopted by the Swiss Government are contrary to the Agreement on the Free Movement of Persons since they differentiate between groups of Member States as, after the termination of the respective transitional periods, Article 10(4) of the Agreement applies to all of them (except for Bulgaria and Romania, still under transitional period) without distinction.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004662/13
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(25. April 2013)

Betrifft: TAP-Abkommen

Anfang 2012 haben sich die Betreiber des größten natürlichen Gasfelds Aserbaidschans für das Trans-Adriatische-Pipeline-Projekt (TAP) als bevorzugten Gastransporteur für die Südroute entschieden. Die Gasfernleitung zwischen Italien, Griechenland und Albanien soll eine Startkapazität von mindestens zehn Milliarden Kubikmeter Erdgas pro Jahr führen. Vor kurzem wurde zur Verwirklichung dieses Projekts ein trilaterales intergouvernenmentales Abkommen von den Regierungen Italiens, Griechenlands und Albaniens unterzeichnet.

1. Welche Auswirkungen durch das TAP-Projekt werden im Rahmen der EU-Energiestrategie erwartet?

2. Wurden im Bereich anderer Pipeline-Projekte (z. B. Nabucco) mittlerweile Fortschritte erzielt?

Antwort von Herrn Oettinger im Namen der Kommission
(17. Juni 2013)

1. Die Trans-Adria-Pipeline wird, falls sie gebaut wird, eine wichtige Verbindungsleitung zwischen den Gasmärkten Griechenlands und Italiens sein. Derzeit gibt es keine direkte physische Verbindung zwischen diesen beiden Märkten. Eine solche neue bidirektionale Gasfernleitungsinfrastruktur dürfte daher einen wesentlichen Beitrag zu mehr Flexibilität auf dem südosteuropäischen Gasmarkt leisten.

2. Wie bei der Trans-Adria-Pipeline stehen die Träger des Projekts „Nabucco" derzeit in geschäftlichen Verhandlungen mit den Entwicklern des Erdgasfeldes Shah Deniz 2 in Aserbaidschan; bei der Projektvorbereitung ergreifen sie alle Maßnahmen, die für den erfolgreichen Abschluss der Verhandlungen erforderlich sind. Das Ergebnis der Verhandlungen wird voraussichtlich Mitte 2013 bekannt gegeben.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004662/13
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: TAP Agreement

At the beginning of 2012, the operators of the largest natural gas field in Azerbaijan chose the Trans-Adriatic Pipeline Project (TAP) as the preferred gas transporter for the southern route. The gas pipeline between Italy, Greece and Albania will have an initial capacity of at least ten billion cubic metres of natural gas per year. A trilateral intergovernmental agreement was recently signed by the governments of Italy, Greece and Albania for the implementation of this project.

1. What is the expected impact of the TAP project on energy security in the EU?

2. Has any progress been achieved in other pipeline projects (such as Nabucco) in the interim?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2013)

1. The Trans-Adriatic Pipeline, if realised, will be an important interconnector between the gas markets of Greece and Italy. There is currently no direct physical link between those two markets. Such a new bi-directional gas transmission infrastructure should therefore contribute substantially to increasing the flexibility of the gas market in South East Europe.

2. As in the case of the Trans-Adriatic Pipeline, the promoters of the Nabucco project are currently in commercial negotiations with the developers of the Shah Deniz 2 gas field in Azerbaijan, and are taking all the steps in project preparation which are necessary for the success of the negotiations. The outcome of the negotiations is expected by mid-2013.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004663/13
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(25. April 2013)

Betrifft: Wiedereinreiseverbot bei Sozialbetrug

Es gibt für EU-Bürger das Recht, in einem anderen EU-Staat zu studieren, zu arbeiten und sich niederzulassen. Gleichzeitig gibt es Armutsflüchtlinge, die das Freizügigkeitsrecht missbrauchen, um sich an den Sozialkassen zu bedienen und sogar absichtlich Sozialbetrug zu begehen.

Bisher musste ein Neuankömmling aus Südeuropa nach spätestens drei Monaten nachweisen, dass er selbstständig berufstätig ist. Konnte er das nicht, musste er in seine Heimat zurückzukehren. Einige Staaten befürchten, dass die seit Jahresanfang geltende Arbeitnehmerfreizügigkeit mit „sinflutartiger Armutsmigration" einhergeht. Nachdem die Hartz-IV-Zuwendungen für eine mehrköpfige Familie das rumänische Durchschnittsgehalt übersteigen, befürchten deutsche Gemeinden eine massive finanzielle Belastung. Deutsche Medien beziffern die Zahl der rumänischen und bulgarischen Armutsmigration mit 180 000 pro Jahr, wobei die Tendenz steigend sei. Neben Deutschland sind auch Österreich, die Niederlande, Großbritannien und Frankreich beliebte Ziele für Rumänen und Bulgaren.

1. Gibt es schon erste Erkenntnisse über die Auswirkung der seit Jahresbeginn geltenden Arbeitnehmerfreizügigkeit für Rumänen und Bulgaren?

2. Gibt es auf EU-Ebene schon konkrete Pläne, dass die Wiedereinreise verweigert werden kann, wenn der Betreffende Sozialbetrug begangen hat?

Antwort von Herrn Andor im Namen der Kommission
(20. Juni 2013)

Die EU-Rechtsvorschriften über die Arbeitnehmerfreizügigkeit sind bisher noch nicht umfassend auf bulgarische und rumänische Staatsangehörige anwendbar, da die Übergangsregelungen es den Mitgliedstaaten ermöglichen, bei schwerwiegenden Störungen ihres Arbeitsmarkts bzw. dessen Gefährdung bis zum 31. Dezember 2013 Zugangsbeschränkungen für ihren Markt beizubehalten. Deutschland ist einer der acht Mitgliedstaaten, die nach wie vor den Zugang zum Arbeitsmarkt für bulgarische und rumänische Arbeitnehmer beschränken.

In einem Bericht von 2011 ([1]) untersuchte die Kommission, inwieweit die Übergangsregelungen für bulgarische und rumänische Arbeitnehmer funktionieren. Daraus ging hervor, dass die Freizügigkeit für Arbeitnehmer aus diesen Ländern sich positiv auf die Wirtschaft der Aufnahmeländer auswirkte.

Sozialbetrug liegt vor, wenn Personen absichtlich falsche Erklärungen abgeben oder Änderungen ihrer persönlichen Umstände nicht melden, um unberechtigt Sozialleistungen zu erhalten. Ein solcher Betrug wird mit Strafen im Rahmen der Rechtssysteme der Mitgliedstaaten geahndet.

Das EU-Recht lässt zu, dass einzelstaatliche Rechtsvorschriften bei Missbrauch oder Betrug Sanktionen hinsichtlich des Rechts auf Freizügigkeit bei Aufenthalt und Wohnsitz vorsehen können, wie die Ausweisung von EU-Bürgern aus einem Mitgliedstaat und ein Wiedereinreiseverbot in schweren Fällen, sofern nachweisbar ist, dass ein EU-Bürger nach vernünftigem Ermessen weiterhin eine ernsthafte Bedrohung für das Gemeinwohl darstellen würde.

([1]) KOM(2011)729 endg. vom 11.11.2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004663/13
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(25 April 2013)

Subject: Re-entry ban for social security fraud

EU citizens have the right to study, work and take up residence in any other EU Member State. At the same time, there are also economic migrants who misuse freedom of movement entitlements to take advantage of social security systems and to commit deliberate social security fraud.

Until now, newcomers from Southern Europe have had at least three months to prove that they were in independent employment. If they were unable to do so, they would have to return to their country of origin. Some countries fear that the freedom of movement for workers that has been in force since the start of the year will result in a 'flood of economic migration'. As the Hartz IV allowances exceed the average income of a Romanian family with multiple family members, German communities fear a huge financial burden. The German media estimate the number of Romanian and Bulgarian migrants at 180 000 per annum and rising. As well as Germany, Austria, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and France are all popular destinations for Romanians and Bulgarians.

1. Are initial findings already available in relation to the impact of freedom of movement entitlements for workers from Romania and Bulgaria, which have been in place since the start of the year?

2. Are there specific plans at EU level allowing individuals to be refused re-entry if they have committed social security fraud?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2013)

EU legislation on the free movement of workers does not yet fully apply to Bulgarian and Romanian nationals since the transitional arrangements permit Member States, in case of serious disturbances to their labour market, or threat thereof, to maintain restrictions on access to their labour market until 31 December 2013. Germany is one of the eight Member States that still restricts access to its labour market for both Bulgarian and Romanian workers.

In a report in 2011 ([1]) the Commission examined how the transitional arrangements for Bulgarian and Romanian workers were functioning. It found that the free movement of workers from these countries was beneficial for the receiving countries' economies.

Social security fraud occurs when persons deliberately make a false declaration, or fail to report a change in their personal circumstances in order to obtain social security benefits they are not entitled to. This sort of fraud is subject to criminal penalties within the Member State legal systems.

EC law already allows that national law may provide for sanctions on the right of free movement and residence in case of abuse or fraud, such as expelling EU citizens from a Member State and imposing re-entry bans in grave cases where it is shown that an EU citizen is reasonably likely to continue to be a serious threat to public policy.

([1]) COM(2011) 729 final of 11.11.2011.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-004664/13
до Комисията
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE), Romana Jordan (PPE), Vladko Todorov Panayotov (ALDE), Adina-Ioana Vălean (ALDE), Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D), Silvia-Adriana Ţicău (S&D), Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE) и Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE)
(26 април 2013 г.)

Относно: Югоизточна Европа като електропреносен коридор

В съобщението на Комисията „Приоритети за енергийна инфраструктура за 2020 г. и по-нататък — план за интегрирана европейска енергийна мрежа“ (COM(2010)0677), Комисията разглежда Югоизточна Европа основно като газов коридор („южният газов коридор“). Съобщението признава единствено по периферен начин нуждата от развиване на мрежови връзки в Югоизточна Европа и препоръчва само „увеличение на преносния капацитет между държавите от Югоизточна Европа, включително държавите по Договора за Енергийната общност, с оглед допълнителното им интегриране в пазарите за електроенергия в Централна Европа.“ ([1])

Комисията поддържа същата позиция и в своето предложение за регламент на Европейския парламент и на Съвета за създаване на Механизъм за свързване на Европа 2011/0302 (COD). В част II от приложението, което съдържа проектосписъка на инфраструктурните приоритетни коридори и области в сферата на енергетиката, въпреки включването на електроенергийните междусистемни връзки север—юг в Централна/Източна и Югоизточна Европа, южният газов коридор, който, има за цел „пренос на газ от Каспийския басейн, Централна Азия, Близкия изток и източния Средиземноморски басейн до Съюза за увеличаване на диверсификацията на доставките на газ“ ([2]) няма еквивалент в електроенергийно отношение.

Тази позиция изцяло пренебрегва факта, че регионът е богат на слънчеви, вятърни, водни и геотермални ресурси, както и възможността за изграждане на съоръжения за съхранение на електрическа енергия, която да бъде включена в европейските енергийни доставки, като по този начин се повиши сигурността на доставките и се постигнат целите за декарбонизация.

Комисията ще обмисли ли включването към своите дългосрочни приоритети развитието на електрическата инфраструктура и мрежовите връзки в Югоизточна Европа, с цел увеличаване на енергийната независимост, стимулиране на растежа и създаване на работни места в държавите членки и в държавите, кандидати за членство от региона?

Отговор, даден от г-н Йотингер от името на Комисията
(21 юни 2013 г.)

Комисията напълно съзнава важността на изграждането на електроенергийни мрежи в Югоизточна Европа и необходимостта от интегриране на държавите от Енергийната общност с европейските пазари на електроенергия. Наистина потенциалът на региона по отношение на възобновяемите енергийни източници и съхранението може да доближи ЕС до постигането на целите на неговата енергийната политика и политиката му областта на климата.

Макар че в регламента се предвижда изрично „южен газов коридор“, поради особеностите, свързани с разнообразяването на пътищата на доставка на природен газ на ЕС, интегрирането на електрическата мрежа в Югоизточна Европа, включително с държавите от Енергийната общност, е част от приоритетните връзки север—юг между електроенергийните мрежи в Централна и Югоизточна Европа.

С общата цел да бъдат интегрирани мрежите в Югоизточна Европа, включително с държавите от Енергийната общност, ЕС и Енергийната общност си сътрудничат при определянето на приоритетни проекти. Енергийната общност паралелно провежда процес на идентифициране на проекти от интерес за Енергийната общност.

([1]) Достъпно в интернет на адрес: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SPLIT_COM:2010:0677(01):FIN:EN:PDF, стр. 30.
([2]) Достъпно в интернет на адрес: http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/president/news/speeches-statements/pdf/20111019_2_en.pdf, стр. 51.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004664/13
à la Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE), Romana Jordan (PPE), Vladko Todorov Panayotov (ALDE), Adina-Ioana Vălean (ALDE), Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D), Silvia-Adriana Ţicău (S&D), Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE) et Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE)
(26 avril 2013)

Objet: Mise en place d'un corridor électrique en Europe du sud-est

Dans sa communication intitulée «Priorités en matière d'infrastructures énergétiques pour 2020 et au-delà — schéma directeur pour un réseau énergétique européen intégré» (COM(2010)0677), la Commission conçoit l'Europe du sud-est essentiellement comme un corridor gazier («le corridor gazier méridional»). Elle ne reconnaît qu'accessoirement la nécessité de créer des connexions au réseau en Europe du sud-est et ne préconise que «l'augmentation des capacités de transfert entre les pays de l'Europe du sud-est, y compris les signataires du traité instituant la Communauté de l'énergie, en vue de poursuivre leur intégration dans les marchés de l'électricité d'Europe centrale» ([1]).

Ce même point de vue est également adopté par la Commission dans sa proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil instituant une infrastructure de connexion européenne (2011/0302 (COD)). Dans la partie II de l'annexe, où figure un projet de liste des corridors et régions prioritaires en matière d'infrastructures dans le domaine de l'énergie, le corridor gazier méridional, décrit comme ayant pour objectif le «transport du gaz du bassin de la mer Caspienne, d'Asie centrale, du Moyen— Orient et de la Méditerranée orientale vers l'Union pour accroître la diversification de l'approvisionnement» ([2]), n'a pas d'équivalent en matière d'électricité, bien qu'il soit fait référence aux interconnexions électriques nord-sud en Europe centrale et en Europe du sud-est.

Ce point de vue ne prend absolument pas en compte les ressources solaires, éoliennes, hydrauliques et géothermiques présentes en abondance dans la région, ni le potentiel de construction d'installations de stockage de l'énergie, qui pourraient être intégrés au réseau européen de distribution de l'énergie, et ainsi accroitre la sécurité d'approvisionnement et contribuer à la réalisation des objectifs de décarbonisation.

La Commission envisage-t-elle d'ajouter, à ses priorités à long terme, le développement des infrastructures électriques et des connexions au réseau en Europe du sud-est, afin d'accroître l'indépendance énergétique, de stimuler la croissance et de créer des emplois dans les États membres et les pays candidats de la région?

Réponse donnée par M. Oettinger au nom de la Commission
(21 juin 2013)

La Commission reconnaît pleinement l'importance du développement des réseaux d'électricité en Europe du sud-est et la nécessité d'intégrer les pays de la Communauté de l'énergie dans les marchés de l'électricité de l'UE. En effet, le potentiel de la région sur le plan des énergies renouvelables et du stockage permettra de faire progresser la réalisation des objectifs stratégiques de l'Europe en matière d'énergie et de climat.

S'il est vrai que le règlement prévoit explicitement un «corridor gazier sud-européen» en raison des particularités de la diversification des filières d'approvisionnement en gaz de l'UE, l'intégration des réseaux d'électricité de l'Europe du sud-est — notamment des pays de la Communauté de l'énergie — fait partie du domaine prioritaire «interconnexions électriques nord-sud en Europe centrale et en Europe du sud-est».

L'UE et la Communauté de l'énergie coopèrent pour déterminer les projets prioritaires, avec pour objectif commun d'intégrer les réseaux de l'Europe du sud-est, notamment avec les pays de la Communauté de l'énergie. La Communauté de l'énergie s'est lancée en parallèle dans un processus de sélection de «projets d'intérêt pour la Communauté de l'énergie» (PECI).

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SPLIT_COM:2010:0677(01):FIN:RO:PDF, p. 30.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/president/news/speeches-statements/pdf/20111019_2_en.pdf, p. 51.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-004664/13
adresată Comisiei
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE), Romana Jordan (PPE), Vladko Todorov Panayotov (ALDE), Adina-Ioana Vălean (ALDE), Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D), Silvia-Adriana Țicău (S&D), Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE) şi Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE)
(26 aprilie 2013)

Subiect: Sud-estul Europei ca un coridor pentru electricitate

În Comunicarea Comisiei întitulată „Priorități în domeniul infrastructurii energetice ante și post 2020. Plan de realizare a unei rețele energetice europene integrate"(COM(2010)0677), Comisia privește sud-estul Europei în principal ca un coridor pentru gaze («coridorul sudic al gazelor»). Comunicarea recunoaște doar periferic necesitatea de a dezvolta conexiuni ale rețelei în sud-estul Europei și recomandă doar «creșterea capacităților de transport între țările din Europa de Sud-Est, inclusiv între cele care sunt parte la Tratatul de instituire a Comunității Energiei, în scopul unei mai bune integrări a lor în piețele electroenergetice central-europene» ([1]).

În propunerea Comisiei de regulament al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului de instituire a mecanismului Conectarea Europei [2011/0302 (COD)] se repetă aceeași perspectivă. În partea II a anexei, care include propunerea de listă a coridoarelor și domeniilor prioritare de infrastructură din domeniul energiei, în ciuda includerii interconexiunilor nord-sud de electricitate în Europa Centrală, de Est de Sud-Est, coridorul sudic al gazelor, descris ca având drept obiectiv „transportul gazelor din bazinul Mării Caspice, Asia Centrală, Orientul Mijlociu și bazinul mediteranean estic către Uniune, pentru consolidarea diversificării surselor de aprovizionare cu gaze" ([2]) nu are un echivalent în domeniul electricității.

Această perspectivă ignoră complet resursele solare, eoliene, hidrologice și geotermale bogate din regiune, precum și potențialul de construire a capacității de stocare a electricității, care ar putea fi integrate în aprovizionarea cu energie la nivel european, consolidând, astfel, siguranța aprovizionării și capacitatea de atingere a obiectivelor de decarbonizare.

Va analiza Comisia posibilitatea de a adăuga la prioritățile sale pe termen lung dezvoltarea infrastructurii energetice și a conexiunilor de rețea în sud-estul Europei pentru a crește independența energetică, a stimula creșterea și a crea locuri de muncă în statele membre și țările candidate din regiune?

Răspuns dat de dl Oettinger în numele Comisiei
(21 iunie 2013)

Comisia recunoaște pe deplin importanța dezvoltării rețelelor de energie electrică în Europa de Sud-Est și necesitatea de a integra țările membre ale Comunității Energiei în piețele energiei electrice din UE. Într-adevăr, sursele regenerabile de energie și potențialul de stocare din regiune vor permite Europei să avanseze în direcția îndeplinirii obiectivelor de politică în materie de energie și climă.

În timp ce regulamentul stabilește în mod explicit un „coridor sudic al gazelor" ținând cont de specificitățile legate de diversificarea surselor de aprovizionare cu gaze a UE, integrarea rețelei de energie electrică din Europa de Sud-Est, inclusiv cu rețelele din țările membre ale Comunității Energiei, este parte a priorității „interconexiuni electrice nord-sud în Europa Centrală și de Sud-Est".

Având obiectivul comun de a integra rețelele din Europa de Sud-Est, inclusiv cu cele ale țărilor membre ale Comunității Energiei, UE și Comunitatea Energiei se sprijină reciproc în identificarea proiectelor prioritare. În paralel, Comunitatea Energiei desfășoară un proces de identificare a unor „proiecte de interes pentru Comunitatea Energiei" (PECI).

([1]) Disponibil online la: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SPLIT_COM:2010:0677(01):FIN:RO:PDF, p. 30.
([2]) Disponibil online la: http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/president/news/speeches-statements/pdf/20111019_2_en.pdf, p. 51.

(Slovenska različica)

Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-004664/13
za Komisijo
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE), Romana Jordan (PPE), Vladko Todorov Panayotov (ALDE), Adina-Ioana Vălean (ALDE), Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D), Silvia-Adriana Ţicău (S&D), Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE) in Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE)
(26. april 2013)

Zadeva: Jugovzhodna Evropa kot elektroenergetski koridor

V Sporočilu Komisije z naslovom Prednostne naloge glede energetske infrastrukture za leto 2020 in pozneje – Načrt za integrirano evropsko energetsko omrežje (COM(2010)0677) je jugovzhodna Evropa v prvi vrsti označena kot plinski koridor („južni plinski koridor"). Sporočilo zgolj obstransko priznava potrebo po razvoju elektroenergetskih povezav v jugovzhodni Evropi in zgolj priporoča, da bo treba „povečati prenosne zmogljivosti med državami jugovzhodne Evrope, vključno s podpisnicami Pogodbe o Energetski skupnosti, v skladu z njihovim nadaljnjim povezovanjem s srednjeevropskimi trgi električne energije" ([1]).

V predlogu Komisije za uredbo Evropskega parlamenta in Sveta o vzpostavitvi instrumenta za povezovanje Evrope 2011/0302(COD) se ponovi isto mnenje. Drugi del Priloge, ki vključuje osnutek seznama prednostnih nalog glede infrastrukture koridorjev in območij na področju energetike, kljub vključitvi medsebojne povezave elektroenergetskih sistemov v srednjevzhodni in jugovzhodni Evropi v smeri sever–jug, ne vsebuje elektroenergetske različice južnega plinskega koridorja, za katerega je naveden cilj „prenos plina iz Kaspijskega bazena, Osrednje Azije, Bližnjega vzhoda in vzhodnomediteranskega bazena v Unijo za povečanje raznolikosti ponudbe plina" ([2]).

S tem so v celoti zapostavljeni bogati sončni, vetrni, vodni in geotermalni viri v regiji, kakor tudi potencial za izgradnjo zmogljivosti za hrambo energije, ki bi ga bilo mogoče vključiti v evropsko oskrbo z energijo ter tako povečati zanesljivost oskrbe z energijo in bolje doseči cilje zmanjšanja emisij ogljika.

Bo Komisija razmislila o tem, da bi na seznam svojih dolgoročnih prednostnih nalog dodala razvoj elektroenergetske infrastrukture in povezav v omrežje v jugovzhodni Evropi ter s tem povečala energetsko neodvisnost, spodbudila rast in ustvarila delovna mesta v državah članicah in kandidatkah v regiji?

Odgovor g. Oettingerja v imenu Komisije
(21. junij 2013)

Komisija v celoti priznava pomembnost razvoja elektroenergetskih omrežij v jugovzhodni Evropi in potrebo po povezovanju držav Energetske skupnosti s trgi električne energije v EU. Obnovljivi viri energije in potencial za shranjevanje v tej regiji bodo pripomogli k doseganju ciljev energetske in podnebne politike EU.

Uredba jasno določa „južni plinski koridor" zaradi posebnosti diverzifikacije dobavnih poti plina EU, povezovanje elektroenergetskega omrežja v jugovzhodni Evropi, vključno z državami Energetske skupnosti, pa je del prednostne naloge „medsebojne povezave elektroenergetskih sistemov v srednjevzhodni in jugovzhodni Evropi v smeri sever-jug".

EU in Energetska skupnost s skupnim ciljem povezave omrežij v jugovzhodni Evropi, vključno z državami Energetske skupnosti, vzajemno podpirata določanje prednostnih projektov. Energetska skupnost je hkrati v postopku določanja „projektov, pomembnih za Energetsko skupnost".

([1]) Na voljo na spletu na naslovu: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SPLIT_COM:2010:0677(01):FIN:EN:PDF, str. 30.
([2]) Na voljo na spletu na naslovu: http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/president/news/speeches-statements/pdf/20111019_2_en.pdf, str. 51.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004664/13
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE), Romana Jordan (PPE), Vladko Todorov Panayotov (ALDE), Adina-Ioana Vălean (ALDE), Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D), Silvia-Adriana Ţicău (S&D), Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE) and Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: South-East Europe as an electricity corridor

In the Commission Communication 'Energy infrastructure priorities for 2020 and beyond — A Blueprint for an integrated European energy network' (COM(2010) 0677), the Commission views South-East Europe primarily as a gas corridor (the 'southern gas corridor'). The communication only recognises in a peripheral manner the need to develop grid connections in South-East Europe and only recommends 'the increase of transfer capacities between South East European countries, including those of the Energy Community Treaty, in view of their further integration with Central European electricity markets' ([1]).

In the Commission's proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the Connecting Europe Facility 2011/0302 (COD), the same view was taken again. In Part II of the annex which includes the draft list of infrastructure priority corridors and areas in the field of energy, in spite of the inclusion of the North-South electricity interconnections in central eastern and South-East Europe, the southern gas corridor, described as having the objective of the 'transmission of gas from the Caspian Basin, Central Asia, the Middle East and the East Mediterranean Basin to the Union to enhance diversification of gas supply' ([2]), does not have an electricity equivalent.

This view completely ignores the rich solar, wind, hydro and geothermal resources in the region, as well as the potential for building power storage capacity, which could be integrated into the European energy supply, thereby enhancing security of supply and the achievement of decarbonisation targets.

Will the Commission consider adding to its long-term priorities the development of electricity infrastructure and grid connections in South-East Europe, with a view to increasing energy independence, stimulating growth and generating jobs in Member States and candidate countries in the region?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(21 June 2013)

The Commission fully recognises the importance of developing electricity networks in South East Europe and the need to integrate the Energy Community countries with EU electricity markets. Indeed, the renewables and storage potential of the region will help bringing Europe closer to its energy and climate policy objectives.

While the regulation sets out an explicit 'Southern Gas Corridor' due to the specificities of diversifying the gas supply routes of the EU, the integration of the electricity network in South East Europe, including with Energy Community countries, is part of the priority 'North-South electricity interconnections in Central and South Eastern Europe'.

With the common objective of integrating the networks in South East Europe, including with Energy Community countries, the EU and the Energy Community are mutually supporting the identification of priority projects. The Energy Community is in parallel carrying out a process of identifying 'Projects of Energy Community Interest' (PECI).

([1]) Available online at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SPLIT_COM:2010:0677(01):FIN:EN:PDF, p. 30.
([2]) Available online at http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/president/news/speeches-statements/pdf/20111019_2_en.pdf, page 51.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004665/13
to the Commission
David Martin (S&D)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Rights of workers questioning health and safety issues at their workplace

An answer to E-003112/2012 (11 May 2012) by Mr Andor, on behalf of the Commission, states: 'The framework Directive lays down the general principles on the prevention of occupational risks, the health and safety of workers, and the information, consultation, participation and training of workers and their representatives. The directive also provides that workers or workers' representatives with special responsibility for the health and safety of workers, may not be placed at a disadvantage because they consult or raise issues with the employer regarding measures to mitigate hazards or to remove sources of danger.'

Mr Andor then goes on to advise that 'Member States are required to transpose the directive into national law. It is, therefore, the responsibility of the relevant national authorities to enforce the national provisions transposing the EU legislation. According to the case-law of the Court of Justice, Member States are obliged to adopt all measures necessary to ensure that the directive is fully effective in accordance with its objectives. Member States are also required to ensure that infringements of EC law are penalised under conditions which are analogous to those applicable to infringements of national law, provided they render the penalty effective, proportionate and dissuasive.'

Could the Commission advise if it is then the case that the setting up of any structure detailing the names of workers deemed to have questioned health and safety issues at their workplace would be considered 'being placed at a disadvantage' and that doing so would be an infringement of EC law?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2013)

Article 11(4) of Directive 89/391/EEC ([1]) provides that workers or workers' representatives with special responsibility for health and safety activities may not be placed at a disadvantage for raising issues relating to health and safety at the workplace.

Any body listing the names of such workers or workers' representatives and thereby placing them at a disadvantage for raising issues relating to health and safety at the workplace would appear to be in direct breach of the directive.

Article 6(1)(b) of Directive 95/46/EC ([2]), which seeks to protect the rights and freedoms of persons with respect to the processing of personal data by laying down guidelines determining when such processing is lawful, makes it a Member State obligation to ensure that personal data are collected for legitimate purposes only and any further processing of such data must not be incompatible with those purposes. The collection or processing by any body and/or employer of personal data of workers or workers' representatives who have raised issues relating to health and safety at the workplace with a view to placing them at a disadvantage would appear to contravene the 'legitimate purpose' requirement and could therefore entail a breach of Directive 95/46/EC.

The Member States must transpose directives into their national law. It is therefore the responsibility of the national authorities to enforce national provisions transposing EU legislation and to investigate specific cases and assess their legality.

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

([2]) Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 1995 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, OJ L 281, 23.11.1995, p. 31.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004666/13
à la Commission
Marielle de Sarnez (ALDE)
(26 avril 2013)

Objet: Étude d'impact de la politique agricole commune sur l'agriculture des pays en voie de développement

Le 17 janvier 2013, le Représentant spécial de l'ONU (RSNU) au droit à l'alimentation a invité l'Union européenne à examiner les répercussions des subventions de la PAC sur la sécurité alimentaire et l'activité des agriculteurs dans les pays en voie de développement. D'après le RSNU, l'article 21 du traité sur l'Union européenne contraint juridiquement l'Union européenne à évaluer les conséquences de ses politiques externes. Ce même article insiste sur le fait que l'Union européenne «veille à la cohérence entre les différents domaines de son action extérieure et entre ceux-ci et ses autres politiques» (article 21, paragraphe 3, TUE).

La Commission compte-t-elle suivre les recommandations du RSNU au droit à l'alimentation et conduire une étude d'impact de la PAC sur l'agriculture des pays en voie de développement et le droit à l'alimentation?

Réponse donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(31 mai 2013)

La Commission rappelle à l'Honorable Parlementaire que les propositions de réforme de la PAC ont été formulées à l'issue d'une évaluation d'impact détaillée qui a été publiée en 2011. Celle-ci comprenait un chapitre portant sur l'incidence potentielle des propositions sur les pays en développement ([1]).

La procédure d'établissement du compte rendu périodique portant sur les principales réalisations dans le cadre de la cohérence des politiques au service du développement (CPD) est bien avancée, et le compte rendu comprendra de nouveau un chapitre concernant la politique agricole et la sécurité alimentaire de l'Union européenne. Étant donné que la majeure partie du soutien apporté par l'Union (90 %) est tout à fait découplée, la Commission est d'avis que d'autres analyses d'impact ne se justifient pas. Compte tenu du fait que l'Union européenne est de plus en plus une preneuse de prix sur les marchés internationaux, et étant donné que les subventions à l'exportation se situent à un niveau historiquement bas, l'incidence de la politique agricole de l'Union sur les marchés tiers est négligeable.

La Commission poursuit ses consultations à propos de la dimension CPD avec les parties intéressées, notamment avec les organisations d'agriculteurs, et ce par des voies appropriées, y compris à l'aide de groupes consultatifs spécialisés et, dernièrement, au sein du sous-comité de coopération commerciale de la PAC.

Cela s'ajoute au fait que la mise en place d'une agriculture durable et d'une sécurité alimentaire et nutritionnelle sont les priorités les plus importantes de la coopération au développement à long terme de l'Union européenne, et constituent un aspect important de notre dialogue avec les pays en développement. Sur le plan de la gouvernance mondiale, l'Union européenne se montre parmi les plus résolus à respecter les engagements du G20 concernant le Plan d'action sur la volatilité des prix alimentaires et sur l'agriculture, y compris en améliorant la transparence des marchés des produits alimentaires par l'intermédiaire du système d'information sur les marchés agricoles (AMIS).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/policy-perspectives/impact-assessment/cap-towards-2020/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004666/13
to the Commission
Marielle de Sarnez (ALDE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Impact assessment of the common agricultural policy (CAP) in respect of agriculture in developing countries

On 17 January 2013, the UN Special Rapporteur (UNSR) on the right to food called on the EU to study the repercussions that CAP subsidies are having on food security and the activity of farmers in developing countries. According to the UNSR, Article 21 of the Treaty on European Union (TEU) legally obliges the EU to assess the consequences of its external policies. The same article stresses that the EU 'shall ensure consistency between the different areas of its external action and between these and its other policies.' (Article 21(3) TEU).

Does the Commission intend to follow the recommendations of the UNSR on the right to food and conduct an impact assessment of the CAP in respect of agriculture in developing countries and the right to food?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(31 May 2013)

The Commission reminds the Honourable Member that prior to the CAP reform proposals, the European Commission conducted a detailed impact assessment which was published in 2011. This included a chapter on the potential impact of the proposals on developing countries ([1]).

The process leading to the periodic reporting of the main achievements under the Policy Coherence for Development (PCD) is well underway and a chapter will, once again, be included on the EU's agricultural policy and food security. With most EU support (over 90%) being totally decoupled, the Commission does not consider that further impact assessments are warranted. The EU is increasingly a price taker on international markets and with the level of export subsidies reaching an all time low, the impact of the EU agricultural policy on third markets is negligible.

The Commission continues to consult with stakeholders, including farmers' organisations, about the PCD dimension via appropriate channels, including specialised advisory groups and most recently in the ACP Trade Cooperation Sub Committee.

This is in addition to the fact that sustainable agriculture and food and nutrition security are at the top of the EU's long-term development cooperation agenda and are an important aspect of our dialogue with developing countries. At a global governance level, the EU has been a major proponent to deliver on the G20 commitments of the action plan on Food Price Volatility and Agriculture, including by enhancing transparency in food commodity markets through the Agricultural Market Information System(AMIS).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/policy-perspectives/impact-assessment/cap-towards-2020/index_en.htm

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004667/13
à la Commission
Marielle de Sarnez (ALDE)
(26 avril 2013)

Objet: Renforcement des normes de sécurité pour les Très Grands Navires (TGN)

Il y a un, le naufrage du paquebot Costa Concordia au large des côtes italiennes a ravivé la question des risques causés à la sécurité des passagers et à l'environnement par la navigation des TNG, dont la taille peut atteindre jusqu'à 60 mètres de long et la capacité d'accueil 5 400 passagers et 2 200 membres d'équipage.

La dimension de ces bateaux suscite des interrogations concernant leur stabilité en mer agitée, le temps et la logistique nécessaires à l'évacuation d'un nombre important de passagers, ainsi que les coûts requis pour assurer ces navires et les risques de défaillance des assureurs en cas de sinistre.

La législation maritime internationale en vigueur prévoit que les TGN sont soumis au code international de gestion de la sécurité des navires et la prévention de la pollution (Code ISM) ainsi qu'à la convention internationale sur la sauvegarde de la vie humaine en mer (SOLAS) de l'Organisation Maritime Internationale (OMI).

La tendance vers la construction de navires toujours plus grands et les risques spécifiques que cela comporte devraient se traduire dans la législation maritime internationale. Or, celle-ci ne semble pas avoir évolué en conséquence. Un rapport de l'Institut Français de la Mer (IFM) met en évidence l'actuelle difficulté des pouvoirs publics et des autorités portuaires à faire face aux conséquences d'un accident grave de TGN.

Au vu des problèmes liés au manque de capacité de gestion des naufrages de TGN, la Commission envisage-t-elle l'adoption de règles relatives aux normes de sécurité renforcées pour ce type de navires?

Réponse donnée par M. Kallas au nom de la Commission
(6 juin 2013)

La Commission n'envisage pas d'adopter de règles européennes spécifiques pour les navires de croisière, étant donné que ces derniers sont soumis à des normes de sécurité internationales. C'est pourquoi, de concert avec les États membres, elle participe activement aux travaux de l'Organisation maritime internationale (OMI). La Commission estime que la stabilité après avarie des navires à passagers revêt une importance cruciale, d'autant plus que, selon l'approche réglementaire l'OMI, le navire constitue le meilleur canot de sauvetage, et parce que cette stabilité après avarie est le principal facteur déterminant la probabilité de survie d'un navire après un accident.

En décembre 2012, une proposition de l'UE envisageant des solutions de remplacement en vue d'améliorer la méthode de calcul utilisée dans la réglementation SOLAS 2009 concernant la probabilité de survie des navires à passagers après avarie a été présentée au sous-comité SLF ([1]) de l'OMI. Surtout, une proposition de l'UE sur les progrès à réaliser en la matière pour améliorer de manière substantielle la sécurité de ces navires a été présentée au MSC ([2]), qui tiendra une réunion en juin 2013. Ce rapport se fonde sur les résultats de la recherche financée par l'UE.

Une étude financée par l'UE ([3]) a suggéré que des options appropriées de maîtrise des risques pourraient faire baisser de manière significative les niveaux de risque acceptables, en améliorant le niveau de sécurité déterminé dans les règles de l'OMI relatives à la stabilité après avarie de 2009. Une autre étude financée par l'UE ([4]) a montré que le niveau de sécurité pouvait être amélioré en introduisant des mesures économiques de conception des navires.

En outre, l'OMI examine actuellement une série de mesures opérationnelles visant à promouvoir l'utilisation de ses normes en matière de sécurité de la navigation, de gestion des ponts et, surtout, d'évacuation des navires à passagers.

([1]) Sous-comité de la stabilité et des lignes de charge et de la sécurité des navires de pêche.
([2]) Comité de la sécurité maritime.
([3]) «Study of the specific damage stability parameters of ro-ro passenger vessels according to SOLAS 2009 including water on deck calculation», réalisée par le Ship Stability Research Centre (SSRC) de l'Université de Strathclyde (UoS) et commandée par l'Agence européenne pour la sécurité maritime (AESM). Cette étude a débuté en décembre 2009 et s'est achevée en juin 2011.
([4]) Projet GOALDS («GOAL based Damage Stability project»), mené au titre du 7e programme-cadre de RDT de l'UE, dans le domaine «Transports de surface durables». Entamé en septembre 2009, le projet s'est achevé en août 2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004667/13
to the Commission
Marielle de Sarnez (ALDE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Enhancing safety standards for megaships

The sinking of the liner *Costa Concordia* off the Italian coast a year ago once again raised the issue of the risks posed to passenger safety and the environment by the navigation of megaships, which can be up to 60 metres in length and accommodate 5 400 passengers and 2 200 crew members.

The size of these ships raises questions about their stability in rough seas, the time and the logistics necessary to evacuate a large number of passengers, as well as the cost of insuring these ships and the risks of insurers going bankrupt in the event of an accident.

International maritime law in force lays down that megaships are subject to the international standard for the safe management and operation of ships and for pollution prevention (ISM Code) as well as the International Maritime Organisation's (IMO) International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS).

The trend towards building increasingly large ships and the specific risks that this involves should be reflected in international maritime law. However, the law does not seem to have developed accordingly. A report by the French Maritime Institute (IFM) highlights the difficulty currently faced by public authorities and port authorities in dealing with the consequences of a serious accident involving a megaship.

In view of the problems associated with the lack of capacity for dealing with wrecks involving megaships, does the Commission plan to adopt rules on enhanced safety standards for this kind of ship?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2013)

The Commission does not plan to adopt specific EU rules on cruise ships as they are subject to international safety standards. Therefore, the Commission, together with the Member States, contribute actively to the work of the International Maritime Organisation (IMO). The Commission considers damage stability of passenger ships of crucial importance, particularly as the IMO regulatory philosophy is to regard the ship as its own best lifeboat and because this is the most important requirement determining the survivability of a ship after an accident.

In December 2012, a joint EU submission on possible alternatives to improve the SOLAS 2009 calculation method for the survivability of passenger ships in a damaged condition was submitted to the relevant IMO sub-committee SLF ([1]) . More importantly, a joint EU submission on how to make progress on the issue with the aim to substantially increase the safety level has been submitted to the MSC ([2]) for its meeting in June 2013. This is based on results of EU-funded research.

One EU-funded study ([3]) suggested that appropriate risk control options could bring down the acceptable risk levels significantly, by improving the safety level provided by the 2009 IMO damage stability regulations. In another EU-funded study ([4]), it was found that the safety level provided could be increased by cost-effective ship design measures.

A number of operational measures to foster the IMO standards concerning the safe navigation, bridge management and, importantly, evacuation of passenger ships are also currently under consideration in the IMO.

([1]) Stability and Load Lines and on Fishing Vessels Safety.
([2]) Maritime Safety Committee.
([3]) 'Study of the specific damage stability parameters of ro-ro passenger vessels according to SOLAS 2009 including water on deck calculation', carried out by the Ship Stability Research Centre (SSRC) of the University of Strathclyde (UoS) commissioned by EMSA. This study started in December 2009 and finalised in June 2011.
([4]) GOALDS: 'GOAL based Damage Stability project' which was carried out under the 7th EU Framework Programme for RTD under the Theme 'Sustainable Surface Transport'. The project started in September 2009 and finalised in August 2012.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004668/13
à la Commission
Michel Dantin (PPE)
(26 avril 2013)

Objet: Marché des œufs en Europe

Le marché des œufs est très perturbé en Europe depuis le début de l'année.

La Commission peut-elle dresser un bilan des contrôles qu'elle a effectués depuis le début de l'année sur l'application de la directive 99/74/CE dans tous les États membres? A-t-elle effectivement constaté des commercialisations d'œufs à partir de poulaillers ne respectant pas la règlementation?

La réactivation des restitutions pour les œufs et les ovoproduits est-elle envisagée par la Commission?

La Commission classe-t-elle toujours les œufs et les ovoproduits dans les accords de libre-échange conclus avec les pays tiers? À l'exportation, obtient-elle des avantages pour ce secteur dans les accords négociés?

La Commission envisage-t-elle de prendre des mesures pour sécuriser ce secteur de la production?

Réponse donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(17 juin 2013)

Cette année, seule la Croatie a fait l'objet d'une inspection de la part de la Commission dans le but d'évaluer son état de préparation en ce qui concerne le respect de la directive 1999/74/CE du Conseil ([1]). Les ressources ne sont pas utilisées à bon escient lorsqu'elles sont consacrées à l'inspection des États membres qui ont reconnu ne pas avoir respecté la réglementation. Deux États membres ne se sont toujours pas conformés à l'interdiction des cages non-aménagées. La Commission les a traduits devant la Cour de justice de l'Union européenne le 25 avril 2013. Il incombe à ces États membres de veiller à ce qu'aucun œuf provenant d'exploitations non-conformes ne soit mis sur le marché.

La baisse des prix des œufs observée depuis le mois de janvier est liée à leur ajustement après une hausse spectaculaire observée en 2012, suivie d'une offre excédentaire d'œufs en 2013. Dans ce contexte, la Commission n'a pas l'intention de rétablir les restitutions à l'exportation pour l'albumine séchée.

Au cours des négociations des accords de libre-échange avec des pays tiers, la Commission examine toujours les éventuelles conséquences positives et négatives que ce type d'accords pourrait avoir sur le marché des œufs et des ovoproduits. En fonction du pays tiers concerné, la Commission peut tirer parti de l'exportation de ces produits ou bien les considérer comme sensibles et limiter l'octroi d'éventuelles concessions aux importations de pays tiers.

À ce stade, la Commission ne prévoit pas de prendre des mesures pour protéger le marché des œufs. Sur la base de l'analyse de la situation observée au cours des cinq dernières années, la Commission estime que la baisse actuelle des prix des œufs conduira à un réajustement de l'approvisionnement et, partant, à un réajustement des prix.

([1]) Directive 1999/74/CE du Conseil établissant les normes minimales relatives à la protection des poules pondeuses; JO L 203 du 3.8.1999.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004668/13
to the Commission
Michel Dantin (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: The European egg market

The European egg market has been in great turmoil since the start of the year.

Can the Commission give a detailed account of what checks it has carried out since the start of the year in respect of the implementation of Directive 99/74/EC in all Member States? Has it become aware of any instances of eggs being marketed which come from henhouses that do not comply with legislation?

Is the Commission planning to bring back refunds for eggs and egg products?

Does the Commission always grade eggs and egg products in free trade agreements with third countries? In the agreements it negotiates, does the Commission secure any benefits for this sector in terms of exports?

Does the Commission plan to take steps to safeguard this production sector?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2013)

So far this year, only Croatia has been inspected by the Commission to assess its readiness to comply with Council Directive 1999/74/EC ([1]). It is not a sound use of resources to inspect Member States who have admitted to non-compliance. Two Member States remain non-compliant with the ban on unenriched cages and on 25 April 2013 the Commission referred them to the European Court of Justice. These Member States are responsible for ensuring that no eggs from non-compliant holdings are placed on the market.

The decrease of egg prices observed since January is linked to the adjustment of prices after the exceptionally high prices observed in 2012, followed by an oversupply of eggs in 2013. In this context, the Commission does not intend to reinstate export refunds for dried albumin.

During free trade agreements' negotiations with third countries, the Commission always examine the potential positive and negative effects of such agreements on the egg and egg product market. Depending on the third country, the Commission can obtain advantages to export these products or alternatively can consider them as sensitive and limit possible concessions to third countries' imports.

At this stage, the Commission does not foresee to take measures to safeguard the egg market. Based on the analysis of the situation in the last five years, the Commission estimates that the current decreased in egg prices will lead to a readjustment of the supply and consequently of prices.

([1]) Council Directive 1999/74/EC laying down minimum standards for the protection of laying hens; OJ L 203, 3.8.1999.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004669/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(26 avril 2013)

Objet: Kokopelli

Cette question fait suite à celle posée en juillet 2012 à la Commission qui portait sur l'impossibilité, pour l'association Kokopelli, de commercialiser des semences non cataloguées officiellement et la dérive probable de la logique productiviste qui mène à la diminution drastique de semences de plantes variées et anciennes (E-007390/2012).

1. Où en est l'ébauche d'une directive? Quels sont les points qui posent encore problème à sa finalisation? Quel est le calendrier de la Commission?

2. Dans sa réponse, la Commission répond que «L'application nationale des directives de la Commission sur les variétés de conservation et sur les variétés "amateurs" de légumes a, jusqu'à présent, donné lieu à l'inscription de quelque 570 variétés aux catalogues communs des variétés des espèces agricoles et de légumes dans un délai inférieur à 18 mois.» Qu'en est-il huit mois plus tard du nombre de variétés enregistrées?

3. Parmi les variétés enregistrées, combien l'ont été via une procédure *light*, a priori proposée à ceux qui ne peuvent se permettre de lourds frais d'enregistrement?

4. Que répond Commission aux centaines de demandeurs qui disent ne pouvoir faire leurs demandes faute de moyens?

Il convient de rappeler que dix multinationales contrôlent deux tiers du marché des semences et qu'en 50 ans, 75 % de la biodiversité a disparu.

5. La Commission peut-elle confirmer ce qu'ont déjà conclu plusieurs spécialistes, à savoir que les «nouvelles» graines sont des variétés si améliorées qu'elles ne permettent pas de réutiliser les semences produites? Une étude est-elle ou sera-t-elle menée en ce sens?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(3 juin 2013)

1. La proposition de règlement a été adoptée par le Collège le 6 mai 2013 (COM(2013)262 final).

2. Le 13 mai 2013, 172 variétés de conservation d'espèces agricoles, 29 variétés de conservation d'espèces de légumes et 519 variétés amateurs — soit 720 variétés au total — étaient enregistrées.

3. L'application de la procédure d'enregistrement pour les variétés traditionnelles relève de la responsabilité des États membres. La Commission ne dispose pas d'informations exhaustives sur les coûts et les procédures de tous les États membres. En général, les variétés traditionnelles ne nécessitent pas de contrôle officiel très long et des procédures simplifiées sont donc envisageables. Plusieurs États membres ont mis en place des procédures d'enregistrement nettement moins chères et moins contraignantes pour les variétés traditionnelles que pour les nouvelles variétés.

4. Le système prévu dans la proposition de la Commission rendra l'enregistrement de variétés traditionnelles moins coûteux et moins contraignant. Les microentreprises seront exonérées du paiement de redevances pour l'enregistrement des variétés et pourront commercialiser du matériel de reproduction des végétaux sans avoir effectué d'enregistrement.

La Commission n'a pas de données fiables indiquant que les multinationales possèdent une part du marché des semences agricoles de l'UE qui soit supérieure à 30 %. Les données tendent à montrer que la majorité du marché est détenue par des PME et des microentreprises ([1]).

5. À la connaissance de la Commission, aucune étude n'a été, n'est ou ne sera menée. Actuellement, des hybrides sont utilisés, entre autres, pour le maïs, le colza et les tomates et, en réalité, il est possible de réutiliser les semences produites.

([1]) Consortium d'évaluation de la chaîne alimentaire: «Evaluation of the Community acquis on the marketing of seed and plant propagating material (S&PM)», 2008, p. 32.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004669/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Kokopelli

This question follows on from the one I asked the Commission in July 2012 (E-007390/2012) about the Kokopelli association not being permitted to market seed that did not appear in official catalogues and the likely productivist trend that was leading to a drastic reduction in the variety of plant seed, including old varieties.

1. What progress has been made with a draft directive? What sticking points remain in finalising it? What is the Commission's timetable for it?

2. In its answer, the Commission replied that 'National implementation of the Commission Directives on conservation varieties and on amateur varieties of vegetables has so far led to the registration of around 570 varieties in the agricultural and vegetable Common Catalogues within less than 18 months'. How many varieties have now been registered, eight months on?

3. Of the registered varieties, how many were registered according to a 'light' procedure, in principle offered to those who cannot afford high registration fees?

4. What does the Commission have to say to the hundreds of applicants who say they cannot submit their applications because they cannot afford it?

It should be pointed out that 10 multinationals control two thirds of the seed market and that 75% of biodiversity has disappeared in 50 years.

5. Can the Commission confirm the conclusion already reached by several specialists, namely that 'new' varieties of seeds are improved so much that they do not allow seed produced to be reused? Is a study on this issue in progress or will one be carried out?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(3 June 2013)

1. The proposal for a regulation has been adopted by the College on 6 May 2013 (COM(2013) 262 final).

2. On 13 May 2013, 172 agricultural conservation varieties, 29 vegetable conservation varieties and 519 amateur varieties were registered. These are in total 720 varieties.

3. Implementation of the registration procedure for traditional varieties is a Member State responsibility. The Commission has no comprehensive information on costs and procedures in all Member States. Generally, no lengthy official examination of traditional varieties is required for their acceptance, and thus light procedures can be expected. Several Member States have implemented registration procedures for traditional varieties that are considerably cheaper and less burdensome than for new varieties.

4. Under the system foreseen in the Commission proposal, registration of traditional varieties will become less costly and less burdensome. Micro-enterprises will be exempted from variety registration fees and they will be allowed to market plant reproductive material without any variety registration.

The Commission has no solid data to indicate that the EU market share of multinationals in agricultural seed exceeds 30%. Data suggest that a majority of the market is held by small & medium enterprises and micro-enterprises ([1]).

5. The Commission is not aware that a study was carried out or that a study is planned or in progress. Currently hybrids are used in e.g. maize, rapeseed or tomatoes and it is in fact possible to reuse the seed produced.

([1]) P. 32 in 'Evaluation of the Community acquis on the marketing of seed and plant propagating material (S&PM)'. Food Chain Evaluation Consortium, 2008.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004670/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(26 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Contraffazione via web

Nel corso di una manifestazione sull'anticontraffazione svoltasi a Milano, organizzata dal ministero per lo Sviluppo economico in collaborazione con Confindustria, è emerso che il business della contraffazione della moda «made in Italy» nel 2012 vale circa 12 milioni di euro, corrispondente a un quinto del fatturato complessivo realizzato dal comparto. Questi dati confermano che il settore tessile/moda è uno tra i più colpiti dall'illegale fenomeno contraffattivo, anche a causa della sua diffusione via web, che rappresenta la forma più ricorrente in evoluzione e di difficile contrasto.

Può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Non ritiene necessario dare risposte e fornire strumenti utili di contrasto al fenomeno, soprattutto per la rapidità della sua espansione tramite il web?

2. Quali azioni ha intrapreso fino ad ora per contrastare l'illegale fenomeno?

3. Cosa intende proporre per garantire la piena legalità all'interno del web e per combatterne l'uso illegale?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(2 luglio 2013)

La Commissione monitora, in collaborazione con l'UAMI ([1]) e l'Osservatorio europeo sulle violazioni dei diritti di proprietà intellettuale, gli sviluppi riguardanti l'immissione via internet di prodotti contraffatti sul mercato dell'UE.

Attraverso accordi commerciali bilaterali e l'acquis doganale, la Commissione si adopera, in cooperazione con gli Stati membri, affinché sia impedito l'ingresso nell'Unione di merci contraffatte. Anche la direttiva 2004/48/CE ([2]) mira a garantire mezzi di ricorso effettivi contro le violazioni dei diritti di proprietà intellettuale. Si è appena concluso un sondaggio sull'efficienza dei mezzi di ricorso civili contro tali violazioni, i cui risultati dovrebbero permettere alla Commissione di decidere se sia necessario modificare l'attuale acquis o integrarlo con altre azioni strategiche a livello dell'UE, tenuto conto delle nuove sfide poste dall'economia digitale e della crescente lunghezza e complessità delle catene di fornitura. Poiché per ridurre la contraffazione può essere efficace anche una cooperazione rafforzata tra i titolari dei diritti e gli intermediari nelle catene di fornitura, la Commissione sta cercando attivamente di agevolarla. Essa ha adottato una relazione sul funzionamento del protocollo d'intesa sulla vendita di merci contraffatte via internet ([3]). Il protocollo d'intesa, firmato tra l'altro da grandi marchi della moda, ha dimostrato di essere un primo passo efficace. La relazione illustra la posizione della Commissione sulle modalità per potenziare il funzionamento del protocollo d'intesa e sviluppare altri accordi. La Commissione attende con interesse il parere del Parlamento europeo al riguardo.

La Commissione ha pubblicato un opuscolo per sensibilizzare il pubblico ai rischi e alle conseguenze negative dell'acquisto di prodotti falsi ([4]).

Nell'ambito del nuovo ciclo programmatico dell'UE per contrastare la criminalità organizzata e le forme gravi di criminalità transnazionale, si prevede che il Consiglio dia maggiore priorità alla lotta alla contraffazione.

([1]) Ufficio per l'armonizzazione nel mercato interno.
([2]) Direttiva 2004/48/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 29 aprile 2004, sul rispetto dei diritti di proprietà intellettuale; http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2004:195:0016:0025:IT:PDF.
([3]) COM(2013)209 def.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/tajani/documents/counterfeit-brochure_it.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004670/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Counterfeiting via the web

During an anti-counterfeiting event in Milan, organised by the Ministry of Economic Development in conjunction with Confindustria, it emerged that the trade in counterfeit fashion items marked 'Made in Italy' was worth approximately EUR 12 million in 2012, equivalent to one fifth of the sector's overall revenue. These data confirm that the textiles and fashion industry is one of the sectors hit hardest by the illegal phenomenon of counterfeiting, not least as a result of its dissemination via the web, which constitutes its most common and evolving form, one which is difficult to combat.

1. Does the Commission not believe it necessary to give answers and provide instruments capable of tackling the phenomenon, especially in view of the speed with which it is expanding via the web?

2. What action has it taken so far to combat this illegal phenomenon?

3. What does it intend to propose to ensure full compliance with the law on the web and to tackle its illegal use?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(2 July 2013)

The Commission, in cooperation with the OHIM ([1]) and its European Observatory on Infringements of intellectual property rights is monitoring developments concerning the placing of counterfeit products on the EU market via the Internet.

Through bi-lateral trade agreements and the Customs *acquis* the Commission, in cooperation with Member States, strives to ensure that counterfeits are prevented from entering the Union. Directive 2004/48/EC ([2]) also seeks to ensure effective redress against IP infringements. A survey on the efficiency of civil redress against IP infringements has just been completed. Its results should allow the Commission to determine whether the existing *acquis* needs to be modified or complemented by other policy actions at EU level given the new challenges of the digital economy and increasingly long and complex supply chains. Enhanced cooperation between rights-holders and intermediaries in supply chains can also be effective in reducing counterfeiting. The Commission is actively seeking to facilitate such cooperation. The Commission adopted a Report ([3]) on the functioning of the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on the Sale of Counterfeit Goods via the Internet. This MoU, signed *inter alia* by major fashion brands, has been shown to be an effective first step forward. The report sets out the Commission's views on how the MoU's functioning could be reinforced and how other agreements might be developed. The Commission looks forward to the European Parliament's opinion on this report.

The Commission published a brochure to raise awareness about risks and negative consequences of buying fakes ([4]).

Within the new EU policy cycle for organised and serious transnational crime, the Council is expected to give higher priortiy to the fight against counterfeiting.

([1]) Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market.
([2]) Directive 2004/48/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the enforcement of intellectual property rights; http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2004:195:0016:0025:EN:PDF
([3]) COM(2013) 209 final.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/tajani/documents/counterfeit-brochure_it.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004671/13
alla Commissione
Giancarlo Scottà (EFD)
(26 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Piccole quantità (articolo 9, paragrafo 1, lettera c), direttiva 147/2009/CE)

Dal 2006, a seguito del riscontro di non univoca interpretazione fornito dalla Commissione europea alla richiesta di parere formulata dall'INFS (attuale ISPRA), si è generata una sostanziale interruzione della funzione di consulenza espletata dall'Istituto nazionale italiano di riferimento, che da quell'anno non ha più dato riscontro alle richieste di quantificazione delle piccole quantità avanzate dalle amministrazioni regionali.

Ad oggi, quindi, gli studi sulle condizioni delle popolazioni dell'avifauna migratrice sono realizzati con cadenza pluriennale, in genere decennale (cfr. *Birds in Europe* 1994 e 2004).

Le sentenze della Corte di giustizia dell'Unione europea stabiliscono che qualsiasi prelievo può essere considerato come «prelievo di piccole quantità» solo nel caso in cui quest'ultimo sia inferiore all'1 % della mortalità annua totale di una popolazione di specie non cacciabile.

Nello specifico, il calcolo dell'1 % della mortalità annua totale è frutto di elaborazioni statistiche formulate secondo il metodo delle ricatture.

Questo calcolo sembra essere un parametro talmente prudenziale da non risentire le variazioni annuali delle popolazioni, in assenza di eventi rilevanti.

Qualora, quindi, l'Italia procedesse con la richiesta di caccia in deroga per la stagione venatoria 2013-2014, nel rispetto di tutta la disciplina in merito, sarebbe la Commissione europea disposta ad accettare, come quantità prelevabili, le piccole quantità (previste all'articolo 9, paragrafo 1, lettera c) della direttiva 147/2009/CE) calcolate in base alle elaborazioni rese dall'INFS per la stagione venatoria 2005-2006, corrispondenti ai più recenti dati aggiornati disponibili?

In caso di risposta negativa, quali sono le eventuali procedure da intraprendere per risolvere la suddetta questione?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(6 giugno 2013)

La risposta alla prima domanda è negativa. Le autorità scientifiche nazionali italiane concordano con la Commissione nel ritenere che per quanto riguarda le specie menzionate dall'onorevole parlamentare i dati disponibili non consentono di determinare e quantificare adeguatamente la popolazione interessata dalle deroghe. Le prescrizioni relative alle piccole quantità di cui all'articolo 9, paragrafo 1, lettera c) della direttiva sugli uccelli 2009/147/CE ([1]) non possono quindi essere soddisfatte.

Per quanto riguarda la seconda domanda le autorità italiane, nel caso in cui intendano applicare tale deroga, dovrebbero limitarla alle specie per le quali si dispone di dati adeguati e pertinenti. Questo potrebbe essere per esempio il caso di alcune specie di uccelli stanziali che sono oggetto di un valido sistema di monitoraggio. È evidente che tali deroghe sarebbero coerenti con la direttiva in questione solamente laddove fossero soddisfatte tutte le altre prescrizioni di cui all'articolo 9.

([1]) GU L 020 del 26.1.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004671/13
to the Commission
Giancarlo Scottà (EFD)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Birds in small numbers (Article 9(1)(c) of Directive 147/2009/EC)

Since 2006, following the ambiguous interpretation provided by the Commission in response to the request for an opinion made by the INFS (National Wildlife Institute) (now ISPRA (Institute for Environmental Protection and Research)), the advisory service of the Italian national institute in question has effectively come to a halt. As of that year, it has no longer responded to requests from regional administrations for the calculation of birds in small numbers.

To date, therefore, studies on the conditions of migratory bird populations are carried out on a multiannual basis, generally every 10 years (see *Birds in Europe* 1994 and 2004).

Rulings of the Court of Justice of the European Union lay down that any hunting of birds may be considered the 'hunting of small numbers' only in the event that the latter amounts to less than 1% of the total annual mortality rate of a population of a species which is not to be hunted.

Specifically, the calculation of 1% of the total annual mortality rate is based on statistics compiled according to the recapture method.

This calculation seems to be such a conservative parameter that it is not affected by annual population variations, in the absence of significant events.

Therefore, should Italy go ahead with its application for a hunting derogation for the 2013-2014 hunting season, in compliance with all the relevant legislation, would the Commission be willing to accept, as numbers which may be hunted, small numbers (specified in Article 9(1)(c) of Directive 147/2009/EC) calculated according to the statistics provided by the INFS for the 2005-2006 hunting season, which are the most recent, up-to-date data available?

If not, what procedures should be followed to resolve the above matter?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2013)

The answer to the first question is no. The Italian national scientific authorities agree with the Commission that, for the species referred to by the Honourable Member, available data do not allow to properly determine and quantify the population affected by the derogations. The condition of the small numbers set by Article 9(1)(c) of the Birds Directive 2009/147/EC ([1]) therefore cannot be fulfilled.

As regards the second question, in case the Italian authorities intend to use this type of derogation, they should limit it to those species for which they have appropriate and relevant data. This might be the case, for example, for certain resident bird species subject to a sound monitoring system. It is obvious that such derogations would only be consistent with the directive if all the other conditions set by Article 9 were also fulfilled.

([1]) OJ L 020, 26.1.2010.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004672/13
al Consiglio
Giancarlo Scottà (EFD)
(26 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Gettito fiscale legato alle sigarette elettroniche

L'interrogante desidera sottoporre al Consiglio europeo una domanda su una questione che negli ultimi tempi sta riscontrando parecchia risonanza, ma che non è stata mai affrontata dal punto di vista che qui di seguito verrà spiegato.

Si fa riferimento alle cosiddette sigarette elettroniche, dispositivi considerati come «prodotti contenenti nicotina» e, quindi, rientranti nell'articolo 18 della proposta di direttiva del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio sul ravvicinamento delle disposizioni legislative, regolamentari e amministrative degli Stati membri relative alla lavorazione, alla presentazione e alla vendita dei prodotti del tabacco e dei prodotti correlati (COM(2012)0788 — 2012/0366 (COD)).

Il consumo delle sigarette classiche garantisce importanti entrate fiscali agli Stati membri, grazie alle ingenti imposte alle quali sono soggette.

Secondo una recentissima notizia dell'ANSA del 21.4.2013, soltanto nei primi due mesi del 2013 le casse dello Stato italiano hanno avuto una perdita di 132 milioni di euro, corrispondenti ad un calo nell'incasso da accise sul tabacco di circa il 7,6 %. Quest'ammanco non è di certo imputabile totalmente alla diffusione dell'uso delle sigarette elettroniche, ma in parte sicuramente lo è.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può il Consiglio dire come intende agire di fronte alle differenze di entrate fiscali che si stanno formando nelle casse statali in seguito alla diffusione di sigarette elettroniche che, al momento, appaiono sprovviste di qualsiasi forma di accisa?

Risposta
(24 giugno 2013)

Come è noto all'onorevole parlamentare, il Consiglio tratta questioni attinenti alla fiscalità sulla base di una proposta della Commissione. Al momento la Commissione non ha presentato nessuna proposta specifica sulla tassazione delle sigarette elettroniche.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004672/13
to the Council
Giancarlo Scottà (EFD)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Tax revenue from electronic cigarettes

I wish to put a question to the Council regarding an issue which has recently been attracting a great deal of interest, but which has never been addressed from the point of view set out below.

I am referring to 'electronic cigarettes', devices considered to be 'nicotine-containing products' which therefore fall within Article 18 of the proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States concerning the manufacture, presentation and sale of tobacco and related products (COM(2012)0788 — 2012/0366 (COD)).

The consumption of traditional cigarettes provides the Member States with sizeable revenues, as a result of the substantial taxes to which they are subject.

According to a recent report by ANSA (Italian news agency) of 21 April 2013, in the first two months of 2013 alone, Italy's coffers registered a loss of EUR 132 million, corresponding to a fall in revenue from duty on tobacco of approximately 7.6%. Of course, this shortfall cannot be completely blamed on the increasing use of electronic cigarettes, but it is certainly partly responsible.

In light of the above, can the Council state what action it intends to take to address the differences in tax revenue materialising in State coffers following the proliferation of electronic cigarettes, which currently appear to be free from any form of duty?

Reply
(24 June 2013)

As the Honourable Member is aware, the Council works in the taxation area on the basis of proposals from the Commission. For the time being, no specific Commission proposal has been tabled concerning the taxation of electronic cigarettes.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004673/13
aan de Commissie
Patricia van der Kammen (NI)
(26 april 2013)

Betreft: Fraude met uitkeringen en toeslagen in Nederland

In Nederland plegen Oost-Europese bendes op grote schaal fraude met toeslagen en uitkeringen, aldus RTL.nl ([1]). Bendes die zich voorheen bezighielden met mensenhandel, zouden zich nu op grote schaal toeleggen op toeslagenfraude, aldus deze berichtgeving. Staatssecretaris Weekers van Financiën vindt het schokkend dat er op grote schaal met toeslagen en uitkeringen wordt gefraudeerd ([2]).

Het vrije verkeer van personen in samenhang met de uitbreiding van de Europese Unie met landen waarvan het welvaartsniveau en de sociale voorzieningen veel lager zijn leidt tot grote problemen en uitermate ongewenste effecten voor landen die door de jarenlange inzet van hun werkende burgers een goede verzorgingsstaat en sociale voorzieningen hebben opgebouwd.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht dat er grootschalige fraude plaatsvindt met toeslagen in Nederland door Oost-Europeanen, zoals ook bevestigd door de Nederlandse Staatssecretaris van Financiën?

2. Wat vindt de Commissie van het feit dat het vrije verkeer van personen binnen de EU eraan meehelpt dat bendes uit landen die nooit tot de EU hadden mogen toetreden, nu ongebreideld misbruik maken van de sociale voorzieningen uit lidstaten waarvan burgers niet alleen die sociale voorzieningen betalen maar ook nog eens grote netto-betalers aan de EU zijn?

3. Wat vindt de Commissie van het feit dat het vrije verkeer van personen nu aan de basis ligt van noodgedwongen door Nederland uit te voeren strenge controles en het invoeren van complexere procedures die deze ongebreidelde en misdadige vormen van beroep op de sociale voorzieningen moeten voorkomen, waardoor ten eerste de beheers- en uitvoeringslasten voor de Nederlandse sociale voorzieningen toenemen en ten tweede Nederlandse burgers onnodig en onevenredig belast worden met bureaucratie en maatregelen die zij niet hebben veroorzaakt?

4. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat elk land zelf moet kunnen beslissen wie het binnen zijn grenzen toelaat? Zo nee, waarom niet?

Antwoord van de heer Andor namens de Commissie
(17 juni 2013)

De Commissie heeft over deze aantijgingen geen nadere informatie ontvangen.

Fraude is per definitie in strijd met de wet. Er bestaat geen feitelijk bewijs dat mobiele Europese werknemers eerder geneigd zouden zijn sociale fraude en misbruik te plegen dan eigen onderdanen.

In principe kan Europees recht niet voor de bestrijding van misbruik of fraude worden ingeroepen.

De EU-wetgeving op dit gebied, zoals Verordening (EG) nr. 883/2004 betreffende de coördinatie van de socialezekerheidsstelsels, bevat krachtige instrumenten zoals de „habitual residence test" (vaststelling van de gewone verblijfplaats) om de lidstaten in staat te stellen gevallen van fraude en fouten te voorkomen. Ook ondersteunt de Commissie de inspanningen van de lidstaten bij het invoeren van beste praktijken en het opzetten van netwerken op dit vlak.

Richtlijn (EG) nr. 2004/38/ betreffende het recht van Europese burgers op vrij verkeer en verblijf binnen de EU biedt de lidstaten de mogelijkheid de maatregelen te nemen die nodig zijn om in geval van rechtsmisbruik of fraude de onder de richtlijn verleende rechten te ontzeggen, te beëindigen of in te trekken.

Alle uitbreidingen van de EU zijn zowel binnen de EU als binnen de toetredende landen volgens democratische besluitvormingsprocedures totstandgekomen. Het vrije verkeer van personen vormt een van de grondbeginselen van het EU-Verdrag en de Commissie verdedigt dit beginsel.

([1]) http://www.rtl.nl/components/actueel/rtlnieuws/2013/04_april/21/binnenland/oost-europese-bendes-frauderen-met-toeslagen.xml.
([2]) http://www.rtl.nl/components/actueel/rtlnieuws/2013/04_april/21/binnenland/Belastingdienst_als_pinautomaat_is_onacceptabel.xml

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004673/13
to the Commission
Patricia van der Kammen (NI)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Benefit and allowance fraud in the Netherlands

According to RTL.nl ([1]), Eastern European gangs are committing large-scale benefit and allowance fraud in the Netherlands. This report says that gangs which previously engaged in human trafficking are now concentrating on large-scale allowance fraud. The Dutch State Secretary for Finance, Frans Weekers, finds it shocking that benefit and allowance fraud is taking place on a large scale ([2]).

The free movement of persons connected with the enlargement of the European Union to include countries that have a much lower level of prosperity and social services is leading to major problems and extremely undesirable effects for countries that have built sound welfare states and social services thanks to the hard work of their working citizens over many years.

1. Is the Commission aware of the report that Eastern Europeans are committing large-scale allowance fraud in the Netherlands, as confirmed by the Dutch State Secretary for Finance?

2. How does the Commission view the fact that the free movement of persons within the EU is helping gangs from countries that should never have been allowed to join the EU to now rampantly abuse the social services of Member States whose citizens are not only paying for those social services but who are also major net contributors to the EU?

3. How does the Commission view the fact that the free movement of persons is now the reason why the Netherlands is feeling forced to carry out stringent checks and introduce more complex measures in order to prevent such rampant and criminal abuse of social services, as a result of which, firstly, the Dutch social security system is facing increasing management and implementation costs and, secondly, Dutch citizens are unnecessarily and disproportionately burdened with bureaucracy and measures they have not caused?

4. Does the Commission agree with the Dutch Freedom Party (PVV) that each country should be able to decide who it allows across its borders? If not, why not?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2013)

The Commission has not received any other information about these allegations.

Fraud is by definition against the law. There is no empiric evidence that EU mobile workers are more likely to commit fraud and abuse in the social field than nationals.

In general, EC law cannot be relied on for the purposes of abuse or fraud.

EU-instruments in this field, such as Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 on social security coordination, contain strong tools such as the habitual residence test, to enable Member States to avoid cases of fraud and error. The Commission is also supporting Member States' efforts to establish best practices and the setting up of networks in this field.

Directive 2004/38 on the right of EU citizens to move and reside freely within the EU allows Member States to adopt the necessary measures to refuse, terminate or withdraw rights conferred by the directive in case of abuse of rights or fraud.

All EU enlargements have been decided following democratic procedures both within the EU and in the acceding countries. The freedom of movement is one of the fundamental principles of the EU Treaty and one for which the Commission stands for.

([1]) http://www.rtl.nl/components/actueel/rtlnieuws/2013/04_april/21/binnenland/oost-europese-bendes-frauderen-met-toeslagen.xml.
([2]) http://www.rtl.nl/components/actueel/rtlnieuws/2013/04_april/21/binnenland/Belastingdienst_als_pinautomaat_is_onacceptabel.xml.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004674/13
aan de Commissie
Patricia van der Kammen (NI)
(26 april 2013)

Betreft: Bericht over mogelijke plicht om alleen EU-goedgekeurd zaaigoed te gebruiken

Volgens bronnen wil de EU komen tot een regulering van zaaigoed ([1]). Het gebruik van door de EU goedgekeurd zaaigoed, de verplichte registratie van alle zaaigoed, en strenge sancties op gebruik van niet geregistreerd of door de EU geaccordeerd zaaigoed zouden onderdeel zijn van plannen die de Europese Commissie in de steigers heeft staan ([2]).

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van het bericht([1]) en van de onderliggende bron, het „options and analysis paper" van de EC(2)?

2. Kan de Commissie weerleggen of ontkennen dat de in het artikel geschetste gevolgen, zoals een verbod voor particulieren om met zelf gewonnen zaad hun moestuin te onderhouden, of het verbod voor kleine boeren om zaden te ruilen met collega's, het resultaat kunnen zijn van de plannen of planvoorbereidingen van de Commissie?

3. Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat de voorgestelde revisieplannen het recht op eigendom zoals gegarandeerd door artikel 17 van het Handvest van de grondrechten van de Europese Unie schenden doordat de keuzevrijheid van consumenten om zaaigoed te kopen of gebruiken anders dan geautoriseerd door de Europese Unie, wordt beperkt?

4. Is de Commissie zich ervan bewust dat geschetste scenario's uit het rapport tot gevolg zullen hebben dat de markt voor zaaigoed volledig in handen gaat komen van enkele zeer grote en uiterst machtige spelers op de wereldmarkt? Wat vindt de Commissie van een dergelijke uitkomst?

5. Is de Commissie net als de PVV van mening dat de voedselvoorziening een zaak van velen zou moeten zijn en er geen sprake mag zijn van monopolie- of oligopolieposities? Is de Commissie bereid om daarom per direct een streep te zetten door de planontwikkeling in dit kader? Zo nee, waarom niet?

Antwoord van de heer Borg namens de Commissie
(11 juni 2013)

1. Het bericht ([3]) en het document over opties en analyses (Options and Analysis Paper) zijn de Commissie bekend.

2. De beweringen in het bericht zijn ongegrond. De productie van teeltmateriaal voor eigen gebruik wordt niet gereglementeerd. De uitwisseling in natura tussen personen die geen professionele exploitanten zijn, zoals die in het voorstel zijn gedefinieerd, valt buiten het toepassingsgebied van de verordening.

3. Het voorstel ([4]) bevat uitsluitend voorschriften voor de productie en het in de handel brengen van teeltmateriaal. Zoals voor andere beleidsterreinen van de Unie zijn die voorschriften nodig om de werking van de interne markt en een vrije en geïnformeerde keuze voor de gebruikers van dat materiaal te waarborgen. In dit verband worden dus geen grondrechten of fundamentele vrijheden geschonden.

4 en 5. Het voorstel bevat evenredige opties voor verschillende soorten exploitanten en materiaal, met inbegrip van nieuwe, verbeterde geteste rassen. De belangen van micro-ondernemingen worden behartigd doordat zij worden vrijgesteld van registratievergoedingen voor rassen. Deze ondernemingen kunnen ook materiaal voor nichemarkten in de handel brengen dat niet tot een geregistreerd ras behoort. De traditionele rassen, die gewoonlijk door kleine exploitanten in de handel worden gebracht, mogen onder heel soepele eisen en zonder tests worden geregistreerd. Met deze bepalingen wordt gezorgd voor een gelijk speelveld voor alle exploitanten, hoogstaande kwaliteit van het materiaal en geïnformeerde keuzes voor de gebruikers.

([1]) http://deutsche-wirtschafts-nachrichten.de/2013/04/23/eu-will-anbau-von-obst-und-gemuese-in-gaerten-verbieten/
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/plant_propagation_material/review_eu_rules/docs/15042011_options_analysis_paper_en.pdf
([3]) http://deutsche-wirtschafts-nachrichten.de/2013/04/23/eu-will-anbau-von-obst-und-gemuese-in-gaerten-verbieten/
([4]) COM(2013) 262 final; zie: http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/plant_propagation_material/review_eu_rules/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004674/13
to the Commission
Patricia van der Kammen (NI)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Reports of a possible requirement for using only EU-approved seed and plant propagating material

According to some sources, the EU wants to regulate the market for seed and plant propagating material (S&PM) ([1]). The use of S&PM approved by the EU, compulsory registration of all S&PM and stringent penalties for the use of S&PM that has not been registered or approved by the EU are said to be part of the plans which the European Commission has in the pipeline ([2]).

1. Is the Commission aware of the report([1]) and of the underlying source, the EC's 'Options and Analysis Paper'([2])?

2. Can the Commission refute or deny that the Commission's (preparatory) plans could result in consequences outlined in the article, such as a ban on individuals growing their kitchen gardens with seeds that they have obtained themselves or a ban for small farmers to exchange seeds with their fellow farmers?

3. Does the Commission agree with the Dutch Freedom Party (PVV) that the proposed overhaul plans violate the right to property as guaranteed by Article 17 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union by restricting the freedom of consumers to buy or use S&PM other than that authorised by the European Union?

4. Is the Commission aware of the possibility that the scenarios outlined in the report will lead to the S&PM market being fully controlled by some very large and extremely powerful players in the world market? What view does the Commission take on such an outcome?

5. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that food supply should be a matter in which many parties have a say and that no monopolistic or oligopolistic positions should be tolerated in this field? Is the Commission, therefore, prepared to call an immediate halt to the formulation of such plans? If not, why not?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2013)

1. The Commission is aware of the report ([3]) and of the 'Options and Analysis Paper'.

2. The claims of the report have no basis in fact. Production of plant reproductive material for own use is not regulated. Exchange in kind between persons, other than professional operators as defined in the proposal, is outside the regulation's scope.

3. The proposal ([4]) only introduces production and marketing requirements for plant reproductive material. As in other Union policy areas, those requirements are necessary to ensure the functioning of internal market and free and informed choices by the users of that material. No fundamental rights or freedoms are thus violated in this respect.

4 and 5. The proposal introduces proportionate options for different types of operators and material, including new, improved tested varieties. Interests of micro-enterprises are supported by exempting them from fees for registration of varieties. Such enterprises also can market niche market material not belonging to any registered variety. Traditional varieties, usually marketed by small operators, may be registered under very relaxed requirements and without testing. These provisions ensure a level playing field for all operators, good quality of material and informed choices for users.

([1]) http://deutsche-wirtschafts-nachrichten.de/2013/04/23/eu-will-anbau-von-obst-und-gemuese-in-gaerten-verbieten/
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/plant_propagation_material/review_eu_rules/docs/15042011_options_analysis_paper_en.pdf
([3]) http://deutsche-wirtschafts-nachrichten.de/2013/04/23/eu-will-anbau-von-obst-und-gemuese-in-gaerten-verbieten/
([4]) COM(2013) 262 final; see http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/plant_propagation_material/review_eu_rules/index_en.htm

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-004675/13
a la Comisión
Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Asunto: Retroactividad de las medidas antidumping frente a importaciones de mandarinas de China

En su respuesta a la pregunta escrita P-001645/2013 del 19 de marzo sobre la aplicación del Reglamento de Ejecución por el que se reestablece un derecho *antidumping* definitivo sobre las importaciones de determinados cítricos preparados o conservados (principalmente mandarinas) originarios de China (Reglamento de Ejecución (UE) n° 158/2013 del Consejo, de 18 de febrero de 2013), la Comisión Europea informaba de que examinaría la aplicación de la retroactividad de estas medidas cuando se dispusiera de las estadísticas de importaciones de mandarinas en conserva procedentes de China

Además, señalaba que una vez contara con estos datos, se comunicarían las conclusiones a las partes y a los Estados miembros en el marco del Comité Antidumping y Antisubvenciones.

¿Cuenta ya la Comisión con las estadísticas de importaciones de mandarinas en conserva procedentes de la República Popular China? ¿Para cuándo tiene previsto tomar una decisión acerca de aplicar la retroactividad en este asunto y transmitir la propuesta al Consejo? En caso de no disponer todavía de estos datos, ¿qué plazo baraja para tomar una decisión al respecto?

Respuesta del Sr. De Gucht en nombre de la Comisión
(24 de mayo de 2013)

Tal como se afirmó en la respuesta a la anterior pregunta escrita P-001645/2013 ([1]), el Consejo, a propuesta de la Comisión, publicó un Reglamento de Ejecución por el que se reestablece un derecho antidumping definitivo sobre las importaciones de determinados cítricos preparados o conservados (principalmente mandarinas, etc.) originarios de la República Popular China (Reglamento de Ejecución (UE) n° 158/2013 del Consejo, de 18 de febrero de 2013).

En el considerando n° 161 de dicho Reglamento, el Consejo afirmaba que la posibilidad de cobrar derechos con carácter retroactivo se decidiría posteriormente, cuando se disponga de datos estadísticos completos. La Comisión ya ha recibido las estadísticas de las importaciones del producto afectado procedentes de la República Popular China y está evaluando los datos de que dispone con arreglo a las normas correspondientes.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq#sidesForm

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004675/13
to the Commission
Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Retroactivity of anti-dumping measures against mandarin orange imports from China

In its reply to Written Question P-001645/2013 of 19 March on the implementation of the Implementing Regulation re-imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of certain prepared and preserved citrus fruits (namely mandarins) originating in China (Council Implementing Regulation (EU) No 158/2013 of 18 February 2013), the Commission said that it would look at the issue of retroactivity when statistics for imports of canned mandarins from China were available.

It also indicated that once it had this information, the conclusions would be submitted to the parties and Member States through the Anti-dumping and Anti-subsidy Committee.

Does the Commission now have the statistics for imports of canned mandarins from the People's Republic of China? By what date does the Commission intend to have made a decision on applying retroactivity in this case and to have sent its proposal to the Council? If this information is still not available, within what time frame does it expect to make a decision?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(24 May 2013)

As stated in the answer to previous Written Question P-001645/2013 ([1]), following a proposal by the Commission, the Council published an implementing Regulation re-imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of certain prepared or preserved citrus fruits (namely mandarins, etc.) originating in the People's Republic of China (Council Implementing Regulation (EU) No 158/2013 of 18 February 2013).

In Recital 161 of the above Regulation, the Council noted that the possibility of collecting retroactive duties would be decided upon at a later stage, once full statistical data were available.

The Commission has now received the statistics of imports of the product concerned from the People's Republic of China and is evaluating the data at its disposal pursuant to the applicable rules.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq#sidesForm.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-004676/13
à la Commission
Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE)
(26 avril 2013)

Objet: Émissions fugitives de méthane dans le gaz de schiste

1. La Commission a-t-elle pris connaissance des nouvelles recherches, examinées par des pairs et publiées au début de cette année par les chercheurs de l'Agence océanographique et atmosphérique américaine (NOAA) et par l'Université du Colorado à Boulder, qui montrent que le taux de fuites de méthane sur les sites de forage de gaz de schiste étudiés représente 9 % de la production totale?

La Commission sait-elle que ce taux est presque trois fois plus élevé que le taux maximal cumulé de fuites (soit 3,2 %) pour qu'un bénéfice sur le plan climatique puisse être tiré de l'abandon de générateurs au charbon au profit du gaz naturel, comme le démontrent cette étude réalisée par Alvarez et al, de l'Université de Princeton, et par le Fonds de défense de l'environnement ainsi que d'autres études telles que celles produites par Petron et al. (2012 et 2013) et Shindell et al. (2012), qui révèlent elles aussi des taux moyens de fuites de méthane excédant 3,2 %?

2. La Commission va-t-elle inclure les recherches susmentionnées dans son évaluation d'impact sur le «cadre d'évaluation de l'environnement, du climat et de l'énergie afin de permettre une extraction sûre des hydrocarbures non conventionnels»?

3. La Commission va-t-elle examiner d'autres échelles de temps que celle sur 100 ans utilisée pour l'étude de la DG Clima (septembre 2012), par exemple des échelles plus courtes, de 20 à 35 ans, comme le recommandent les études récentes?

4. La DG Clima va-t-elle défendre le point de vue selon lequel le gaz de schiste ne réduira probablement pas les émissions de gaz à effet de serre et qu'il ne constitue ainsi pas la panacée pour résoudre les problèmes liés au climat, contrairement à ce qu'ont affirmé les industriels; la DG Clima va-t-elle également s'exprimer sur ce point lors du Conseil «Énergie» du mois de mai?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Hedegaard au nom de la Commission
(31 mai 2013)

1. Oui, la Commission a connaissance de ces études ([1]).

2. Toutes les études récentes examinées par des pairs ayant trait au changement climatique, de même que l'étude en cours sur l'atténuation des émissions fugitives de méthane, désignées comme la principale source d'émissions de GES précombustion, seront prises en compte dans les travaux en cours relatifs au «Cadre d'évaluation des questions liées à l'environnement, au climat et à l'énergie visant à permettre une extraction sûre et sécurisée des hydrocarbures non conventionnels».

3. L'étude de 2012 réalisée à la demande de la Commission européenne ([2]) a porté sur une période de 100 ans, conformément aux lignes directrices de la CCNUCC, qui recommandent de se fonder sur une période d'un siècle pour l'élaboration des inventaires des gaz à effet de serre. Il n'est pas prévu pour le moment d'utiliser d'autres échelles de temps.

4. L'étude susmentionnée indique dans quelles circonstances le gaz de schiste peut apporter une contribution à l'objectif global de réduction des émissions de gaz à effet de serre de l'UE. D'autres travaux suivront, qui se baseront sur ces résultats et sur ceux d'autres études pertinentes. La Commission reconnaît que l'exploitation du gaz de schiste n'est pas l'unique réponse à tous les défis qui se présentent à l'UE sur les plans climatique et énergétique mais qu'elle pourrait faire partie d'un large éventail de politiques et de mesures. Cette nécessité d'adopter une approche globale est également bien illustrée par les conclusions de la discussion du Conseil sur l'énergie qui s'est tenu le 22 mai 2013.

([1]) L'étude d'Alvarez et al (2012) indique que si «les nouvelles centrales au gaz naturel produisent des bénéfices nets sur le plan climatique par rapport aux nouvelles centrales à charbon performantes utilisant du charbon à faible teneur en gaz, quelle que soit l'échelle de temps considérée, tant que les fuites du système de gaz naturel sont inférieures à 3,2 % entre le puits et la centrale électrique», 3,2 % est «le seuil au-delà duquel le gaz devient plus nocif pour le climat que le charbon, au moins pour une certaine période».

([2]) «Climate impact of potential shale gas production in the EU» (Impact sur le climat d'une éventuelle production de gaz de schiste dans l'UE) (http://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/eccp/docs/120815_final_report_en.pdf).

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004676/13
to the Commission
Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Fugitive methane emissions of shale gas

1. Is the Commission aware of the new peer-reviewed findings published earlier in 2013 by researchers at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the University of Colorado, Boulder, which showed that the methane leakage rate in the shale gas fields studied was 9% of total production?

Is the Commission aware that this rate is almost triple the maximum cumulative leakage rate (3.2%) which would allow for any climatic benefits to be drawn from the switch from coal-fired generators to natural gas, as concluded in the study by Alvarez et al., from Princeton University and the Environmental Defence Fund, and that other studies, such as Petron et al. (2012 and 2013) and Shindell et al. (2012), also show that on average, methane leakage rates exceed this figure of 3.2%?

2. Will the Commission be including the abovementioned research in its impact assessment for the 'Environmental, climate and energy assessment framework to enable safe and secure unconventional hydrocarbon extraction'?

3. Will the Commission be examining different timescales from the 100-year timeframe used in the September 2012 study by DG Clima, such as shorter timescales of between 20 and 35 years, for example, as is recommended by recent studies?

4. Will DG Clima advocate the view that shale gas will probably not reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and that it is, therefore, not the panacea for the climate as the industry has claimed? Does DG Clima intend to express such a view at the May Energy Council?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(31 May 2013)

1. Yes, the Commission is aware of these studies ([1]).

2. All latest peer reviewed studies on climate aspects along with the ongoing study on mitigation of fugitive methane emissions, that were identified as the biggest source of pre-combustion GHG emissions, will feed into ongoing work on the 'Environmental, climate and energy assessment framework to enable safe and secure unconventional hydrocarbon extraction'.

3. The 2012 study for the European Commission ([2]) examined a 100-year timeframe following the UNFCCC reporting guidelines that recommend a 100-year time horizon for compiling greenhouse gas inventories. Examining other timeframes is not currently foreseen.

4. The abovementioned study indicates under which circumstances shale gas can make a contribution to the overall EU greenhouse gas emissions target. Further work will be based on these outcomes and further relevant studies. The Commission agrees that shale gas exploitation is not the sole answer to all the EU's climate and energy challenges, but could be part of a wide range of policies and measures that are needed. This need for a comprehensive approach is also well reflected in the conclusions of the European Council's discussion on energy held on 22 May 2013.

([1]) Alvarez et al. (2012) state that whereas 'new natural gas power plants produce net climate benefits relative to efficient, new coal plants using lowgassy coal on all time frames as long as leakage in the natural gas system is less than 3.2% from well through delivery at a power plant', 3.2% is the 'threshold beyond which gas becomes worse for the climate than coal for at least some period of time'.

([2]) 'Climate impact of potential shale gas production in the EU' (http://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/eccp/docs/120815_final_report_en.pdf).

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita P-004677/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Fundo de Investigação das Doenças Raras

Considerando o seguinte:

— As doenças de depósito lisossómico (DDL) são doenças raras, o que significa que a sua prevalência é inferior a 1 em cada 2 000 indivíduos. As DDL dão origem a uma importante morbilidade e mortalidade entre os afetados, representando custos de capital para os sistemas de saúde dos Estados europeus.

— O investimento na investigação trouxe benefícios claros aos pacientes de DDL. Na última década, a compreensão destas doenças aumentou exponencialmente, tendo sido desenvolvidas terapias enzimáticas específicas para algumas destas doenças.

— O Centro Hospitalar do Alto Ave — Guimarães — é um centro português de referência para as DDL. Este Centro é o maior centro ibérico e um dos maiores centros europeus da doença de Fabry, uma situação que se explica pelo efeito fundador existente nesta região de Portugal.

— O Centro Hospitalar do Alto Ave, Guimarães, apresenta um elevado nível de especialização na área das DDL. Este Centro desenvolve atividades de investigação, em cooperação estreita com vários hospitais, universidades e institutos portugueses e com universidades e hospitais de outros Estados europeus (como o Centro Médico Universitário de Hamburgo, o Royal Free Hospital, de Londres, e o Hospital Clinico San Carlos, de Madrid).

— Recentemente, a Comissão Europeia tornou pública a disponibilidade de fundos importantes para a investigação na área das doenças raras. De acordo com o documento público, cumpre aos Estados-Membros candidatarem-se aos referidos fundos. Atendendo à reconhecida especialização do Centro Hospitalar do Alto Ave, Portugal, o Centro tenciona candidatar-se aos fundos em questão.

Assim, pergunta-se à Comissão:

Como podem entidades como o Centro Hospitalar do Alto Ave formalizar o pedido de fundos para investigação sobre doenças raras e assegurar a atribuição desses fundos a Portugal?

Resposta dada por Máire Geoghegan-Quinn em nome da Comissão
(29 de maio de 2013)

O recente anúncio da Comissão ([1]) sobre o financiamento, no montante de 144 milhões de euros, destinado à investigação no domínio das doenças raras no âmbito do Sétimo Programa-Quadro de atividades em matéria de investigação, desenvolvimento tecnológico e demonstração (7.° PQ, 2007-2013) abrange 26 novos projetos de investigação selecionados para financiamento em 2012, com base nas propostas apresentadas na sequência de um anterior convite à apresentação de propostas ([2]) no âmbito do Tema Saúde do 7.° PQ. Com efeito, um dos projetos financiados, MeuSIX ([3]), tem por objetivo o desenvolvimento de uma terapia genética para uma doença rara de depósito lisossómico. Dado que o mandato de sete anos do 7.° PQ chega ao seu termo no final do presente ano, não estão previstos mais convites à apresentação de propostas no âmbito do Tema Saúde.

O financiamento da UE para a investigação sobre doenças raras, apoiado por sucessivos programas-quadro da UE, tem dado um contributo importante para o avanço dos conhecimentos sobre as doenças raras ao longo das últimas duas décadas. No 7.° PQ, foram financiados cerca de 100 projetos relacionados com as doenças raras, cifrando-se a contribuição total da UE em cerca de 500 milhões de euros.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-169_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/call_FP7?callIdentifier=FP7-HEALTH-2012-Innovation-1&specificProgram=Cooperation#wlp_call_FP7
([3]) http://cordis.europa.eu/search/index.cfm?fuseaction=proj.document&PJ_RCN=13439773

O forte empenho da Comissão no domínio da investigação das doenças raras deverá ser prosseguido no próximo programa-quadro de investigação e inovação — Horizonte 2020. Uma vez que as negociações interinstitucionais ainda estão em curso, é demasiado cedo para definir as questões específicas em matéria de investigação que poderão ser abordadas. No entanto, quando os primeiros convites à apresentação de propostas forem lançados, as entidades como o Centro Hospitalar do Alto Ave poderão candidatar-se ao financiamento à investigação através do portal dos participantes ([4]). Para obter informações atualizadas sobre os preparativos para Horizonte 2020, que irá lançar os próximos convites à apresentação de propostas, consultar o sítio *Web* da Comissão em matéria de investigação e inovação ([5]).

([4]) https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/home
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/horizon2020/index_en.cfm

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004677/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Rare disease investigation funds

Lysosomal storage disorders (LSDs) are rare diseases, meaning that they occur in less than one in every 2 000 individuals. LSDs are the cause of significant morbidity and mortality rates for those affected, accounting for capital costs for the health systems of Member States.

Investment in research has brought about clear benefits for patients with LSDs. In the last decade, the understanding of LSDs has increased exponentially and specific enzymatic therapies have been developed for some of these diseases.

The Hospital Centre of Alto Ave, Guimarães, is a Portuguese reference centre for LSDs. This centre is the largest Iberian centre and one of the largest European centres for Fabry disease, its location being explained by the presence of the founder effect in this region of Portugal.

The Hospital Centre of Alto Ave, Guimarães, is a centre for expertise in LSDs and is currently the leader of Portuguese research in LSDs. The centre has conducted research in close collaboration with several Portuguese hospitals, universities and institutes, as well as universities and hospitals in other Member States, such as the University Medical Centre Hamburg-Eppendorf, the Royal Free London Hospital and the San Carlos University Hospital, Madrid).

The Commission recently announced the availability of significant funding for research on rare diseases. According to the public document, Member States must submit an application in order to avail of this funding. Given the recognised expertise of the Alto Ave Hospital Centre in Portugal, the Centre intends to apply for this funding.

In light of the above, could the Commission answer the following:

How can entities like the Hospital Centre of Alto Ave formalise an application for funding for research in rare diseases and ensure the allocation of these funds to Portugal?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(29 May 2013)

The recent Commission announcement ([1]) on funding in the amount of EUR 144 million for research on rare diseases as part of the Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013) referred to 26 new research projects selected for funding in 2012 from proposals submitted to an earlier call ([2]) in the FP7 Health Theme. In fact, one of the projects funded, MeuSIX, ([3]) aims at developing a gene therapy for a rare Lysosomal storage disorder. As the seven year mandate of FP7 is coming to an end this year, no more calls for proposals are foreseen in the Health Theme.

EU funding for rare diseases research, supported by successive EU Framework Programmes, has made a substantial contribution to advancing knowledge on rare diseases over the last two decades. In FP7, close to 100 projects related to rare diseases have been funded accounting for an overall EU contribution of almost EUR 500 million.

The Commission's strong commitment to rare diseases research is expected to continue in the next Framework Programme for Research and Innovation, Horizon 2020. Since interinstitutional negotiations are still ongoing, it is too early to define the specific research issues that could be addressed. However, when the first calls for proposals will be launched, entities such as the Hospital Centre of Alto Ave will be able to apply for research funding from the programme through the participants portal ([4]). For updates on the preparations for Horizon 2020 which will release the next calls for proposals, please consult the Commission Research and Innovation website ([5]).

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-169_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/call_FP7?callIdentifier=FP7-HEALTH-2012-INNOVATION-1&specificProgram=COOPERATION#wlp_call_FP7
([3]) http://cordis.europa.eu/search/index.cfm?fuseaction=proj.document&PJ_RCN=13439773
([4]) https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/home
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/horizon2020/index_en.cfm

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris P-004678/13
adresată Comisiei
Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE)
(26 aprilie 2013)

Subiect: Ordonanța de Urgență nr. 25 din 10 aprilie 2013 pentru modificarea și completarea Legii audiovizualului

Guvernul României a adoptat Ordonanța de urgență (OUG) nr. 25 din 10 aprilie 2013 pentru modificarea și completarea Legii audiovizualului.

Ordonanța introduce reguli pentru activitatea de achiziționare a publicității televizate și are caracterul de „ordonanță de urgență", ceea ce înseamnă că produce deja efecte.

Ordonanța propune reglementări pentru piața comercială de publicitate, ceea ce nu intră în scopul legii audiovizualului, eliminând o verigă din lanțul comercial, fapt care poate fi interpretat ca o ingerință în regulile de piață.

În plus, modificarea nu a fost discutată în spațiul public și se referă doar la televiziune (radioul și alte mijloace de comunicare în masă nu sunt menționate).

Au fost exprimate, de asemenea, interpretări privind o serie de efecte ale acestei OUG: creșterea prețului publicității, eliminarea unui mare număr de posturi de televiziune de pe piață și crearea de poziții dominante.

Cer Comisiei să își exprime punctul de vedere în ceea ce privește conformitatea OUG nr. 25 din 10 aprilie 2013 cu reglementările europene în domeniile audiovizualului, pieței interne și concurenței.

Răspuns dat de dna Kroes în numele Comisiei
(29 mai 2013)

În prezent, Comisia examinează dacă Ordonanța de urgență nr. 25 din 10 aprilie 2013 pentru modificarea și completarea Legii audiovizualului este în conformitate cu Directiva 2010/13/UE (Directiva serviciilor mass-media audiovizuale). De asemenea, Comisia va evalua conformitatea acestei ordonanțe cu principiile privind libertatea de stabilire și libera prestare a serviciilor.

În plus, în temeiul articolului 4 alineatul (3) din TUE, statele membre ar trebui să se abțină de la adoptarea de restricții care ar putea submina eficacitatea deplină a articolelor 101 și 102 din TFUE. Totuși, Comisia nu dispune, în acest stadiu, de nicio dovadă conform căreia Ordonanța nr. 25 ar putea încălca aceste dispoziții.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004678/13
to the Commission
Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Emergency Ordinance No 25 of 10 April 2013 amending and supplementing the audiovisual law

The Romanian Government has adopted Emergency Ordinance No 25 of 10 April 2013 amending and supplementing the audiovisual law.

This ordinance introduces rules governing the acquisition of television advertising space, and the fact that it takes the form of an 'emergency ordinance' means that it is already producing effects.

The ordinance regulates the advertising market, which did not fall within the scope of the audiovisual law, and removes one link in the commercial chain, which could be interpreted as interference in market rules.

Furthermore, there was no public debate on the amendment in question, which concerns television only (it makes no mention of radio and other media).

Attention has been drawn to the possible effects of this ordinance, which include an increase in the price of advertising, the disappearance of a large number of television stations from the market and the creation of dominant positions.

Can the Commission say whether it considers Emergency Ordinance No 25 of 10 April 2013 to be in line with European audiovisual, internal market and competition rules?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(29 May 2013)

The Commission is currently scrutinising whether the emergency ordinance n° 25 of 10 April 2013 amending and supplementing the audiovisual law is in compliance with Directive 2010/13/EU (the Audiovisual Media Services Directive). It will also assess its conformity with the freedom of establishment and free provision of services Principles.

Furthermore under Article 4(3) TEU Member States should refrain from adopting restrictions that would undermine the full effectiveness of Articles 101 and 102 TFEU. Nevertheless, the Commission has, at this stage, no evidence that Ordinance n° 25 may be in breach of these provisions.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004679/13
aan de Commissie
Daniël van der Stoep (NI)
(26 april 2013)

Betreft: Het opzetten van een Europees subsidieregister

Er bestaat een wirwar aan regelingen en subsidies van de Europese Commissie. Elke Commissaris houdt dit op zijn eigen manier bij.

In de huidige situatie is het voor de burger onmogelijk om te volgen wie of wat gesubsidieerd wordt door de Europese Commissie.

Om transparantie en duidelijkheid te scheppen pleit ik dan ook voor het opzetten van een Europees Subsidieregister, met een daaraan gekoppelde website. Hiermee kan elke burger niet alleen raadplegen aan wie of wat subsidies worden verleend, maar ook wat hij hiervan terug kan zien in zijn directe omgeving. Ook over de hoogte van de subsidies die worden verleend moet duidelijke informatie worden verstrekt.

Het opzetten van een dergelijk Europees Subsidieregister zal zorgen voor een enorme sprong in verantwoording van uitgaven richting de belastingbetaler.

Graag verneem ik van de Commissie hoe zij hier tegenover staat.

Antwoord van de heer Lewandowski namens de Commissie
(3 juni 2013)

De Commissie wil eraan herinneren dat reeds in 2006, in het groenboek over het Europees Transparantie-initiatief ([1]), is voorgesteld gegevens over de begunstigden van EU-middelen bekend te maken. Dankzij een speciale website die door de Commissie wordt beheerd, heeft elke burger toegang tot informatie over begunstigden van financiering uit de EU-begroting: http://ec.europa.eu/contracts_grants/beneficiaries_nl.htm.

Voor middelen die rechtstreeks door de Commissie worden beheerd (Financieel Reglement, artikel 58, lid 1, onder a)) biedt het systeem voor financiële transparantie (*Financial Transparency System* — FTS) een interactieve zoekmachine om te zoeken naar begunstigden van beurzen, contracten en andere soorten uitgaven uit de EU-begroting. Deze zoekmachine bevat verschillende zoekcriteria en is beschikbaar op de volgende website: http://ec.europa.eu/beneficiaries/fts/index_en.htm. Daarnaast wordt het precieze totaalbedrag van iedere verbintenis gegeven. De volledige gegevensreeks kan worden gedownload in een eenvoudig bewerkbaar formaat (.csv,.xls of.xml) en kan met elke software voor gegevensverwerking worden verwerkt. De database bevat gegevens over het lopende meerjarig financieel kader tot 2011. De gegevens voor 2012 worden uiterlijk eind juni 2013 toegevoegd.

Bovendien kan elke burger via dit systeem op eenvoudige wijze (aan de hand van een e-mailformulier dat wordt doorgestuurd naar de bevoegde dienst van de Commissie) aanvullende informatie vragen over een verbintenis in het FTS. Deze functie is reeds veelvuldig gebruikt en heeft in sommige gevallen geleid tot verzoeken van burgers om exacte documentatie, die de Commissie hen in overeenstemming met het Financieel Reglement heeft bezorgd.

([1]) Groenboek van de Commissie over het „Europees Transparantie-initiatief" van 3 mei 2006, COM(2006) 194.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004679/13
to the Commission
Daniël van der Stoep (NI)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: European index of subsidies

Members of the Commission are doing their utmost to master its rules and subsidy arrangements, which have now assumed labyrinthine proportions.

Under these circumstances, it is impossible for individual citizens to keep abreast of who or what is being subsidised by the Commission.

For the sake of transparency and clarity, it would accordingly be advisable to introduce a European index of subsidies with its own website available for consultation by individuals seeking to ascertain not only who or what is receiving subsidies, but also possible benefits as far as they themselves are concerned. Clear information should also be given regarding the amount of the subsidies in question.

Such a measure would be an enormous step forward in justifying expenditure to taxpayers.

What are the Commission's views on the matter?

Answer given by Mr Lewandowski on behalf of the Commission
(3 June 2013)

The Commission would like to recall that it was the European Transparency Initiative launched through a Green Paper in 2006 ([1]) where the publication of data on the beneficiaries of EU funds was proposed. Thanks to a dedicated website managed by the Commission any citizen may have access to information on who or what is being financed from the EU budget http://ec.europa.eu/contracts_grants/beneficiaries_en.htm.

For funds directly managed by the Commission (Financial Regulation, Article 58.1(a) the Financial Transparency System (FTS) http://ec.europa.eu/beneficiaries/fts/index_en.htm provides an interactive search engine on beneficiaries of grants, contracts and other types of expenditure from the EU budget. FTS offers multiple search criteria. The exact total amount of each commitment is provided. The complete dataset may be downloaded in an easily editable format ('csv', 'xls' or 'xml') and processed by using any data-processing software. The database covers the current Multiannual Financial Framework up to 2011. The information on 2012 will be added by the end of June 2013.

In addition the system offers any citizen to ask easily (using a prepared e-mail form which directs the question to the responsible Commission's department) for any additional information concerning any commitment contained in the FTS. This feature has been extensively used and in some cases led to citizens requests for exact documentation which the Commission provided in accordance with the Financial Regulation.

([1]) Green Paper of the Commission 'European Transparency Initiative' of 3 May 2006, COM(2006)194.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004680/13
an die Kommission
Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)
(26. April 2013)

Betrifft: Bürgerbeauftragter stellt Misswirtschaft im OLAF fest

Die Entscheidung des Europäischen Bürgerbeauftragen (1697/2010/(BEH)JN) wirft OLAF in vier Fällen Misswirtschaft vor. Dabei geht es um die Untersuchung einer NGO, an deren Spitze ein ehemaliges Mitglied des Europäischen Parlaments und Angehöriger einer EU-Institution stand. Der Fall betrifft auch eine College-Entscheidung vom 27.11.2012 (Nr. 3240804312) mit Verzicht auf eine Wiedereinziehung über 325 934,47 EUR.

1. Welche Schlüsse zieht das OLAF aus der Entscheidung 1697/2010 des Bürgerbeauftragten?

2. Warum konnte das Amt die Beihilfenempfänger nicht identifizieren, obwohl die Präsidentin der NGO Mitglied einer EU-Institution war?

3. Warum hat das OLAF keine weitere Anstrengungen unternommen, um dem französischen Gericht, das angeblich die Fallakte verloren hatte, diese Akte erneut zukommen zu lassen?

4. Warum hat das Amt nicht empfohlen, die Präsidentin der NGO als oberste Führung in die juristische Aufarbeitung einzubeziehen, obwohl eine einfache Internetrecherche zur Identifikation der Präsidentin genügt hätte, wie auch der Bürgerbeauftragte schreibt?

5. Warum hat das Amt den Schluss, dass die Präsidentin für das geschäftliche Handeln der NGO gar nicht verantwortlich war, nicht einem ordentlichen Gericht überlassen?

6. Wann wurde der OLAF-Überwachungsausschuss über diesen Fall informiert?

7. Warum wurde der Informant, der den Fall dankenswerter Weise aufgedeckt hat, nicht geschützt?

8. Wird die Kommission den Beihilfevertrag (BRA/1999/0340/000001/CRIS 54220) einschließlich des Addendums aus dem Jahre 2002 veröffentlichen bzw. dem Parlament, insbesondere den Mitgliedern des Haushaltskontrollausschusses, gegebenenfalls auch vertraulich, zur Einsicht zur Verfügung stellen?

9. Wird die Kommission die Dokumente mit den ARES Nummern: 498015, 812133, 853167 und 184406 sowie die Aufzeichnung über die Reise einer Delegation nach Brasilien (17.11.2006 — Nr. 965) die Aufzeichnung des OLAF vom Februar 2009 (Nr. 630) wie auch die Aufzeichnungen des Juristischen Dienstes (Nr. 72668 und Nr. 73062 vom 11.2.2009 bzw. 27.7.2010) und darüber hinaus alle weiteren Dokumente im Zusammenhang mit dem Vorgang veröffentlichen oder dem Parlament, insbesondere den Mitgliedern des Haushaltskontrollausschusses des Europäischen Parlaments, gegebenenfalls auch vertraulich, zur Einsicht zur Verfügung stellen?

10. Wird die Kommission die Rechnungsprüfungsberichte, die zu den Projekten der NGO angefertigt wurden, veröffentlichen oder dem Parlament, insbesondere den Mitgliedern des Haushaltskontrollausschusses des Europäischen Parlaments, gegebenenfalls auch vertraulich zur Einsicht zur Verfügung stellen?

11. Wird die Kommission die Kosten-Nutzenanalyse, die zur Entscheidung über eine Klage gegen die NGO angestellt wurde, veröffentlichen und dem Parlament zur Verfügung stellen?

Antwort von Herrn Šemeta im Namen der Kommission
(29. Juli 2013)

1. Das OLAF übermittelte am 6. Juni 2013 seine Antwort auf die Beschwerde an den Europäischen Bürgerbeauftragten. Obgleich die Entscheidungen des Europäischen Bürgerbeauftragten rechtlich nicht bindend sind, stellt die Kommission stets sicher, dass angemessene Folgemaßnahmen ergriffen werden.

Das OLAF hat den Europäischen Bürgerbeauftragten davon in Kenntnis gesetzt, dass es bereits Änderungen der internen Verfahren in Bezug auf Whistleblowers vorgenommen hat und dass es weiterhin in der Kommunikation mit Hinweisgebern alle einschlägigen Vorschriften ([1]) anwenden wird, wobei den Vorschriften bezüglich der Vertraulichkeit, des Berufsgeheimnisses und des Datenschutzes Rechnung getragen wird. In diesem Rahmen wird das OLAF auch Wistleblower über mögliche Folgemaßnahmen informieren.

2./4. Das OLAF hat den Empfänger im Laufe der Untersuchung, die zwischen Mai 2007 und Februar 2009 erfolgte, identifiziert. Dagegen konnte es nicht feststellen, wer zu diesem Zeitpunkt für die Verwaltung der Organisation verantwortlich war.

3./5. Das OLAF ersuchte die zuständige Behörde um Unterstützung und ließ ihr alle einschlägigen Informationen zukommen.

6. 3. April 2008.

7. Über die Identität des Bediensteten, der dem OLAF die Informationen zur Verfügung gestellt hatte, informierte das OLAF den Europäischen Rechnungshof, erst nachdem festgestellt wurde, dass der ERH wusste, dass derselbe Bedienstete den Fall in seiner Institution aufgeworfen hatte ([2]).

8.-11. Die Kommission wird die Dokumente, die sie bereits gemäß den Bestimmungen der Verordnung Nr. 1049/2001 veröffentlicht hat, dem Vorsitzenden des Ausschusses für Haushaltskontrolle des Europäischen Parlaments zur Verfügung stellen ([3]). Die übrigen Dokumente wird sie nicht veröffentlichen, sondern jeden Antrag des Europäischen Parlaments unter den Voraussetzungen der Rahmenvereinbarung zwischen Parlament und Kommission prüfen ([4]).

([1]) Insbesondere das Beamtenstatut, die Leitlinien der Kommission zur Meldung von Missständen („Whistleblowing") und die OLAF-Anweisungen für das Personal in Bezug auf Ermittlungsverfahren.

([2]) Siehe auch Punkt 1.

([3]) (Nachdem die erforderlichen Maßnahmen zum Schutz des Zwecks von Inspektions-, Untersuchungs- und Audittätigkeiten, der Privatsphäre und der Integrität des Einzelnen und zum Schutz wirtschaftlicher Interessen getroffen wurden.) Siehe insbesondere Artikel 4 der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1049/2001. Die betreffenden Dokumente sind ARES(2009)498015 und ARES(2010)853167. Das OLAF hat den abschließenden Untersuchungsbericht, die erste Bewertung und den abschließenden Vermerk unter den gleichen Bedingungen veröffentlicht.

([4]) In Bezug auf den Verzichtsbeschluss war es unmöglich, eine Zwangsbeitreibung gegen den Empfänger anzustrengen, da dieser seine Tätigkeiten eingestellt hatte und keine Vermögenswerte mehr hatte. Der Verzichtsbeschluss sieht jedoch unter bestimmten Bedingungen vor, dass die Kommission Maßnahmen gegen Personen treffen kann, die zur Erfüllung der Schuld des Empfängers verpflichtet sind. Auf der Grundlage von in der Entscheidung des Europäischen Bürgerbeauftragten enthaltenen Angaben hat der Rechnungsführer der Kommission mit den ehemaligen Vertretern des Empfängers Kontakt aufgenommen, um ihre Rolle sowie den gegenwärtigen Status des Empfängers und mögliche Verbindungen zu einer neu eingerichteten Organisation zu ermitteln.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004680/13
to the Commission
Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Ombudsman confirms maladministration by OLAF

In response to Complaint 1697/2010/(BEH)JN, the European Ombudsman has confirmed four cases of maladministration by OLAF involving the investigation of an NGO whose President was formerly an MEP and subsequently a member of an EU institution and Decision 3240804312 of 27 November 2012 regarding the waiver of a recovery order for an amount of EUR 325,934.47.

1. What conclusions are being drawn by OLAF regarding the Ombudsman's decision?

2. Why was OLAF unable to identify the aid recipient, despite the fact that the President of the NGO concerned belonged to an EU institution?

3. Why has OLAF made no further attempt to forward copies of the case files to the French court which apparently misplaced those initially sent?

4. Why did OLAF not recommend that the NGO President, as the person ultimately responsible, be investigated as part of the legal proceedings, despite the fact that, as pointed out by the Ombudsman, a simple web search would have sufficed to identify her?

5. Why did OLAF not leave it up to a normal court to decide whether the NGO President could be absolved entirely of responsibility for its business dealings?

6. When was this case brought to the attention of the OLAF Supervisory Committee?

7. Why was no protection given to the informant who fortunately brought the case to light?

8. Will the Commission publish or make available to Parliament, in particular the members of the Committee on Budgetary Control, confidentially if necessary, the aid application concerned (BRA/1999/0340/000001/CRIS 54200), including the addendum from 2002?

9. Will the Commission publish or make available to Parliament, in particular the members of the Committee on Budgetary Control, confidentially if necessary, ARES Documents 498015, 812133, 853167 and 184406, together with Note 965 of 17 November 2006 regarding the delegation visit to Brazil, Note 630 of February 2009 from OLAF and Notes 72668 and 73062 (of 11 February 2009 and 27 July 2010 respectively) from the Legal Service, as well as any other relevant documentation?

10. Will the Commission publish or make available to Parliament, in particular the members of the Committee on Budgetary Control, confidentially if necessary, the audit reports relating to the NGO projects?

11. Will the Commission publish and make available to Parliament the cost-benefit analysis on which the decision concerning the complaint against the NGO was based?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(29 July 2013)

1. OLAF sent its reply to the European Ombudsman complaint on 6 June 2013. EO's decisions are not legally binding, however the Commission systematically ensures an appropriate follow-up.

OLAF informed the EO that it had already adopted a number of changes to internal procedures towards whistleblowers and that it will continue to apply thoroughly all the relevant rules ([1]) when communicating with informants, including whistleblowers, whilst taking into account the rules on confidentiality, professional secrecy and data protection. In this framework OLAF will also inform a whistleblower of possible follow-up actions.

([1]) In particular the Staff Regulations, Commission Guidelines on whistleblowers and Instructions to Staff on Investigative Procedures.

2 & 4. The beneficiary was identified by OLAF during the course of the investigation which was undertaken between May 2007 and February 2009. However, OLAF was unable to identify the persons in charge of the administration of the organisation at the time.

3 & 5. OLAF requested some assistance to the competent authority and forwarded it all the relevant information.

6. 3 April 2008.

7. OLAF disclosed to the European Courts of Auditors the identity of the servant who provided the information to OLAF, only after having established that the ECA knew that the same servant had raised the issue to its institution ([2]).

8-11. The Commission will send to the chairman of the Budget Control committee of the European Parliament the documents it has already disclosed under the provisions of Regulation 1049/2001 ([3]). As for the remainder documents, the Commission does not intend to publish them but will assess any request from the European Parliament under the conditions of the framework Agreement between the Parliament and the Commission ([4]).

([2]) See also point 1.

([3]) After having taken the necessary measures to ensure the protection of the purpose of inspections, investigations and audits; the protection of privacy and integrity of individuals; and the protection of commercial interests. See in particular Article 4 of Regulation 1049/2011. This concerned documents are ARES(2009) 498015 and Ares(2010)853167. OLAF also disclosed the Final Case Report, the initial assessment and case closure note under the same conditions.

([4]) In relation to the waiving decision, given that the beneficiary ceased its activities and had no more assets, it has been impossible to launch a forced recovery against it. The waiving decision however foresees, under certain conditions, the possibility for the Commission to undertake actions against the persons who could be found liable for the debt of the beneficiary. On the basis of the elements mentioned in the EO's decision, the accounting officer of the Commission has taken contact with the former representatives of the beneficiary in order to assess their role in it, the current status of the beneficiary and any possible link between it and a new-created body.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004681/13
an die Kommission
Jörg Leichtfried (S&D)
(26. April 2013)

Betrifft: Schweinemast auf Frachtschiffen mit anschließender Schlachtung in der EU

Es kursieren Informationen über die Mast von Schweinen auf Frachtschiffen, welche über Wochen hinweg in internationalen Gewässern verkehren. Die Zulieferung des Futters findet teilweise mithilfe von Helikoptern statt. Diese Schiffe fahren meist unter der Flagge von Staaten, die nur geringe, oder zumindest weit weniger strenge als in der EU übliche Vorschriften im Bereich der Tierhaltung haben. In internationalen Gewässern besteht also diesbezüglich ein quasi rechtsfreier Raum, da es völkerrechtlich keinerlei Regelung gibt und eventuelle staatliche Kontrollen in Wirklichkeit äußerst selten stattfinden. Wenn die Tiere reif für die Schachtung sind, werden sie in Mitgliedsländern der EU an Land gebracht und innerhalb der EU weiter transportiert. Schlussendlich werden die Tiere dann geschlachtet und weiterverarbeitet und als Fleisch aus dem jeweiligen Land, in dem die Verarbeitung stattfand, deklariert.

Besitzt die Kommission Kenntnisse über die obengenannte Praxis?

Wenn ja, ist die Kommission bereit, diese Informationen zu veröffentlichen?

Wenn die Kommission keinerlei Kenntnis von der obengenannten Praxis hat, plant die Kommission, Nachforschungen in dieser Sache anzustellen?

Sieht sich die Kommission gegenüber den Bürgerinnen und Bürgern der europäischen Union als verantwortlich und verpflichtet, größtmögliche Lebensmittelsicherheit zu gewährleisten und die Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher bestmöglich über die Herkunft von Lebensmitteln zu informieren?

Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(7. Juni 2013)

Der Kommission ist diese Praxis nicht bekannt.

In diesem Zusammenhang weist die Kommission auf alle rechtlichen Anforderungen hin, die in diesem Fall für die Einfuhr von Fleisch ([1]) bzw. von lebenden Tieren ([2]) gelten.

Lebende Schweine dürfen in die EU nur aus in einer beschränkten Liste geführten zugelassenen Drittländern eingeführt werden (Verordnung (EG) Nr. 206/2010 der Kommission ([3])), und es muss eine von den zuständigen Behörden des Ursprungslands unterzeichnete Veterinärbescheinigung mitgeführt werden. Die Tiere dürfen in die EU nur über gelistete Grenzkontrollstellen eingeführt werden, an denen sie von einem amtlichen Tierarzt daraufhin kontrolliert werden, ob sie allen Anforderungen der EU-Vorschriften genügen.

Falls jemand über Informationen über möglicherweise illegale Einfuhren lebender Schweine verfügt, sollten diese Informationen möglichst ausführlich den zuständigen Veterinärbehörden des Eingangshafens übermittelt werden, damit sichergestellt wird, dass die hohen Standards der EU für öffentliche Gesundheit, Tiergesundheit und Tierschutz nicht beeinträchtigt werden.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/international/trade/index_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/international/trade/importing_en.htm
([3]) ABl. L 146 vom 11.6.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004681/13
to the Commission
Jörg Leichtfried (S&D)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Pig fattening on cargo ships with subsequent slaughtering in the EU

Information is coming to light concerning the fattening of pigs on cargo ships operating in international waters for weeks on end. In some cases feedstuffs are delivered by helicopter. These ships mostly operate under the flag of states that that have fewer or far less stringent regulations than those that apply in the area of livestock farming within the EU. Thus, international waters are almost like a lawless zone because there are no regulations under international laws and any state controls are in practice very few and far between. When the animals are ready for slaughter, they are landed in EU Member States and carried onwards within the EU. The animals are then finally slaughtered and processed and declared as meat from the country in which processing takes place.

Is the Commission aware of this practice?

If so, is the Commission prepared make this information publicly available?

If the Commission is unaware of this practice, does it plan to initiate research into this matter?

Does the Commission regard itself as responsible to the citizens of the European Union and does it believe it is obliged to ensure the greatest possible food safety and to offer consumers the best possible information about the origin of food?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(7 June 2013)

The Commission is not aware of this practice.

In this respect the Commission would refer to all the legal requirements applicable in this case on import of meat ([1]) or of live animals ([2]).

Import of live pigs into the EU may only occur from a restricted list of authorised third countries (Commission Regulation (EC) No 206/2010 ([3])), and must be accompanied by a veterinary health certificate, signed by the competent authorities of the country of origin. These animals may only be introduced into the EU through listed Border Inspection posts, where they are inspected by an official veterinarian, checking that they fulfil all the requirements provided for in the EU legislation.

Anybody having information on possible illegal imports of live pigs should immediately refer this information, with as much detail as possible, to the Competent Veterinary Authorities of the port of entry, in order to ensure that the EU high standards of public health, animal health and welfare, are not compromised.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/international/trade/index_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/international/trade/importing_en.htm
([3]) OJ L 146, 11.6.2010.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004682/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(26 Απριλίου 2013)

Θέμα: Πανευρωπαϊκό σύστημα πληροφοριών για τα βιντεοπαιχνίδια (PEGI)

Η Επιτροπή καθόρισε, με την ανακοίνωσή της του 2008 για τα βιντεοπαιχνίδια, τις αρχές και τις βέλτιστες πρακτικές για την προστασία των νεαρών καταναλωτών από επιβλαβή παιχνίδια. Οι εν λόγω αρχές και πρακτικές βασίζονται κυρίως σε συστήματα προοδευτικής πρόσβασης στα βιντεοπαιχνίδια ανάλογα με την ηλικία. Σημαντικό μέσο για την προστασία των παιδιών είναι το πανευρωπαϊκό σύστημα πληροφοριών για τα βιντεοπαιχνίδια (PEGI), το οποίο, ναι μεν είναι προαιρετικό, ωστόσο προτάθηκε να αντικαταστήσει τα αντίστοιχα εθνικά συστήματα.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Εφαρμόζει το σύνολο των κρατών μελών το σύστημα PEGI; Κρίνεται επιτυχής η μέχρι σήμερα εφαρμογή του;

2. Διαπιστώνει η Επιτροπή ότι τα κράτη μέλη συμμορφώνονται με τη σχετική ανακοίνωση με την οποία καλούνται να βελτιώσουν περαιτέρω την προστασία των ανηλίκων από τα βίαια βιντεοπαιχνίδια;

3. Ποια κράτη μέλη έχουν εφαρμόσει τα πλέον αποδοτικά μέτρα για την ευαισθητοποίηση σχετικά με τους πιθανούς κινδύνους των βιντεοπαιχνιδιών, αλλά και σχετικά με τις υφισταμένες μεθόδους προστασίας;

Απάντηση του κ. Kroes εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(3 Ιουνίου 2013)

Στην έκθεση της Επιτροπής του 2011 «Η προστασία των παιδιών στον ψηφιακό κόσμο» ([1]) αναφέρεται, συγκεκριμένα, ότι ([2]):

— 17 κράτη μέλη κρίνουν ικανοποιητική τη λειτουργία των οικείων συστημάτων ηλικιακής διαβάθμισης. Με εξαίρεση τη Γερμανία, τα κράτη μέλη βασίζονται στα συστήματα PEGI και PEGI Online.

— Μόνο σε πέντε κράτη μέλη έχουν τεθεί σε εφαρμογή ηλεκτρονικά συστήματα αξιολόγησης για την εκτίμηση πιθανών ευνοϊκών ή δυσμενών επιπτώσεων των βιντεοπαιχνιδιών στην ανάπτυξη ή την υγεία των ανηλίκων.

— Η αγωγή στα μέσα επικοινωνίας και η ευαισθητοποίηση αναφέρονται συνήθως ως επιπλέον μέτρα για την προστασία των ανηλίκων από τα επιβλαβή βιντεοπαιχνίδια. Ωστόσο, τα μέτρα αυτά είναι ενταγμένα στη σχολική εκπαίδευση μόνο σε 8 κράτη μέλη.

Τον Ιούλιο του 2012 θεσπίστηκε το σύστημα «PEGI for APPS», σκοπός του οποίου είναι να εισαγάγει ηλικιακές διαβαθμίσεις σε πλατφόρμες στις οποίες θα μπορούν να φορτώνονται μικρές λογισμικές εφαρμογές, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των παιχνιδιών. Μια από τις σχετικές προκλήσεις είναι το γεγονός ότι ορισμένοι σημαντικοί διαχειριστές διαδικτυακών πλατφορμών χρησιμοποιούν τις δικές τους κατοχυρωμένες διαβαθμίσεις.

Στην ευρωπαϊκή στρατηγική για ένα Διαδίκτυο καλύτερα προσαρμοσμένο στα παιδιά ([3]), η Επιτροπή υπογραμμίζει τη σημασία μιας εν γένει εφαρμοστέας, διαφανούς και συνεκτικής προσέγγισης στις ηλικιακές διαβαθμίσεις σε ολόκληρη την ΕΕ. Η ανάληψη δεσμεύσεων από μέρους της βιομηχανίας είναι σημαντική: 31 εταιρείες έχουν αναλάβει τη δέσμευση ([4]) να προβούν σε συγκεκριμένες ενέργειες, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της ευρύτερης χρήσης της ταξινόμησης περιεχομένου.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52011DC0556:EN:NOT
([2]) Βλ. επίσης http://eur-lex.europa.eu/lexuriserv/lexuriserv.do?uri=sec:2011:1043:fin:en:pdf
([3]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-12-445_el.htm?locale=el
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/news/better-internet-kids-ceo-coalition-1-year

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004682/13
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Pan-European Game Information System (PEGI)

In its 2008 Communication on video games, the Commission established the best practices and principles for protecting young consumers from harmful games. These practices and principles are mainly based on a system of progressive access to videogames based on age. An important means for protecting children is the Pan-European Game Information system (PEGI) which, although optional, was proposed in order to replace the corresponding national systems.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Are all Member States implementing the PEGI system? Does it consider its implantation to date successful?

2. Has the Commission found that the Member States are complying with this communication, which requires them to enhance the protection of minors from violent video games?

3. Which Member States have implemented the more effective measures for raising awareness of the possible dangers of video games, in particular those relating to existing protection measures?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(3 June 2013)

The Commission's 2011 report 'Protecting Children in the Digital World' ([1]) indicates, in particular, that ([2]):

— 17 Member States consider the functioning of their age rating systems to be satisfactory. With the exception of Germany, Member States rely on PEGI and PEGI Online.

— Evaluation systems for the assessment of possible favourable or adverse effects of video games on minors' development or health are in place in only 5 Member States.

— Media literacy and awareness-raising are most often mentioned as further measures to protect minors from harmful video games. However, only in 8 Member States are such measures integrated into school education.

In July 2012 'PEGI for APPS' was introduced, designed to bring the age ratings to platforms where small software applications, including games, can be downloaded. One of the challenges in this respect is the fact that some major Internet platform operators use their own proprietary ratings.

In the European Strategy for a Better Internet for Children ([3]), the Commission underlines the importance of having a generally applicable, transparent and consistent approach to age ratings EU-wide. Engagement by industry is important: 31 companies have made commitments ([4]) to work on concrete actions, including wider use of content classification.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52011DC0556:EN:NOT.
([2]) See also http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SEC:2011:1043:FIN:EN:PDF.
([3]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-12-445_en.htm?locale=en.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/news/better-Internet-kids-ceo-coalition-1-year.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004683/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(26 Απριλίου 2013)

Θέμα: Διαδικασία Υπερβολικών Ανισορροπιών και νοικοκυριά

Το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο και το Συμβούλιο κατέληξαν πριν από δύο περίπου χρόνια σε οριστική συμφωνία σχετικά με δέσμη νομοθετικών διατάξεων για την ενίσχυση του οικονομικού συντονισμού στο εσωτερικό της Ένωσης. Η δέσμη αυτή περιλαμβάνει μεταξύ άλλων ένα νέο πλαίσιο εποπτείας για την πρόληψη και διόρθωση επιζήμιων μακροοικονομικών ανισορροπιών, το οποίο αναφέρεται ως Διαδικασία Υπερβολικών Ανισορροπιών (ΔΥΑ-EIP). Η ΔΥΑ θα καταστήσει δυνατή την ταυτοποίηση θυλάκων χρέους σε διαφόρους κλάδους της οικονομίας σε πρώιμο στάδιο, συμπεριλαμβανομένου του κλάδου των νοικοκυριών, και μεταξύ των μη χρηματοδοτικών εταιρειών.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Είναι σε θέση να παραθέσει στοιχεία αναφορικά με την ταυτοποίηση του βαθμού υπερχρέωσης των νοικοκυριών στην ΕΕ; Ποια η περίπτωση της Ελλάδας;

2. Καθώς η ΔΥΑ έπρεπε να αρχίσει τη λειτουργία της με έναν μηχανισμό προειδοποίησης, ολοκληρώθηκαν οι τεχνικές εργασίες σε αυτό το επίπεδο; Βρίσκεται σε πλήρη επιχειρησιακή ικανότητα ο συγκεκριμένος μηχανισμός;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(19 Ιουνίου 2013)

1. Στο πλαίσιο της διαδικασίας μακροοικονομικών ανισορροπιών (ΔΜΑ), η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί τις εξελίξεις σχετικά με την κατάσταση του χρέους του ιδιωτικού τομέα στα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ. Τα στατιστικά στοιχεία διατίθενται ελεύθερα στη βάση δεδομένων της Eurostat. Το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου μπορεί επίσης να συμβουλευθεί, εάν το επιθυμεί, την ειδική ιστοσελίδα του Διαδικτύου που περιέχει πληροφορίες σχετικές με τη διαδικασία μακροοικονομικών ανισορροπιών, τους κυριότερους μακροοικονομικούς δείκτες, καθώς και το χρέος του ιδιωτικού τομέα, ανά κράτος μέλος ([1]). Οι αναλύσεις στις οποίες προέβη το προσωπικό της Επιτροπής όσον αφορά την κατάσταση του χρέους του ιδιωτικού τομέα και τις πιέσεις για απομόχλευση εκδόθηκαν πρόσφατα σε δύο δημοσιεύσεις: «Χρέος, δυναμική της απομόχλευσης και μακροοικονομική προσαρμογή» ([2]) και «Αξιολόγηση της δυναμικής της απομόχλευσης του ιδιωτικού τομέα» ([3]).

2. Η διαδικασία μακροοικονομικών ανισορροπιών λειτουργεί πλήρως και διανύει τον δεύτερο ετήσιο κύκλο της. Τον Νοέμβριο του 2012, η Επιτροπή δημοσίευσε τη δεύτερη Έκθεση του Μηχανισμού Επαγρύπνησης ([4]) που περιέχει τον τελευταίο πίνακα αποτελεσμάτων των δεικτών που καλύπτει τις κυριότερες πηγές μακροοικονομικών ανισορροπιών. Επιπλέον, στις 10 Απριλίου 2013, δημοσιεύθηκαν εμπεριστατωμένες επισκοπήσεις για 13 κράτη μέλη.

([1]) Βλ. http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/indicators/economic_reforms/eip/

([2]) Βλ. Cuerpo, C., I. Drumond, J. Lendvai, P. Pontuch and R Raciborski (2013), «Χρέος, δυναμική της απομόχλευσης και μακροοικονομική προσαρμογή», Ευρωπαϊκή οικονομία — οικονομικά έγγραφα («Indebtedness, Deleveraging Dynamics and Macroeconomic Adjustment,» European Economy-Economic Papers). 477, διαθέσιμη στη διεύθυνση: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/economic_paper/2013/pdf/ecp477_en.pdf

([3]) Βλ. Τριμηνιαία έκθεση για τη ζώνη του ευρώ, τόμος 12 (2013) τεύχος 1, σ. 26-32, διαθέσιμη στη διεύθυνση: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/qr_euro_area/2013/pdf/qrea1_en.pdf

([4]) COM(2012)751 τελικό.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004683/13
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: The Excessive Imbalance Procedure and households

Two years ago, the European Parliament and the Council reached a definitive agreement on the set of legal provisions for strengthening economic coordination within the European Union. This set of principles includes, *inter alia*, a new surveillance framework for preventing and correcting detrimental macroeconomic imbalances, known as the Excessive Imbalance Procedure (EIP). The EIP will enable the identification of pockets of indebtedness in various sectors of the economy at an early stage, including in the household sector and amongst non-financial corporations.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Is it in a position to provide data on the identification of the level of over-indebtedness of households in the EU? What is the situation in Greece?

2. As the EIP should have begun its operation using an early warning mechanism, has the technical work been completed on this? Is the mechanism in question fully operational?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2013)

1. In the context of the Macroeconomic Imbalance Procedure (MIP), the Commission monitors developments related to the private indebtedness in the EU Member States. The statistical data are freely available in the Eurostat database. The Honourable Member of Parliament may also wish to consult a dedicated web page with information on the MIP, main macroeconomic indicators, including private sector debt, per Member State ([1]). Analytical work by Commission staff on private indebtedness and deleveraging pressures has recently given rise to two publications: 'Indebtedness, Deleveraging Dynamics and Macroeconomic Adjustment' ([2]) and 'Assessing the private sector deleveraging dynamics' ([3]).

2. The MIP is fully operational and running its second annual cycle. In November 2012, the Commission published its second Alert Mechanism Report ([4]) providing the latest scoreboard of indicators that cover major sources of macroeconomic imbalances. Moreover, in-depth reviews (IDRs) for 13 Member States have been published on 10 April 2013.

([1]) See http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/indicators/economic_reforms/eip/
([2]) See Cuerpo, C., I. Drumond, J. Lendvai, P. Pontuch and R Raciborski (2013), 'Indebtedness, Deleveraging Dynamics and Macroeconomic Adjustment,' European Economy-Economic Papers. 477, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/economic_paper/2013/pdf/ecp477_en.pdf
([3]) See Quarterly Report on the Euro Area, volume 12 (2013) issue 1, pp.26-32, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/qr_euro_area/2013/pdf/qrea1_en.pdf
([4]) COM(2012) 751 final.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004684/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(26 Απριλίου 2013)

Θέμα: Δράση για τον εθελοντικό επαναπατρισμό

Η Ελλάδα συμπεριέλαβε την πιλοτική δράση για τον εθελοντικό επαναπατρισμό παράνομων μεταναστών για πρώτη φορά στο ετήσιο πρόγραμμά της για το 2009, ενώ αποφάσισε να συνεχίσει τη δράση αυτή στο πλαίσιο των επόμενων ετησίων προγραμμάτων.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Διαθέτει στοιχεία αναφορικά με τον αριθμό των ατόμων που επαναπατρίστηκαν με τη χρήση του συγκεκριμένου προγράμματος κατά το 2012;

2. Ποιο ήταν το συνολικό κόστος της δράσης για τον εθελοντικό επαναπατρισμό;

Απάντηση της κ. Malmström εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(21 Ιουνίου 2013)

Η Ελλάδα ξεκίνησε για πρώτη φορά την εφαρμογή του προγράμματος της υποστηριζόμενης οικειοθελούς επιστροφής (AVR), στο πλαίσιο του ετήσιου προγράμματος του Ταμείου Επιστροφής προσφύγων του 2009. Αυτό είχε ως αποτέλεσμα 1097 εκούσιες επιστροφές για την περίοδο μεταξύ Μαΐου 2010 και Ιουνίου 2011.

Το πρόγραμμα AVR συνεχίστηκε στο πλαίσιο επακόλουθων ετήσιων ελληνικών προγραμμάτων του Ταμείου Επιστροφών προσφύγων.

Στο πλαίσιο του ετήσιου προγράμματος του 2010, η Ελλάδα σκόπευε να επιστρέψουν οικειοθελώς 3.000 άτομα μέχρι τον Ιούνιο του 2012, με συνολικό προϋπολογισμό 5 εκατ. ευρώ (χρηματοδότηση από την ΕΕ 75%). Ωστόσο, επειδή η υποβολή της τελικής έκθεσης εφαρμογής (που αναμενόταν για τις 31/3/2013) έχει καθυστερήσει, η Επιτροπή δεν είναι ακόμη σε θέση να παράσχει τα οριστικά στοιχεία σχετικά με την εφαρμογή των οικειοθελών επιστροφών στο πλαίσιο του εν λόγω προγράμματος.

Επίσης, η Ελλάδα σκόπευε να συγχρηματοδοτήσει το πρόγραμμα AVR βάσει των ετησίων προγραμμάτων 2011 και 2012, τα οποία επρόκειτο να εφαρμοστούν έως τις 30 Ιουνίου 2013 και 30 Ιουνίου του 2014, αντίστοιχα. Στο πλαίσιο καθενός από τα δύο αυτά ετήσια προγράμματα, η Ελλάδα έχει δεσμεύσει 10 εκατ. ευρώ (με 85% και 75% χρηματοδότηση της ΕΕ, αντίστοιχα), με σκοπό την οικειοθελή επιστροφή περίπου 7 000 ατόμων ανά πρόγραμμα. Μόλις υποβληθούν οι αντίστοιχες τελικές εκθέσεις, οι οποίες αναμένονται έως τις 31 Μαρτίου 2014 (το ετήσιο πρόγραμμα 2011), και της 31ης Μαρτίου 2015 (το ετήσιο πρόγραμμα 2012), η Επιτροπή θα είναι σε θέση να παράσχει τα πραγματικά αριθμητικά στοιχεία για κάθε περίοδο.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004684/13
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Action on voluntary repatriation

Greece included pilot action on the voluntary repatriation of illegal immigrants for the first time in its 2009 annual programme and it decided to continue this action in subsequent annual programmes.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Does it have information on the number of people repatriated under this programme in 2012?

2. What was the total cost of this action on voluntary repatriation?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(21 June 2013)

Greece started implementing the Assisted Voluntary Return (AVR) programme for the first time in under the 2009 Return Fund annual programme. This resulted in 1097 voluntary returns for the period between May 2010 and June 2011.

The AVR programme was continued under subsequent Greek annual programmes of the Return Fund.

Under the 2010 annual programme, Greece planned to return voluntarily 3000 persons by June 2012 with the total budget of EUR 5 million (EU funding 75%). However, since the submission of the final implementation report (due by 31/3/2013) is delayed, the Commission is not yet in a position to provide final figures on the implementation of voluntary returns under this programme.

Greece also planned to co-finance the AVR programme under the 2011 and 2012 annual programmes expected to be implemented by 30 June 2013 and 30 June 2014 respectively. Under each of these two annual programmes, Greece has earmarked EUR 10 million (with 85% and 75% EU funding respectively) aiming at the voluntary return of approximately 7000 persons per programme. Once the corresponding final reports, due by 31 March 2014 (the 2011 annual programme) and 31 March 2015 (the 2012 annual programme), are submitted, the Commission will be in position to provide the actual figures for each period concerned.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004685/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(26 Απριλίου 2013)

Θέμα: Επενδύσεις στην προσχολική αγωγή και φροντίδα

Είναι γεγονός ότι το ποσοστό απόδοσης της επένδυσης στην προσχολική εκπαίδευση είναι πολύ υψηλότερο από αυτό των επενδύσεων στην εκπαίδευση για τα μεταγενέστερα στάδια της ζωής, σημείο το οποίο πρέπει να ληφθεί υπόψη κατά τον σχεδιασμό αποτελεσματικών πολιτικών εκπαίδευσης και κατάρτισης στα κράτη μέλη. Ωστόσο, παρατηρείται πως πολλά κράτη μέλη δεν έχουν μέχρι σήμερα δώσει τη δέουσα προσοχή στην προσχολική αγωγή και φροντίδα.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Διαθέτει πρόσφατα στοιχεία σχετικά με τα ποσοστά συμμετοχής παιδιών στη προσχολική αγωγή και εκπαίδευση στα κράτη μέλη; Ποια η περίπτωση της Ελλάδας;

2. Ποιο είναι το συγκριτικό επίπεδο δημόσιων δαπανών για την προσχολική εκπαίδευση μεταξύ των κρατών μελών;

Απάντηση της κ. Βασιλείου εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(7 Ιουνίου 2013)

Τα πλέον πρόσφατα διαθέσιμα στοιχεία για τη συμμετοχή σε προσχολική εκπαίδευση και φροντίδα (ECEC) καλύπτουν το έτος 2011. Τα εν λόγω αριθμητικά στοιχεία δημοσίευσε η Eurostat τον Μάιο του 2013 και είναι επί του παρόντος διαθέσιμα για 18 κράτη μέλη. Η βάση δεδομένων επικαιροποιείται συνεχώς καθώς εισέρχονται νέα αριθμητικά στοιχεία. Τα τελικά αριθμητικά στοιχεία αναμένονται τον Ιούνιο του 2013.

Όσον αφορά την Ελλάδα, το 2010, το 73,5% της ηλικιακής ομάδας μεταξύ 4 ετών και της ηλικίας έναρξης της υποχρεωτικής εκπαίδευσης συμμετείχε στην ECEC. Σύμφωνα με το ισχύον κριτήριο αναφοράς για την ECEC, η συμμετοχή στην προσχολική εκπαίδευση των παιδιών αυτής της ηλικιακής ομάδας πρέπει να ανέρχεται τουλάχιστον στο 95% έως το 2020. Όλα τα στοιχεία σχετικά με τη συμμετοχή στην ECEC για τα έτη 2000-2011 είναι διαθέσιμα στη διαδικτυακή βάση δεδομένων της Eurostat ([1]).

Η πρόσφατη δημοσίευση Eurydice «Χρηματοδότηση της εκπαίδευσης στην Ευρώπη: Ο αντίκτυπος της οικονομικής κρίσης, 2013», παρέχει επισκόπηση των συγκριτικών επιπέδων των δαπανών και των προϋπολογισμών για την εκπαίδευση στα κράτη μέλη ([2]). Τα πιο πρόσφατα στοιχεία για τους προϋπολογισμούς για την εκπαίδευση στην Ελλάδα διατίθενται σε αυτήν.

Τα αριθμητικά στοιχεία για τις δαπάνες για την εκπαίδευση ως ποσοστό του ΑΕΠ ή οι δημόσιες δαπάνες για την προσχολική εκπαίδευση (ISCED 0) για την περίοδο 2001-2010 είναι διαθέσιμα στη διαδικτυακή βάση δεδομένων της Eurostat ([3]). Το τμήμα B1 της έκθεσης του ΟΟΣΑ «Η Εκπαίδευση με μία ματιά» παρέχει περισσότερα χρήσιμα αριθμητικά στοιχεία για τις δαπάνες των εκπαιδευτικών ιδρυμάτων ανά μαθητή ([4]). Ωστόσο, τα στοιχεία για την Ελλάδα δεν έχουν επικαιροποιηθεί τα τελευταία χρόνια.

([1]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/product_details/dataset?p_product_code=TPS00179
([2]) http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/thematic_reports/147EN.pdf
([3]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/product_details/dataset?p_product_code=EDUC_FIGDP
([4]) http://www.oecd.org/edu/EAG%202012_e-book_EN_200912.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004685/13
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Investments in pre-school education and care

It is a fact that the rate of return on investment in pre-school education is much higher than investments in education at later stages in life, an issue which should be taken into account when formulating effective education and training policies in the Member States. However, it has been observed that many Member States have yet to give pre-school education and care the appropriate attention.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Does it have recent data on the number of children in pre-school care and education in the Member States? What is the situation in Greece?

2. What is the comparative level of public expenditure on pre-school education in the Member States?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(7 June 2013)

The most recent data available for participation in early childhood education and care (ECEC) covers the year 2011. These figures were released by Eurostat in May 2013 and are currently available for 18 Member States. The data base is continually being updated as new figures are coming in. The final figures are expected for June 2013.

With regards to Greece, in 2010, 73.5% of the age group between 4 years-old and the starting age of compulsory education were in ECEC. This compares to an EU average in 2010 of 92.4%. The current benchmark for ECEC states that participation in pre-school education of children of this age group should be at least 95% by 2020. All data concerning participation in ECEC for the years 2000-2011 can be found in the Eurostat online database ([1]).

The recent Eurydice publication, 'Funding of Education in Europe: The Impact of the Economic Crisis, 2013', provides an overview of the comparative levels of expenditure and budgets for education in Member States ([2]). The most recent information on education budgets relevant to Greece can be found there.

The figures for expenditure on education as % of GDP or public expenditure for pre-primary level (ISCED 0) for the years 2001-2010 can be found in the Eurostat online database ([3]). Section B1 of the OECD publication, 'Education at a Glance 2012', provides further useful figures on expenditure per student by educational institutions ([4]). However, the data for Greece has not been updated in recent years.

([1]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/product_details/dataset?p_product_code=TPS00179.
([2]) http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/thematic_reports/147EN.pdf
([3]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/product_details/dataset?p_product_code=EDUC_FIGDP.
([4]) http://www.oecd.org/edu/EAG%202012_e-book_EN_200912.pdf

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004686/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(26 Απριλίου 2013)

Θέμα: Το έργο ARROWPlus στην Ελλάδα

Το έργο ARROW (Accessible Registries of Rights Information and Orphan Works) συγχρηματοδοτείται από την Επιτροπή στο πλαίσιο του προγράμματος eContentplus. Αποβλέπει στη διευκόλυνση της επιμελούς έρευνας για αναζήτηση δικαιωμάτων, κατόχων δικαιωμάτων και του καθεστώτος δικαιωμάτων βιβλίων για λογαριασμό βιβλιοθηκών και άλλων χρηστών που επιθυμούν να τα ψηφιοποιήσουν και να τα καταστήσουν διαθέσιμα. Στο πλαίσιο του ARROWPlus, επιχειρήθηκε η επέκταση της πιλοτικής υπηρεσίας ώστε να καλύψει το Βέλγιο, την Ιρλανδία, την Ουγγαρία, τη Λιθουανία, την Ελλάδα, την Πορτογαλία, την Πολωνία, τη Βουλγαρία, τη Λετονία και τη Ρουμανία.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Επιτεύχθηκε η επέκταση της δράσης του ARROWPlus στις παραπάνω χώρες;

2. Διαθέτει στοιχεία αναφορικά με την αξιοποίησή του στην Ελλάδα;

3. Διατίθενται στοιχεία σχετικά με το ποσοστό των ορφανών έργων ελληνικής προέλευσης;

Απάντηση της κ. Kroes εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(20 Ιουνίου 2013)

Το Arrow Plus βασίζεται και προωθεί περαιτέρω το σύστημα Arrow, το οποίο αναπτύχθηκε στο πλαίσιο του έργου Arrow (πρόγραμμα eContent plus). Το Arrow είναι ένα σύστημα διευκόλυνσης βιβλιοθηκών και άλλων χρηστών στην ενδελεχή τους αναζήτηση κατόχων δικαιωμάτων πνευματικής ιδιοκτησίας έργων τα οποία πρόκειται να περιληφθούν σε ένα πρόγραμμα ψηφιοποίησης των βιβλίων, μέσω της αναζήτησης δικτύου ευρωπαϊκών πηγών δεδομένων.

Το Arrow Plus περιλαμβάνει εταίρους του έργου από το Βέλγιο, την Ελλάδα, την Πορτογαλία, την Πολωνία, τη Βουλγαρία, τη Λετονία, τη Λιθουανία, την Ουγγαρία, την Ιρλανδία και τη Ρουμανία, παρέχοντας μια πραγματικά πανευρωπαϊκή υποδομή, περιορίζοντας το χάσμα ποιότητας των σχετικών με τα βιβλία δεδομένων μεταξύ των ευρωπαϊκών χωρών. Το Arrow Plus θα εξασφαλίσει επίσης την ανάλυση και καθοδήγηση όσον αφορά την επέκταση των υπηρεσιών Arrow στον τομέα της εικόνας.

Δυστυχώς, καθώς το έργο είναι ακόμη σε εξέλιξη, δεν υπάρχουν αυτή τη στιγμή ιδιαίτερα δημόσια δεδομένα σχετικά με την Ελλάδα. Οι πληροφορίες θα πρέπει να διαχέονται στο βαθμό που επιτρέπεται από τους κανόνες εμπιστευτικότητας.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004686/13
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: The ARROW Plus project in Greece

The ARROW project (Accessible Registries of Rights Information and Orphan Works) is co-financed by the European Commission under the eContentplus programme. It aims to facilitate the diligent search of rights, rights holders and the system governing book rights for libraries and other users who intend to digitalise these works and make them available. Under the ARROWPlus project, the pilot was extended to include Belgium, Ireland, Hungary, Lithuania, Greece, Portugal, Poland, Bulgaria, Latvia and Romania.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Has the ARROW Plus project been extended to the aforementioned countries?

2. Does it have any data on its use in Greece?

3. Does it have any data on the number of orphan works from Greece?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2013)

Arrow Plus builds on and further implements the Arrow system, developed within the Arrow project (eContent Plus programme). Arrow is a system to facilitate libraries and other users in their diligent search for right holders in works that are to be included in a digitisation programme of books, through querying a network of European data sources.

Arrow Plus includes project partners from Belgium, Greece, Portugal, Poland, Bulgaria, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Ireland and Romania delivering a genuinely pan-European infrastructure, closing the gap in book data quality between European countries. Arrow Plus also analyses and pilots the extension of Arrow services to the image domain.

Unfortunately, as the project is still ongoing, no particular data concerning Greece are publicly available at the moment. Information will be disseminated to the extent permitted by confidentiality rules.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004687/13
an die Kommission
Knut Fleckenstein (S&D)
(26. April 2013)

Betrifft: Umsetzung der Strategie „LeaderSHIP 2020"

Die Kommission hat am 20. Februar 2013 ein hochrangiges Treffen veranstaltet und bei der Gelegenheit die Strategie „LeaderSHIP 2020" als überarbeitete Version der Strategie „LeaderSHIP 2015" vorgestellt, um den neuen Herausforderungen, mit denen die Schiffbauindustrie konfrontiert ist, Rechnung zu tragen und den Umfang der Strategie auf weitere Industriebereiche des maritimen Sektors auszuweiten.

Die 24 Empfehlungen zu den vier Themenbereichen Beschäftigung und Qualifizierung, verbesserter Marktzugang und faire Marktbedingungen, Zugang zu Finanzmitteln sowie Forschung, Entwicklung und Innovation dienen als ein guter Ausgangspunkt, da sie Bestandteil einer europäischen Politik zum maritimen Industriesektor sind. Damit der Sektor erfolgreich umgestaltet und gleiche Wettbewerbsbedingungen geschaffen werden können, müssen Prioritäten festgelegt und konkrete Maßnahmen bestimmt werden.

1. Beabsichtigt die Kommission zu diesem Zweck einen Aktionsplan zu erstellen, der an die 24 Empfehlungen anknüpft? Falls ja, kann die Kommission grob sagen, wann solch ein Aktionsplan veröffentlicht und mit dem Europäischen Parlament erörtert werden soll?

2. Falls kein Aktionsplan geplant ist, wie gedenkt die Kommission dafür Sorge zu tragen, dass die Empfehlungen in die Praxis umgesetzt werden?

3. Wie will die Kommission dahin gehend das Image der Industrie verbessern?

4. Was genau beabsichtigt die Kommission zu tun, wenn es um die Verortung der Maßnahmen geht, damit die Erfordernisse in den unterschiedlichen Regionen im Hinblick auf Beschäftigung berücksichtigt werden?

5. Was tut die Kommission, um für eine bessere gegenseitige Anerkennung von Hochschulabschlüssen in den Mitgliedsländern zu sorgen?

6. Wie beabsichtigt die Kommission, der Erkundung marktgestützter zugänglicher Bürgschaften neuen Schwung zu verleihen?

7. Wie wird die Kommission öffentlich-private Partnerschaften für innovative Projekte und Demonstrationsvorhaben fördern, die mit einem hohen Risiko behaftet sind?

Antwort von Herrn Tajani im Namen der Kommission
(18. Juni 2013)

1./2. Die neue Strategie „LeaderSHIP 2020" wurde von der Industrie mit Unterstützung der Kommission entwickelt. Die Empfehlungen wenden sich an das gesamte Spektrum der Interessenträger einschließlich der Kommission. Eine Reihe von Empfehlungen betrifft jedoch die Industrie selbst und kann daher nicht in die Planung der Kommission aufgenommen werden. Bei der Umsetzung von Empfehlungen wird die Kommission gegebenenfalls eng mit der Branche, den Regionen und den Mitgliedstaaten zusammenarbeiten.

3. Die Kommission wird Initiativen der Industrie zur Imagepflege, etwa im Rahmen des Europäischen Tags der Meere, aktiv unterstützen.

4./5. Die Kommission arbeitet mit einem Netzwerk von Küstenregionen zusammen, dabei geht es sowohl um den Einsatz ihrer Instrumente für eine Bestandsaufnahme der Kompetenzen ([1]) als auch um die gegenseitige Anerkennung von Abschlüssen. Zudem forderte die Kommission einen Vertreter der Schiffsbauindustrie zur Mitarbeit am Programm ESCO ([2]) auf, um eine Bestandsaufnahme der entsprechenden Berufe und Qualifikationen als Grundlage für ihre Anerkennung durchzuführen. Sie bereitet außerdem ein Treffen der Branche mit der Europäischen Investitionsbank vor, auf dem Möglichkeiten zur Kreditvergabe erörtert werden sollen.

([1]) EU-Qualifikationsrat für die Branche/branchenspezifische Kompetenzbündnisse/EU-Kompetenzpanorama
([2]) ESCO ist das Programm der Kommission für eine europäische Klassifizierung von Fähigkeiten/Kompetenzen, Qulifikationen und Berufen. Nähere Informationen unter: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1042&langId=de

6. Wie im Bericht angegeben, werden Bürgschaften für den Schiffsbau von den kommerziellen Finanzmärkten gestellt und nach den in einigen Ländern geltenden Regelungen durch öffentliche Bürgschaften ergänzt. Es obliegt daher vor allem diesen Akteuren, zusammen mit ihren Kunden aus der Schifffahrts- und Werftenbranche, nach Möglichkeiten zu suchen, wie einem Marktversagen begegnet werden kann.

7. LeaderSHIP 2020 setzt einen deutlichen Schwerpunkt auf Innovation, mehr Umweltfreundlichkeit und Diversifizierung in neuen Märkten. Diese Zielsetzungen entsprechen der Initiative „Horizont 2020". In LeaderSHIP 2020 wird auch das Konzept einer öffentlich-privaten-Partnerschaft im Rahmen von Horizont 2020 erwähnt, welche derzeit von der Branche entwickelt wird. Diese könnte sich gegebenenfalls auf Demonstrationsvorhaben erstrecken. Forschungsprojekte könnten zudem durch die Europäische Investitionsbank finanziert werden.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004687/13
to the Commission
Knut Fleckenstein (S&D)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Implementation of the LeaderSHIP 2020 strategy

On 20 February 2013, the Commission held a high-level meeting where it presented the LeaderSHIP 2020 strategy as a revision of the LeaderSHIP 2015 strategy, in order to take account of new challenges facing the shipbuilding industry, as well as widening the scope to include more industries in the maritime cluster.

The 24 recommendations covering the four thematic areas of employment and skills, improving market access and fair market conditions, access to finance, and research, development and innovation serve as a good starting point in forming part of an EU maritime industry policy. In order to bring about the change needed in the sector and to create a level playing field, priorities have to be set and concrete actions have to be specified.

1. To this end, does the Commission plan to develop an action plan to follow up on the 24 recommendations? If so, approximately when will the Commission publish such an action plan and discuss it with Parliament?

2. If, however, the Commission does not plan to develop an action plan, how will it make sure that the recommendations are translated into practice?

3. To this end, how does the Commission plan to improve the image of the industry?

4. What exactly does the Commission plan to do in terms of mapping activities, so as to take into account the employment needs of the various regions?

5. What is the Commission doing to enhance the mutual recognition of degrees of EU graduates by Member States?

6. How does the Commission plan to create a new impetus to explore market-based accessible guarantees?

7. How will the Commission foster public-private partnerships for innovative projects and demonstration activities which are associated with high levels of risk?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(18 June 2013)

1-2. The new Leadership 2020 strategy has been developed by the industry with the support of the Commission. The recommendations are addressed to the variety of stakeholders, including the Commission. However, a number of them regard the industry and as such they cannot be included in the Commission's planning. The Commission will work closely with the industry, regions and Member States on the implementation of recommendations where appropriate.

3. The Commission will actively support initiatives of the industry to change its image, for example in the framework of the European Maritime Day.

4-5. The Commission collaborates with a network of coastal regions to make use of its tools for skills mapping ([1]) and for mutual degree recognition. Additionally, the Commission invited a maritime representative to ESCO ([2]) to map the maritime professions and qualifications as a basis for their recognition. It is also preparing a meeting of the industry with the European Investment Bank to discuss lending opportunities.

6. As indicated in the report, guarantees for the construction of ships are arranged by commercial financial markets, complemented by public guarantee schemes in some Member States. It is therefore primarily for these actors, together with their clients from the shipping and shipbuilding industry, to explore ways to address any market failures.

([1]) EU sectorial skills council/Sector skill alliances/EU skills Panorama.
([2]) ESCO is the Commission programme for the classification of European Skills, qualifications and Occupations. For more information, please click on: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1042&langId=en

7. LeaderSHIP2020 puts a strong focus on innovation, greening and diversification into emerging markets. These objectives are in line with Horizon2020. LeaderSHIP2020 also mentions the concept of PPP under Horizon2020 currently being developed by the industry. It could include demonstration projects as necessary. The EIB may also finance research projects.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004689/13
to the Commission
David Martin (S&D)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Use of Alpha Bank bailout funds in property legal cases

The Commission will be aware of the previous questions I have asked regarding the Cypriot property developer Alpha Panareti. The Commission will also be aware of the role that Alpha Bank has played in funding many of Panareti's schemes, and that Alpha Bank has also been a recipient of significant bailout funds from EU institutions.

Could the Commission clarify the nature of such bailouts, as well as the conditions that are put on a bank such as Alpha Bank? Does the Commission condone the use of bailout funds by Alpha Bank to pursue legal cases against persons who have bought properties from a property developer who is currently under investigation by the Commission and the Cypriot authorities for misleading customers?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2013)

Alpha Bank has received a capital injection of EUR 940 million from the Greek State and benefits from other aid measures ([1]) under the recapitalisation, the guarantee and the bond loan schemes, which are all part of the 'Support Measures for the Credit Institutions in Greece' approved by the Commission on 19 November 2008 ([2]). Alpha Bank has also received a recapitalisation from the Hellenic Financial Stability Fund (HFSF) of EUR 1.9 billion, temporarily approved ([3]) by the Commission on 27 July 2012 as rescue aid. Finally, in December 2012, the Bank received an additional recapitalisation of EUR 1 billion from the HFSF, not yet approved by the Commission. Alpha Bank has not received directly any bailout funds from EU institutions.

The Commission, in assessing the compatibility of the aid measures, has acknowledged the systemic importance of Alpha Bank for Greece and the fact that a default of the Bank would create a serious disturbance in the Greek economy. The Commission also took note that the difficulties for the Bank and consequently its need of aid measures came about mainly as a result of high losses on its holdings of Greek Government Bonds and the Greek protracted economy recession, and not as a result of mismanagement or excessive risk taking. The Commission does not enter into a loan-by-loan review of the loans granted by the aid beneficiary, nor does it interfere with the bank's litigation policy related to these loans.

The Commission will take a final decision on the recapitalisation of the Bank by the HFSF, on the basis of a restructuring plan, which must fulfil the requirements of the Restructuring Communication ([4]) as regards return to viability, burden-sharing and own contribution and measures limiting the distortion of competition.

([1]) As of 22 May 2012 the guarantees granted to Alpha Bank amounted to EUR 9.8 billion and the bond loans to about EUR 0.5 billion.

([2]) See Commission decision of 19 November 2008 in state aid N 560/2008 *'Support Measures for the Credit Institutions in Greece'*, OJ C 125, 5.6.2009, p. 6. It was attributed the number SA. 26678 (N 560/2008). That scheme was subsequently prolonged and amended.

([3]) See Commission decision of 27 July 2012 in state aid No SA. 34823 (2012/C, ex 2012/NN) *'Recapitalisation of Alpha Bank by the Hellenic Financial Stability Fund'*, OJ C 357, 20.11.2012, p. 36.

([4]) Communication from the Commission 'The return to viability and the assessment of restructuring measures in the financial sector in the current crisis under the state aid rules', OJ C 195, 19.8.2009, p. 9.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004690/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Linda McAvan (S&D)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Somalia — abuse against displaced persons

I have recently been made aware of a report by Human Rights Watch on the situation of internally displaced persons in Somalia ('Hostages of the Gatekeepers: Abuses against Internally Displaced in Mogadishu, Somalia'). The report states that members of state security forces and armed groups have raped, beaten, and otherwise abused displaced Somalis who have been arriving in Somalia's capital since 2011, fleeing famine and armed conflict.

Is the High Representative aware of this report? Has the issue been raised with the authorities in Mogadishu?

What action is the EU taking to help ensure that displaced communities in Somalia are protected from further abuse, and that the perpetrators are appropriately disciplined or prosecuted?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(14 June 2013)

The Human Rights Watch report rightly identifies the need for increased government protection for displaced communities with special attention to the protection of women and girls, and recalls the need to hold accountable those responsible for abuses.

Restoring security and rule of law is the priority of the EU support to Somalia. The EU is using all the instruments at its disposal in order to ensure minimum security conditions. For example, improving the human rights and gender awareness of the Somali security forces is a priority for the EU and is a central part of the training programme that the EU provides in its assistance to the Security Forces. Equally, the EU is supporting increased parliamentary and executive oversight, strengthened command and control structures as well as the structural reforms of the justice sector, to ensure that effective and impartial justice can be dispensed and those responsible for HR abuses can be held accountable. Nevertheless, changes are slow to deliver and necessitate concerted efforts of the international community.

In this respect, the recent international Somalia Conference in London recognised the importance of scaling up efforts to create the conditions for voluntary return and reintegration of Internally Displaced Persons and underlined that returns need to take place in the context of increased security conditions and livelihood opportunities. It was also agreed to work on tackling sexual violence in Somalia. The recent visit of the UN Special Representative on Sexual Violence in Conflict to Somalia was specifically recognised and the plans for Somali and international experts to make recommendations on how sexual violence could be addressed were welcomed.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004691/13
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Impact of public procurement on small businesses

A more sustainable and strategic approach to public procurement is now on the radar of policy-makers in Ireland. There is a belief that government policy on procurement in Ireland has the potential to eliminate small businesses from the tendering process, resulting in business closures, job losses, regional imbalances and, ultimately, less competition in the market. Centralised large aggregated contracts make it increasingly difficult for small innovative companies to compete. There are difficulties in small firms collaborating to make joint tender bids as they may fall foul of competition law and many do not have the necessary skills required for successful collaboration.

The Commission specifically advocates the 'think small first' principle in public procurement, highlighting the role SMEs play in society as providers of employment opportunities and as key players in the well-being of local communities.

Does the Commission have a plan in place that might limit the impact on smaller businesses? What are the requirements of Member States that implement public procurement, in relation to competition law?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2013)

SMEs are the backbone of the EU economy and need easier access to public procurement to develop their potential for job creation, growth and innovation. To optimise the possibilities of SMEs, the European Commission adopted the Small Business Act for Europe, which puts into place a comprehensive SME policy framework for the EU ([1]). In that ambit, a Code of best practices for public procurement ([2]) was adopted as an operational response given by the Commission to the problems SMEs face in accessing public markets. The Commission also encourages Member States to learn from each other how to foster SMEs via the Public Procurement Network ([3]). Moreover, the Commission Communication addresses basic standards for public contracts not subject to the provisions of the Public Procurement Directives ([4]). In addition, launched in 2008, the Enterprise Europe Network (EEN) offers support and advice to SMEs.

In December 2011, the Commission adopted its proposals on the public procurement reform to review the current Directives. They aim at an in-depth modernisation of public procurement legislation including, in particular, some targeted measures to favour SMEs access to public procurement. SMEs will benefit from general simplification measures, among them, the reduction of documentation requirements ([5]) and, in the medium term, the generalisation of the electronic communication in public procurement (e-procurement). Some other measures in the reform are specifically designed for SMEs, among them, the subdivision into lots for contracts above EUR 500 000 (e.g. application of the principle 'apply or explain') and a maximum turnover cap required to participate in a procurement procedure which cannot exceed three times the estimated value of the contract.

([1]) Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European parliament, the European Economic and social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, 'Thinks Small First', a 'Small Business Act' for Europe, COM(2008) 394 final.
([2]) 'European Code of Best Practices Facilitating Access by SMEs to Public Procurement Contracts', SEC(2008) 2193.
([3]) The Public Procurement Network is an informal European-wide cooperation network in the field of public procurement, established on January 31, 2003. The European Commission has the status of observer to the PPN and supports the activities within the Public Procurement Network.
([4]) Commission Interpretative Communication on the Community law applicable to contract awards not or not fully subject to the provisions of the Public Procurement Directive, 23.6.2006.
([5]) e.g. the self-declarations will be accepted and only the winning bidder will have to submit formal evidence.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004692/13
to the Commission
Sharon Bowles (ALDE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Leniency notice

Will the Commission answer the following questions:

1. How many leniency applications were received by the Commission under the 2006 Commission notice on immunity from fines and reduction of fines in cartel cases, (2006/C 298/11) (hereafter the '2006 notice') between the coming into force of the notice and 1April 2013 in total, and in each year in which the notice applied?

2. In how many cases was a conditional offer of immunity granted by the Commission? Please give the total numbers and numbers in total for each year in which the notice was applied.

3. In how many cases was a conditional offer of immunity withdrawn in total, and in each year in which the notice was applied? What were the reasons for the withdrawal of the conditional offer of immunity in each case?

4. How many markers have been granted under the 2006 notice in total, and in each year in which the notice was applied? What was the average marker period given by the Commission during which the applicant's priority was preserved?

5. In how many cases was a discount of 30-50% granted by the Commission in total, and in each year in which the notice was applied?

6. How many statements of objections were issued in cases where an application for immunity was received under the 2006 notice in total, and in each year in which the notice was applied?

7. What was the average time taken from receipt of the leniency application where an immunity was ultimately granted to the statement of objection to final prohibition decision?

8. Can the Commission list the nationalities of the corporate headquarters of the leniency applicants received and state the number of applications received from each country?

9. From which market sectors did the Commission receive leniency applications?

10. In how many cases did the Commission transfer leniency applications to the national competition authorities? Is the Commission aware of any instances where the applicant had not already applied for leniency before the national competition authority concerned?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(1 July 2013)

1. Until the end of 2012, 166 applications for immunity under the 2006 Leniency Notice were received.

2-3. Conditional immunity has been granted to more than 30% of these applications resulting so far in decisions covering 11 infringements. There were no 'withdrawals' of conditional immunity decisions.

4. The applications for immunity were preceded in around one third of the cases by a marker. Around 60 markers have been granted, typically for an initial period of three weeks.

5. In all 11 infringements, where a decision was adopted, a company has received a leniency reduction in the 30 to 50% band.

6. In 15 cases, a statement of objections or a supplementary statement of objections was issued.

7. It took on average slightly less than three years from receipt of the immunity application to a statement of objections and more than one year from the statement of objections to the decision for the seven Commission decisions adopted so far where an application of immunity under the 2006 Leniency Notice was made.

8-9. In order to safeguard its investigations and the efficiency of the Leniency Notice, the Commission does not publish the number of its immunity applicants by nationality and the sectors concerned. Similar approach is followed by the national authorities.

10. Around 30% of immunity applications also received by the Commission are dealt with by one or more national competition authorities.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004693/13
to the Commission
Sharon Bowles (ALDE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Leniency Notice

Could the Commission answer the following questions:

1. In how many cases was a leniency application made in parallel with the US Corporate Leniency Programme?

2. Were any other parallel applications made in respect of the leniency programme with other third countries and if so, with which states?

3. In how many cases where an immunity application has been received has the Commission decided neither to pursue the matter itself nor to refer it to a national competition authority (NCA)? What were the Commission's reasons for these decisions?

4. How many cases is the Commission aware of where it has received a leniency application and where an NCA also investigated the same matter in respect of the period prior to the Member State's accession?

5. What percentage of the statements of objections issued by the Commission originated from information obtained from a leniency applicant, compared with information obtained from a complainant or an own-initiative investigation? Please provide totals by total number and by each year in which the Leniency Notice has been applied.

6. What percentage of (a) immunity applications and (b) leniency applications have resulted in an infringement finding against the applicant in relation to the cartel in question, and correspondingly, what percentage have not resulted in such a finding? In the case of the latter, how many cases were involved, and what were the Commission's reasons for not pursuing a case against each applicant concerned?

7. Since the entry into force of the 2006 Leniency Notice, have any requests been made for information obtained from leniency applicants? How many requests have been made by potential plaintiffs? How many requests have been made by courts? How many requests have been granted? From which countries have such requests been made?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2013)

1. The Commission does not keep data on the number of applications under the 2006 Leniency Notice that were made in parallel with the US Department of Justice (DoJ). However, every international cartel is typically reported at least to the DoJ and the European Commission.

2. Parallel applications have been made with other third countries such as Japan, Korea, Canada, Australia, Switzerland, Brazil and Mexico.

3 & 6. Less than half of the 166 applications for immunity under the 2006 Leniency Notice received until the end of 2012 are dealt with by one or more NCAs or they are not further pursued by the Commission.

Conditional immunity decisions have been granted to around 40% of the applications resulting so far in Commission decisions covering 11 infringements. 20% of the applications are still reviewed.

4. In around half a dozen cases an NCA has investigated the same matter in respect of the period prior to that Member State's accession.

5. Of the 43 cartel statements of objections issued by the Commission since 2006, 33 cases originated from information obtained from a leniency applicant, compared with 10 with information obtained from a complainant or an own-initiative investigation.

7. The Commission has received requests for documents from leniency applicants pursuant to Regulation No 1049/2001 and has been informed of requests by claimants in proceedings before courts within and outside the EU. In all such cases, it has informed the requesting party or court that leniency documents shall not be disclosed. The Commission itself has never disclosed a corporate statement from a leniency applicant.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004694/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(26 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Made in Italy e settore conciario: difficoltà di approvvigionamento della materia grezza

Accanto alla concorrenza sleale, alla contraffazione e alla generale situazione di crisi, il settore conciario italiano denuncia oggi una nuova difficoltà legata all'approvvigionamento della materia prima grezza continentale sottoposta a un crescente protezionismo che ne blocca il 50 % della circolazione.

La materia prima continentale, per il 47 %, viene ritirata dal mercato dai competitori stranieri, soprattutto cinesi, grazie anche al sostegno di finanziamenti pubblici. Sebbene dunque le multinazionali continuino a fare richiesta di prodotti conciari made in Italy, il settore deve rifiutare tali ordini per mancanza di materia prima.

Può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se è a conoscenza di questa preoccupante situazione che rischia di mettere ulteriormente in ginocchio un importante settore del made in Italy;

2. quali misure intende applicare per proteggere il settore conciario italiano, il made in Italy e tutte le imprese e i lavoratori del comparto;

3. se ha in progetto di avviare con urgenza tavoli di negoziazione per definire rapporti bilaterali che riaprano il mercato della materia prima grezza aiutandolo a superare la concorrenza, anche sleale, di paesi come ad esempio la Cina?

Risposta di Karel De Gucht a nome della Commissione
(12 giugno 2013)

Dall'adozione dell'iniziativa europea sulle materie prime, avvenuta nel 2008, la questione della disponibilità di materie prime figura al vertice tra le priorità della Commissione ([1]). Tale iniziativa presenta una forte componente commerciale, che mira a garantire un approvvigionamento equo e sostenibile di materie prime provenienti dal mercato mondiale. La comunicazione intitolata «Affrontare le sfide relative ai mercati dei prodotti di base e alle materie prime» ([2]), avallata dalla Commissione nel 2011, ha dato nuovo impulso a questa iniziativa confermando l'elevata priorità politica che la contraddistingue e rafforzando ulteriormente la sua componente commerciale.

Sono stati presi diversi provvedimenti coronati dal successo e la Commissione continuerà ad operare rifacendosi ai tre pilastri della strategia commerciale per le materie prime, vale a dire negoziare norme commerciali nell'ambito di trattative bilaterali e multilaterali, applicare tali norme e coinvolgere attivamente i paesi terzi.

La strategia commerciale della Commissione nel campo delle materie prime ha già contribuito a migliorare l'accesso a queste ultime per l'industria conciaria dell'Unione: la Commissione ha recentemente concluso i negoziati per un accordo di libero scambio globale e approfondito con l'Ucraina che stabilisce l'eliminazione dei dazi all'esportazione di pelli grezze; all'epoca dell'adesione della Russia all'OMC la Commissione ha altresì negoziato l'impegno assunto dalla Russia a ridurre significativamente e vincolare il tasso dei dazi all'esportazione di tali pelli.

La Commissione vigila costantemente sugli sviluppi delle restrizioni all'esportazione e prende le misure del caso nei confronti dei paesi terzi. Laddove il dialogo non conduca al risultato atteso la Commissione è anche pronta a ricorrere alla procedura di risoluzione delle controversie dell'OMC, come già accaduto nel primo procedimento contro le restrizioni imposte dalla Cina all'esportazione di diverse materie prime, conclusosi positivamente all'inizio del 2012.

([1]) Comunicazione della Commissione al Parlamento europeo ed al Consiglio. L'iniziativa «materie prime» — rispondere ai nostri bisogni fondamentali per garantire la crescita e creare posti di lavoro in Europa.
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2008:0699:FIN:IT:PDF

([2]) Comunicazione della Commissione al Parlamento europeo, al Consiglio, al Comitato Economico e Sociale europeo e al Comitato delle Regioni — affrontare le sfide relative ai mercati dei prodotti di base e alle materie prime.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004694/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: 'Made in Italy' products and the leather industry: difficulties in procuring raw material

Alongside unfair competition, counterfeiting and the crisis in general, the Italian leather industry is now highlighting a new difficulty concerning the procurement of continental raw material, which is subject to growing protectionism that has blocked 50% of the movement of raw material.

Forty-seven per cent of continental raw material is removed from the market by foreign competitors, particularly the Chinese, aided also by public funding. Therefore, although the multinationals continue to request leather products made in Italy, the industry has to refuse these orders owing to a lack of raw material.

1. Is the Commission aware of this worrying situation, which risks further crippling a major sector of Made in Italy products?

2. What measures does it intend to put in place to protect the Italian leather industry, Made in Italy products and all of the sector's firms and workers?

3. Does it intend to urgently launch negotiations to define bilateral relations which will reopen the raw material market and help it overcome competition, including unfair competition, from countries such as China?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2013)

The issue of availability of raw materials is high on the Commission's agenda since the adoption in 2008 of the 'Raw Material Initiative' ([1]). This initiative has a strong trade component that aims at ensuring a fair and sustainable supply of raw materials from global markets. The communication entitled 'Tackling the challenges in commodity markets and raw materials' ([2]), which was endorsed by the Commission in 2011 renewed this initiative, confirming its high political priority and further reinforcing its trade component.

A number of steps have been successfully taken and the Commission will continue to pursue work along the lines of three pillars of the trade strategy for raw materials, i.e. to negotiate trade rules in bilateral and multilateral negotiations, to enforce these rules; and to reach out to third countries.

The Commission's trade strategy for raw materials has already delivered positive results to improve access to raw materials by the EU leather industry: the Commission recently concluded the negotiations on a Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement with Ukraine providing for the elimination of export duties on raw hides and skins; at the time of Russia's accession to the WTO, the Commission negotiated Russia's commitment to significantly reduce and bind its export duty rates on raw hides and skins.

The Commission is constantly monitoring new developments on export restrictions and taking action vis-à-vis third countries. When dialogue fails, the Commission is also ready to use the WTO dispute settlement procedure, as in the first case against China's export restrictions on a number of raw materials that was successfully concluded early 2012.

([1]) Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council. The raw materials initiative — meeting our critical needs for growth and jobs in Europe: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2008:0699:FIN:EN:PDF

([2]) Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions tackling the challenges in commodity markets and on raw materials.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-004695/13
till kommissionen
Carl Schlyter (Verts/ALE)
(26 april 2013)

Angående: Fall SA.33618 Uppsala arena

Skulle kommissionen kunna informera mig om vad som händer i detta fall?

Om kommissionen inte kan informera om fallet eller inte accepterar klagan, kan ni informera om kommissionen planerar några förändringar av statsstödsreglerna för att hindra att lokala myndigheter gynnar vissa privata intressen?

Svar från Joaquín Almunia på kommissionens vägnar
(19 juni 2013)

Vad beträffar parlamentsledamotens fråga om Uppsala arena har kommissionen den 2 maj 2013 kommit fram till att den nya multiarenan i Uppsala är förenlig med EU:s regler om statligt stöd. Kommissionen anser att den offentliga medfinansieringen av arenan står i proportion till det mål som ska uppnås och är begränsad till det minimum som krävs för att nå detta mål (läs pressmeddelandet här http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-394_sv.htm). Den icke-konfidentiella versionen av beslutet kommer att kunna läsas på GD Konkurrens webbplats och i Europeiska unionens officiella tidning så fort konfidentialitetsfrågorna har lösts.

Vad beträffar parlamentsledamotens fråga om möjliga ändringar av reglerna för statligt stöd överväger kommissionen att reformera reglerna (läs mera här http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/modernisation/index_en.html).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004695/13
to the Commission
Carl Schlyter (Verts/ALE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Case SA.33618 Uppsala arena

Could the Commission let me know what is happening in this case?

If it cannot provide information on the case or does not accept the action, can it say whether it is planning to make any changes to the state aid rules in order to prevent local authorities from favouring certain private interests?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2013)

As regards the Honourable Member's question on the Uppsala arena case, the Commission authorised the aid to the new multi-purpose arena in Uppsala on 2 May 2013. The Commission found the public co-financing of the arena to be both proportional to the objective pursued and limited to the minimum necessary to attain that objective (see also press release http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-394_en.htm). The non-confidential version of the decision will be made available on the DG Competition website once any confidentiality issues have been resolved and it will be published in the OJ.

As regards the Honourable Member's question on possible changes to the state aid rules, the Commission is contemplating a reform of those rules; for more information see:
http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/modernisation/index_en.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004696/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Marco Scurria (PPE)
(26 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Condanna a morte di Raif Badawi

Raif Badawi è un venticinquenne saudita, blogger e attivista per i diritti umani, arrestato nel dicembre del 2009 all'aeroporto di Jeddah dalle autorità arabe senza alcuna motivazione mentre stava per prendere un volo per Beirut. Fu in seguito accusato di aver pubblicato sul suo blog materiale in contrasto con i valori islamici, insultando Dio e attaccando alte autorità religiose come il Gran Muftì. Secondo l'accusa, Raif avrebbe pubblicato commenti sarcastici accusando la polizia religiosa di brutalità e un post intitolato «è Dio iniquo?». La difesa sostiene che nel procedimento a carico di Raif siano state violate 13 regole giudiziarie e legali richiedendo l'intervento del Ministro della giustizia.

Tutto questo fa parte di un piano di oppressione e controllo sociale. Da mesi ormai il regime saudita si sta dedicando a rendere più severe le pene per il reato di blasfemia, specialmente sul web e in particolare nei siti sociali.

Raif Badawi è stato condannato il dicembre scorso alla pena capitale per apostasia.

Può il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante Ashton chiarire se intende sollecitare e fare pressione sulla comunità internazionale e sull'Arabia Saudita affinché sia risparmiata la vita all'ennesimo dissidente che denuncia la repressione e la paura in Arabia Saudita?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(2 agosto 2013)

L'AR/VP e suoi servizi sono a conoscenza del caso Raif Badawi.

In base alle informazioni disponibili al momento della redazione, Raif Badawi non è attualmente accusato di apostasia, la quale comporta una condanna a morte, in quanto un tribunale superiore ha respinto l'accusa il 21 gennaio 2013.

In accordo con la sua posizione di principio contro la pena capitale, l'UE si sta attivamente occupando della questione in generale, attraverso dichiarazioni pubbliche e iniziative private. La scelta delle misure da adottare è sempre basata sulla valutazione della loro efficacia.

Oltre a sfruttare ogni occasione per affermare all'Arabia Saudita la propria posizione riguardo alla pena di morte e la propria preoccupazione in merito all'alto numero di persone giustiziate, l'Unione chiede regolarmente al paese di prendere in considerazione almeno una moratoria. Di fronte a tale richiesta le autorità saudite sostengono che la pena di morte è parte integrante della loro cultura, tradizione e religione e che la legge islamica non può essere modificata.

Malgrado tali difficoltà, l'AR/VP e suoi servizi continueranno a sollevare la questione della pena capitale con le autorità saudite attraverso i canali appropriati e a seguire gli sviluppi specifici del caso Raif Badawi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004696/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Marco Scurria (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Raif Badawi sentenced to death

Raif Badawi is a 25-year-old Saudi Arabian blogger and human rights activist. He was arrested in December 2009 at Jeddah airport by the Saudi authorities for no reason, as he was about to fly to Beirut. He was subsequently accused of publishing material on his blog which ran counter to Islamic values, insulted God and attacked high religious authorities such as the Grand Mufti. According to the prosecution, Raif published sarcastic comments accusing the religious police of brutality and a post entitled 'Is God unjust?'. The defence claims that during the proceedings against Raif, 13 judicial and legal rules were breached, and is calling for the Minister for Justice to intervene.

All this is part of a plan for oppression and social control. For months now, the Saudi regime has been focused on increasing the severity of punishments for the offence of blasphemy, especially on the Internet and on social sites in particular.

In December, Raif Badawi was sentenced to death for apostasy.

Can Vice-President/High Representative Ashton clarify whether she intends to put pressure on the international community and on Saudi Arabia in order to save the life of the latest in a long line of dissidents who denounce the repression and fear in Saudi Arabia?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(2 August 2013)

The HR/VP and her services are aware of Mr Badawi's case.

According to information available at the time of drafting Mr Badawi is currently not facing apostasy charges, involving a death sentence, as an upper court dismissed the charge on 21 January 2013.

The EU is actively addressing the issue of death penalty in general, based upon the EU's principled position against capital punishment. The diplomatic range from public statements, to more private demarches. The choice of action is always based upon an assessment of what action would be the most effective.

In addition to using every opportunity to flag to Saudi Arabia its principled line on death penalty and its concerns over the high number of individuals executed, the EU regularly asks Saudi Arabia to consider at least a moratorium. When confronted with this request, the Saudi authorities argue that death penalty is enshrined in their culture, tradition and religion and that the Islamic law cannot be changed.

In spite of these difficulties the HR/VP and her services will continue to raise the issue of capital punishment with the Saudi authorities through appropriate channels and will continue to monitor developments on the specific case of Mr Badawi.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004697/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Marietta Giannakou (PPE) και Maria Eleni Koppa (S&D)
(26 Απριλίου 2013)

Θέμα: Αδιαφανείς διαδικασίες στις προσλήψεις υπαλλήλων με συμβάσεις ορισμένου χρόνου (CAST) στα θεσμικά όργανα της ΕΕ

Σύμφωνα με τους εσωτερικούς κανονισμούς της ΕΕ, τα θεσμικά όργανα και οι οργανισμοί της Ένωσης απασχολούν προσωπικό με συμβάσεις ορισμένου χρόνου για την κάλυψη αναγκών σε ειδικούς τομείς, στους οποίους δεν υπάρχουν αρκετοί μόνιμοι υπάλληλοι.

Οι συμβασιούχοι προσλαμβάνονται κατόπιν σχετικού ειδικού διαγωνισμού που διοργανώνει συνήθως η Ευρωπαϊκή Υπηρεσία Επιλογής Προσωπικού. Σε περίπτωση επιτυχίας στους διαγωνισμούς αυτούς, τα ονόματα των επιτυχόντων περιέρχονται σε μια βάση δεδομένων-λίστα επιτυχόντων, βάσει της οποίας τα ίδια τα θεσμικά όργανα και οι οργανισμοί της ΕΕ καλύπτουν, κατόπιν συνεντεύξεως, τις ανάγκες τους για έκτακτο προσωπικό. Τα ονόματα των επιτυχόντων παραμένουν κατά κανόνα στη βάση δεδομένων για ένα διάστημα τριών ετών. Μετά το πέρας της τριετίας, οι επιτυχόντες διαγράφονται από τη σχετική λίστα.

Παρόλα αυτά, παρατηρούνται συχνά φαινόμενα υποψηφίων, οι οποίοι, ενώ έχουν επιτύχει σε πολλούς σχετικούς διαγωνισμούς, δεν έχουν κληθεί ποτέ για συνέντευξη από κανένα θεσμικό όργανο της Ένωσης. Παράλληλα, σημειώνονται περιπτώσεις υποψηφίων, οι οποίοι προσελήφθησαν με συμβάσεις ορισμένου χρόνου, παρότι είχε παρέλθει κατά πολύ το όριο της τριετίας.

Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη τα παραπάνω ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Ποιος είναι ο συνολικός αριθμός κοινοτικών υπαλλήλων με συμβάσεις ορισμένου χρόνου, που απασχολούνται αυτή τη στιγμή σε όλα τα θεσμικά όργανα της ΕΕ;

2. Ποιος ήταν χρονικά ο μέσος όρος παραμονής τους στις λίστες των επιτυχόντων πριν από την πρόσληψή τους; Σε ποιες περιπτώσεις δεν τηρείται το χρονικό όριο της τριετίας και πώς αυτό δικαιολογείται;

3. Δεδομένου ότι δεν τηρείται σειρά κατάταξης στις λίστες των επιτυχόντων, με ποιον τρόπο διασφαλίζεται ο αξιοκρατικός χαρακτήρας των προσλήψεων;

4. Διαθέτει στοιχεία σχετικά με τον αριθμό κοινοτικών υπαλλήλων που, ενώ προσελήφθησαν με συμβάσεις ορισμένου χρόνου, στη συνέχεια μετετράπησαν οι συμβάσεις τους σε αορίστου χρόνου;

Απάντηση του κ. Šefčovič εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(23 Ιουλίου 2013)

1. Η Επιτροπή δεν είναι σε θέση να δώσει τις ζητούμενες πληροφίες επειδή δεν διαθέτει τα απαιτούμενα στοιχεία για τα άλλα θεσμικά όργανα της ΕΕ.

2. Οι κανόνες σχετικά με την ισχύ των πινάκων CAST καθορίζονται από την αρχή που είναι αρμόδια για τη σύναψη των συμβάσεων, η οποία μπορεί να επεκτείνει αυτούς τους πίνακες. Αυτό γινόταν έως τώρα για όλους τους πίνακες γενικά χωρίς καμία μεμονωμένη παρέκκλιση.

3. Η Επιτροπή δεν συμμετέχει στην πρόσληψη συμβασιούχων υπαλλήλων σε άλλα θεσμικά όργανα της ΕΕ ούτε στους εσωτερικούς τους διαγωνισμούς. Ο κανονισμός υπηρεσιακής κατάστασης παρέχει σε κάθε θεσμικό όργανο σημαντικό βαθμό ευελιξίας από την άποψη αυτή. Η οργάνωση των διαγωνισμών επιλογής συμβασιούχων υπαλλήλων από την Ευρωπαϊκή Υπηρεσία Επιλογής Προσωπικού (EPSO) είναι μια δυνατότητα που εξασφαλίζει αξιοκρατικό σύστημα προσλήψεων που μπορεί να συνδυαστεί με συνέντευξη.

4. Μόνο σε συμβασιούχους υπαλλήλους της ομάδας καθηκόντων I και σε συμβασιούχους υπαλλήλους που εργάζονται σε γραφεία διοικητικής υπηρεσίας, οργανισμούς και αντιπροσωπείες μπορεί να προσφερθεί σύμβαση αορίστου χρόνου αφού είχαν μια σύμβαση ορισμένου χρόνου. Η Επιτροπή δεν είναι σε θέση να δώσει τα ζητούμενα στοιχεία δεδομένου ότι δεν διαθέτει τις απαιτούμενες πληροφορίες για τα άλλα θεσμικά όργανα της ΕΕ.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004697/13
to the Commission
Marietta Giannakou (PPE) and Maria Eleni Koppa (S&D)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Non-transparent EU recruitment procedures for staff on fixed-term contracts (CAST)

According to the EU's rules of procedure, Union institutions and bodies may employ staff on fixed-term contracts in order to meet requirements in specific sectors in which there are insufficient permanent employees.

Contract staff are recruited following a special procedure, which is usually organised by the European Personnel Selection Office. The names of successful candidates are entered in a database, from which the EU institutions and bodies select staff, following an interview, in order to meet their additional staffing requirements. The names of successful candidates remain in the database for three years, after which they are deleted from the relevant list.

Despite this, candidates who have successfully passed numerous such procedures are often never called for an interview by any Union institution. At the same time, some candidates have been recruited on fixed-term contracts well after the three-year limit.

In light of the above, will the Commission say:

1. How many employees on fixed-term contracts are currently being employed by all the EU institutions?

2. How long on average were their names in the database of successful candidates prior to their recruitment? When is the three-year limit ignored and how is that justified?

3. Given that successful candidates are not ranked, what is done to ensure that recruitment is meritocratic?

4. Does it have data on the number of Union employees whose initial fixed-term contract was later converted to an open-ended contract?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(23 July 2013)

1. The Commission cannot provide the requested information since it does not have the required information with regard to other EU institutions.

2. The rules concerning the validity of the CAST lists are fixed by the Contracting Authority which can extend these lists. This has been done up to now for all lists on a general basis without any individual derogation.

3. The Commission is not involved in the recruitment of contract agents in other EU institutions and their internal procedures. The Staff Regulations provide each institution with a considerable degree of flexibility in this regard. The organisation of selection procedures for contract agents through EPSO is one possibility to ensure merit based recruitment which can be combined with subsequent interviews.

4. Only contract staff in Function Group I and contract staff working in administrative offices, agencies, delegations and representations can benefit from an indefinite contract after having a fixed-term contract. The Commission cannot provide the requested data since it does not have the required information with regard to other EU institutions.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004698/13
to the Commission
Chris Davies (ALDE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Raising standards in European zoos

Can the Commission confirm that a stakeholder liaison group of experts has been established to develop a best practice document to assist Member States to implement and enforce the requirements of the Zoos Directive (1999/22/EC).

Will such a document make reference to the need to evaluate conservation and educational programmes in zoos, and will it include the species-specific advice about animal welfare standards that is so important if conditions for all animals are to be improved?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2013)

The Commission can confirm that within the framework of work to develop a guidance and best practice document on the Zoos Directive ([1]), a Stakeholder Liaison Group (SLG) has been established. The SLG involves representatives from key interests, including the Member States, and its role is to provide advice and support to the development of the guidance document. The document is intended to consist of a thorough, operationally detailed and science-based compilation and summary of relevant information in order to provide a comprehensive up-to-date reference to support practitioners and Member States in implementing the directive. The document is under preparation and issues such as those suggested by the Honourable Member will also be considered.

([1]) Directive 99/22/EC, OJ L 94, 9.4.1999.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004699/13
aan de Commissie
Bastiaan Belder (EFD)
(26 april 2013)

Betreft: Uitvoering van de richtlijn betreffende vervalste geneesmiddelen

Richtlijn 2011/62/EU, beter bekend als de richtlijn betreffende vervalste geneesmiddelen, werd op 8 juni 2011 goedgekeurd en heeft als doel te verhinderen dat vervalste geneesmiddelen in de distributieketen terechtkomen. In deze richtlijn wordt er onder meer geëist dat er voor werkzame farmaceutische stoffen (WFS) die in de EU worden ingevoerd, een schriftelijke verklaring wordt afgegeven waarin staat dat deze bestanddelen voldoen aan kwaliteitsnormen die equivalent zijn met de in de EU geldende normen. Deze specifieke eis wordt van kracht op 2 juli 2013 en fabrikanten en importeurs van geneesmiddelen zijn zich momenteel hierop aan het voorbereiden. De autoriteiten van derde landen zijn begonnen met de voorbereidingen voor het certifiëren van fabrikanten van WFS in hun eigen land, maar het is mogelijk dat de bepalingen voor landen die grote exporteurs zijn, tegen 2 juli 2013 nog niet of slechts gedeeltelijk kunnen worden uitgevoerd.

De farmaceutische sector heeft herhaaldelijk schriftelijke informatie doen toekomen aan fabrikanten van WFS wereldwijd en bewustmakingsactiviteiten georganiseerd, maar de respons van de fabrikanten hierop was klein. Op 2 juli 2013 wordt de vereiste inzake geïmporteerde WFS van kracht en zal de invoer van buiten de EU geproduceerde WFS in de EU verboden worden, tenzij de bevoegde autoriteiten in het land van productie formeel bevestigen dat de WFS in overeenstemming met de kwaliteitsnormen van de EU zijn vervaardigd. Dat betekent dat het totale aantal WFS dat in de EU wordt ingevoerd, met wel 40 % zou kunnen dalen, met mogelijkerwijs rampzalige gevolgen voor de toegang van patiënten in de EU tot kwalitatief hoogstaande geneesmiddelen. De farmaceutische sector heeft een aantal concrete voorstellen gedaan om het niveau van de bescherming van de volksgezondheid zo hoog mogelijk te houden (d.w.z. dat kwaliteit op de eerste plaats komt) en tegelijk voor een continue toelevering van WFS te zorgen en geneesmiddelenschaarste te verhinderen.

Is de Commissie eventueel bereid om de opstelling te bevorderen van een EU-classificatie (beoordeling) van de landen die partij zijn bij het verdrag inzake farmaceutische inspectie en de samenwerkingsregeling inzake farmaceutische inspectie (PIC/S), uitgaande van de gelijkwaardigheid van de richtsnoeren van de EU en het PIC inzake goede praktijken bij het vervaardigen van geneesmiddelen? Zou de Commissie ook overwegen om de leden van de internationale conferentie voor harmonisering (ICH) in deze beoordeling op te nemen?

Kan de Commissie de interpretatie verduidelijken van de uitzonderlijke omstandigheden die een verklaring van afstand van het tweede type mogelijk maken (bijvoorbeeld wanneer een derde land niet bereid is schriftelijke verklaringen te verstrekken)? Is een door één lidstaat aangevraagde verklaring van afstand automatisch ook van toepassing voor andere lidstaten, zonder dat zij hier uitdrukkelijk om verzoeken?

Is de Commissie van plan de term „geldig EU-certificaat inzake goede praktijken bij het vervaardigen van geneesmiddelen" te interpreteren als „een geldig certificaat of een equivalent instrument of ander positief certificaat van een instantie in een land met normen die gelijkwaardig zijn met de EU-eisen inzake goede praktijken bij het vervaardigen van geneesmiddelen" (zoals Zwitserland, de VS en Australië)?

Antwoord van de heer Borg namens de Commissie
(6 juni 2013)

Aanvragen voor opname in de EU-lijst worden ingediend op initiatief van het aanvragende derde land. De Commissie zet zich er continu voor in om exporterende derde landen in te lichten over de geldende voorschriften en de aanvraagprocedure te vergemakkelijken. Artikel 111 ter van Richtlijn 2001/83/EG van het Europees Parlement en de Raad ([1]) bevat geen uitzonderingen voor landen die lid zijn van de PIC/S. In de gelijkwaardigheidsbeoordeling wordt echter wel uitdrukkelijk rekening gehouden met de naleving van internationaal vastgestelde richtsnoeren ([2]).

Zie antwoord op punt 1. Zowel Japan als de Verenigde Staten — de twee niet tot de EU behorende ICH-leden — hebben een aanvraag ingediend voor opname in de lijst; momenteel wordt de beoordelingsprocedure voor beide landen voltooid.

([1]) PB L 311 van 28.11.2011, blz. 67.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/files/gmp/2012_10_list.pdf

Artikel 46 ter, lid 4, van Richtlijn 2001/83/EG biedt lidstaten de mogelijkheid om af te zien van de vereiste „schriftelijke verklaring" indien dat nodig blijkt om een tekort aan geneesmiddelen te voorkomen.

Het is aan elke lidstaat om zelf te beslissen of hij al dan niet gebruikmaakt van de mogelijkheid tot afstand van het tweede type, en om de Europese Commissie proactief kennis te geven van zijn besluit.

De formulering van Richtlijn 2001/83/EG staat de Commissie niet toe om de term „geldig EU-certificaat inzake goede praktijken bij het vervaardigen van geneesmiddelen" te interpreteren als „een geldig certificaat of een equivalent instrument of ander positief certificaat van een instantie in een land met normen die gelijkwaardig zijn met de EU-eisen inzake goede praktijken bij het vervaardigen van geneesmiddelen".

Een EU-certificaat inzake goede praktijken bij het vervaardigen van geneesmiddelen is een certificaat dat is afgegeven door de bevoegde nationale autoriteit van een lidstaat. De autoriteit van een niet-EU-land die een schriftelijke verklaring aflevert kan zich daarbij echter baseren op de resultaten van de controles van de autoriteiten van de EU of andere autoriteiten die gelijkwaardige normen inzake goede praktijken bij de vervaardiging toepassen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004699/13
to the Commission
Bastiaan Belder (EFD)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Implementation of the Falsified Medicines Directive

Directive 2011/62/EU, commonly known as the 'Falsified Medicines Directive', was adopted on 8 June 2011 and is aimed at combating the risk of counterfeit or sub-standard medicine ingredients entering the supply chain. The specific requirement for a written confirmation that active pharmaceutical ingredients (APIs) imported into the EU comply with quality standards equivalent to those valid in the EU comes into force on 2 July 2013, and manufacturers and importers of medicines are now preparing for that deadline. Authorities in third countries have started preparations for the certification of API manufacturers in their own countries, but for major exporting countries the provisions may not be in place or fully operational by 2 July 2013.

The pharmaceutical industry has repeatedly sent information letters to API manufacturers worldwide and organised awareness-raising activities, despite a lack of response from these API manufacturers. On 2 July 2013, the requirement for API importation included in the new Directive will enter into effect, forbidding the importation into the EU of APIs manufactured outside of the EU, unless the competent authorities in the country of manufacture certify that the API has been manufactured in accordance with EU quality standards. Therefore, the total amount of APIs imported into the EU could be cut by up to 40%, leading to a potentially disastrous situation for access to quality medicines for EU patients. The pharmaceutical industry has put forward a number of concrete proposals which are designed to ensure the highest level of public health protection (i.e. putting quality first) while securing a continuous supply of APIs and preventing medicines shortages.

Would the Commission be willing to consider facilitating the EU listing (EU assessment) of Pharmaceutical Inspection Convention and Pharmaceutical Inspection Cooperation Scheme (PIC/S) member countries, based on the equivalence of the EU and PIC/S GMP Guidelines covering APIs? Would the Commission also consider including International Conference on Harmonisation (ICH) members in such an assessment?

Could the Commission clarify the interpretation of 'exceptional circumstances' mentioned as 'waiver 2' options, such as the lack of readiness of third countries to issue written confirmations, for example? Is a waiver requested by one Member State automatically extensible to other Member States without their explicit request?

Does the Commission plan to interpret the term 'valid EU-GMP' certificate as 'a valid certificate or equivalent instrument or other positive certificate from an authority in a country with standards equivalent to those of EU-GMP requirements' (such as in Switzerland, USA, Australia, for example)?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2013)

Applications for 'EU listing' are submitted at the initiative of the applicant third country. The Commission has engaged continuously with exporting third countries to clarify the applicable requirements and facilitate the application process. Article 111b of Directive 2001/83/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council ([1]) does not include exceptions for PIC/S member countries. However, the adherence to internationally established guidelines is explicitly taken into account in the equivalence assessment ([2]).

See reply to point 1. Japan and the United States, the two non-EU ICH members, both applied for 'listing' and the assessment procedure for both is being finalised.

Article 46b (4) of Directive 2001/83/EC gives Member States the possibility to waive the requirement for 'written confirmation' when necessary to prevent shortages of medicines.

It is up to each Member State to decide independently whether to use waiver 2 or not, and proactively communicate its decision to the European Commission.

([1]) OJ L311, 28.11.2011, p. 67.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/files/gmp/2012_10_list.pdf

The wording of Directive 2001/83/EC does not allow the Commission to interpret the term 'valid EU-GMP' certificate as 'a valid certificate or equivalent instrument or other positive certificate from an authority in a country with standards equivalent to those of EU-GMP requirements'.

An EU-GMP certificate is a certificate issued by the competent national authority of a Member State. However the authority of a non-EU country issuing a written confirmation may base itself on inspection results from EU authorities or other authorities applying equivalent standards for good manufacturing practice

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004701/13
à la Commission
Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(26 avril 2013)

Objet: L'interdiction du géraniol dans la fabrication de parfums

En juin 2012, la Commission européenne a commandé un rapport scientifique au dermatologue anglais Ian White pour évaluer la dangerosité de certains composants dans la fabrication de parfums.

Le rapport recommande d'interdire trois ingrédients potentiellement allergisants et de limiter drastiquement l'utilisation de certaines substances naturelles, dont le géraniol. Cette molécule est présente dans les ingrédients fortement utilisés dans les parfums, comme le citron, la rose, etc.

Le fait de considérer une molécule comme allergène la placerait parmi les produits interdits ou à usage limité, et entraînerait *de facto* un véritable bouleversement dans le monde de la parfumerie.

La Commission estime-t-elle que d'autres études complémentaires seraient nécessaires avant de valider les résultats de ce rapport et entraîner ce bouleversement majeur dans l'univers de la parfumerie?

Le fait de considérer une molécule comme allergène doit-il automatiquement avoir pour effet de la classer dans les produits interdits ou à usage limité, alors que de nombreux produits allergènes, notamment dans l'alimentation, sont autorisés sans restriction.

La Commission ne considère-t-elle pas que l'étiquetage des produits considérés comme allergènes dans un parfum soit suffisant, afin de préserver la recette intégrale et secrète des parfums?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(6 juin 2013)

L'avis sur les ingrédients de parfum allergènes dans les produits cosmétiques a été publié en juin 2012 par le comité scientifique pour la sécurité des consommateurs, un organisme d'évaluation des risques indépendant qui assiste la Commission. Pour toute question portant sur les suites réservées par la Commission à cet avis, l'Honorable Parlementaire est invité à se référer aux réponses données à de précédentes questions sur le sujet (voir, par exemple, les questions E-009517/2012, E-010718/2012, E-000022/2013 et E-000057/2013 ([1])).

Aucune suite concrète à l'avis susmentionné n'a encore été formellement proposée. Les services de la Commission examinent actuellement la nécessité de réaliser des études complémentaires concernant plusieurs substances visées dans l'avis. Ils examinent également si l'adoption de mesures garantissant une information appropriée des consommateurs et introduisant des restrictions pour les allergènes les plus agressifs serait une réponse adéquate contre les risques que les ingrédients de parfum allergènes font courir à la santé des personnes.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004701/13
to the Commission
Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Banning geraniol in perfume manufacturing

In June 2012, the Commission asked British dermatologist Ian White to draft a scientific report to assess the danger of certain compounds in perfume manufacturing.

The report recommends banning three potentially allergenic ingredients and drastically limiting the use of some natural substances, including geraniol. This molecule is found in ingredients frequently used in perfumes, such as lemon, rose, etc.

If a molecule is considered an allergen, it is included in the list of banned or limited-use substances, and this would de facto lead to real upheaval in the perfume industry.

Does the Commission believe that other additional studies would be needed before validating the results of this report and causing this major upheaval in the perfume sector?

If a molecule is considered an allergen, should it automatically be classified as a banned or limited-use product when many allergenic products are authorised without restrictions, particularly in the food sector?

Does the Commission not believe that labelling products considered to be allergens in perfumes would be sufficient, so as to preserve the perfumes' integral and secret recipes?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2013)

The opinion on fragrance allergens in cosmetic products, of June 2012, was issued by the Scientific Committee on Consumer Safety (SCCS), which is an independent risk assessment body that assists the Commission. For questions concerning the response of the Commission to this opinion, the Honourable Member is referred to answers to previous questions on this matter, e.g. E-009517/2012, E-010718/2012, E-000022/2013, E-000057/2013 ([1]).

No measures for the implementation of the abovementioned scientific opinion have been yet formally proposed. The Commission services are currently considering whether additional studies would be needed in relation to several of the substances addressed in this opinion. They are also considering whether measures for appropriate consumer information, together with restrictions for the strongest allergens, would be appropriate to address the risks of fragrance allergens for human health.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-004702/13
til Kommissionen
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Oreste Rossi (EFD) og Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(26. april 2013)

Om: Afvigende kultur

Den Europæiske Union har med rette ofret dyrevelfærd den allerstørste opmærksomhed, defineret dyr som følende væsener og fastsat regler til at sikre og beskytte dem. Nogle såkaldte »kunstnere« har udstillet en død hest i centrum af Genève, og andre har brugt dyr ved at »indbygge« dem i vægge eller har tatoveret grise. Én kunstner fastholder, at dyr kan bruges som ethvert andet materiale, og direktøren for et galleri i Genève tilføjer, at dyr og børn er emner, som kunsten bruger til at pirke til samvittigheden. Desuden er en levende hund tidligere er blevet udstillet og overladt til at dø af sult.

1. Er Kommissionen bekendt med disse afvigende kulturelle begivenheder, som er utroligt nihilistiske?

2. Agter den at anmode medlemsstaterne om at forbyde udstillinger, der bruger og udstille døde dyr eller levende dyr, der kan blive udsat for lidelse eller underkastes tvang?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Tonio Borg
(11. juni 2013)

Kommissionen har ikke kendskab til de begivenheder, som de ærede parlamentsmedlemmer omtaler.

Brugen af dyr i udstillinger, show, kulturelle eller sportslige begivenheder ligger uden for EU's beføjelser og er derfor udelukkende medlemsstaternes ansvar.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004702/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Oreste Rossi (EFD) e Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(26 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Cultura aberrante

L'Unione europea ha giustamente dedicato la massima attenzione al benessere degli animali, considerandoli esseri senzienti, e ha definito norme per la loro tutela e protezione. Alcuni cosiddetti «artisti» hanno esposto un cavallo morto nel centro di Ginevra, altri hanno usato animali incorporandoli nei muri e praticando tatuaggi sui maiali. Un artista afferma che si possono utilizzare gli animali come un materiale qualsiasi e il direttore di una galleria a Ginevra aggiunge che animali e bambini sono soggetti che l'arte usa per smuovere le coscienze. Inoltre, in passato, è stato esposto un cane vivo lasciandolo morire di fame.

Può la Commissione riferire se:

1. è a conoscenza di queste manifestazioni culturali aberranti e nichiliste alla massima potenza;

2. ritiene di chiedere agli Stati membri di vietare mostre che utilizzano ed espongono animali morti o animali vivi che possano subire sofferenze e costrizioni?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(11 giugno 2013)

La Commissione non è a conoscenza dell'evento evocato nell'interrogazione degli onorevoli deputati.

L'uso di animali in mostre, spettacoli, eventi culturali o sportivi esula dalle competenze dell'UE e rimane di esclusiva responsabilità degli Stati membri.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004702/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Oreste Rossi (EFD) and Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Deviant culture

The European Union has rightly paid the utmost attention to animal welfare, considering animals to be sentient beings, and has laid down rules to safeguard and protect them. Some so-called 'artists' have put a dead horse on display in the centre of Geneva, and others have used animals by incorporating them into walls, and have tattooed pigs. One artist maintains that animals can be used like any other material and the director of a gallery in Geneva adds that animals and children are subjects that art uses to prick the conscience. In addition, in the past, a live dog was put on display and left to die of hunger.

1. Is the Commission aware of these deviant cultural events, which are incredibly nihilistic?

2. Does it plan to ask the Member States to ban exhibitions that use and exhibit dead animals or live animals which may undergo suffering or be subjected to constraints?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2013)

The Commission is not aware of the event referred to in the question of the Members of the European Parliament.

The use of animals in exhibitions, shows, cultural or sporting events is beyond the competences of the EU and remains under the sole responsibility of the Member States.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004703/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Barbara Matera (PPE)
(26 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Persecuzione dei cristiani in Nigeria

I cristiani nigeriani delle tribù indigene nello stato di Yobe sono terrorizzati e si preparano ad abbandonare i loro territori ancestrali, a causa delle minacce e delle violenze del gruppo di miliziani islamici «Boko Haram», che continua gli attacchi contro chiese e abitazioni dei fedeli cristiani. Boko Haram è la setta integralista che ha steso sul territorio un velo pesante, palpabile, di terrore soffocante. In quest'area, i musulmani sono costretti ad abbracciare il credo del fanatismo, mentre i cristiani hanno due possibilità: andare via oppure convertirsi, anche nel caso in cui vivano lì da generazioni; questo è nel mirino degli integralisti, i quali sono pronti ad uccidere i dissidenti.

Il 19 aprile 2013 almeno 185 persone hanno perso la vita durante gli scontri tra esercito ed estremisti islamici. Il bilancio è ancora provvisorio in quanto molti corpi sono stati bruciati e secondo tradizione islamica sono stati sepolti il prima possibile. Un aspetto positivo è senza dubbio la resistenza da parte dei sacerdoti che hanno deciso di non abbandonare i propri fedeli finché ne resterà solo uno di cui prendersi cura. Essi spiegano che il problema più grave è la mancanza di cultura. I preti stessi sono costretti a convivere con questo terrore quotidiano, fatto anche di raccolta di cadaveri ogni qualvolta è compiuto un attentato. Si va sempre più estendendo il timore che gli eccidi finiscano per coinvolgere l'intero Paese, 160 milioni di abitanti ripartiti tra le due religioni in modo numericamente uguale ma geograficamente diverso: il sud è a maggioranza cristiana, il nord è essenzialmente musulmano.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Quali azioni ha svolto per garantire la protezione di tutti i gruppi religiosi, tra cui i cristiani, in Nigeria?

2. Ha cercato la delegazione dell'UE di contattare i gruppi cristiani locali per valutare la situazione?

3. Ha pensato l'UE all'ipotesi di avviare blocchi commerciali nei confronti della Nigeria fino a quando la sicurezza di tutti i gruppi religiosi non sia garantita in tutte le aree della nazione?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(19 giugno 2013)

L'inasprirsi della violenza in alcune zone della Nigeria settentrionale è fonte di crescenti preoccupazioni per quanti si trovano all'interno e all'esterno del paese. Queste violenze, dirette contro la popolazione civile innocente, vanno condannate con fermezza.

L'Unione europea sta collaborando con la Nigeria, attraverso un dialogo permanente e interventi di aiuto mirati, per aiutarla a risolvere il problema dell'insicurezza e agire sui fattori che provocano la radicalizzazione e la violenza. Sta inoltre riorientando il suo programma di aiuti per contribuire ad far fronte al fenomeno della povertà nel Nord del paese. La questione del rispetto della libertà di religione è affrontata da diverse azioni, alcune delle quali nell'ambito della strategia dell'UE in materia di diritti umani in Nigeria.

La delegazione dell'Unione europea, inoltre, coinvolge regolarmente un'ampia gamma di rappresentanti della società civile, compresi i gruppi religiosi. Valutare la situazione della crescente violenza in Nigeria settentrionale fa parte della sua attività quotidiana. Tuttavia, un embargo commerciale non sarebbe necessariamente un contributo positivo, in quanto avrebbe un impatto diretto sulle persone che l'UE sta cercando di aiutare.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004703/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Barbara Matera (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Persecution of Christians in Nigeria

Nigerian Christians from the indigenous tribes in Yobe state are being terrorised and are preparing to abandon their ancestral lands, as a result of threats and violence by the Islamist militant group Boko Haram, which is continuing to carry out attacks against the churches and homes of Christians. Boko Haram is the fundamentalist sect that has shrouded the territory in a heavy, palpable veil of suffocating terror. In this area, Muslims are forced to embrace the creed of fanaticism, while Christians have two options: to leave or to convert, even if they have been living there for generations; that is the aim of the fundamentalists, who are prepared to kill dissidents.

On 19 April 2013 at least 185 people lost their lives during the fighting between the army and Islamic extremists. The death toll is still not confirmed, because many bodies were burned and in accordance with Islamic tradition buried as quickly as possible. A positive aspect is, without doubt, the resistance by the priests, who have decided not to abandon their flocks while they still have even one Christian to minister to. According to them, the most serious problem is the lack of culture. The priests too are forced to live with this daily terror, which is partly generated by the collection of bodies every time an attack is carried out. There is an increasingly widespread fear that the massacres will end up affecting the entire country, which is home to 160 million people. They belong in approximately equal numbers to the two religions, but the geographical distributions differ: the south is mainly Christian, while the north is primarily Muslim.

1. What action has the Vice-President/High Representative taken to ensure that all religious groups in Nigeria, including Christians, are protected?

2. Has the EU delegation sought to contact local Christian groups in order to assess the situation?

3. Has the EU considered the option of initiating a trade embargo against Nigeria until the safety of all religious groups is guaranteed in all parts of the country?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2013)

The escalating violence in parts of Northern Nigeria is a growing cause of concern for those inside and outside the country. It targets innocent civilians and has to be strongly condemned.

Through continuous dialogue and targeted aid interventions the EU is working with Nigeria to help it tackle the challenges of insecurity and to address the factors conducive to radicalisation and violence. It is also reorienting its aid programme to help tackle the problem of poverty in the North. Respect for freedom of religion is addressed through several actions including some which are part of the EU's Human Rights Strategy for Nigeria.

The EU Delegation is also regularly reaching out to a broad range of civil society representatives, including religious groups. It is part of its daily work to assess the situation of increasing violence in the North of Nigeria. However, a trade embargo would not necessarily be a positive contribution as it would impact directly on the ordinary members of society the EU is trying to help.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004704/13
to the Commission
Andrew Henry William Brons (NI)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Police raid at the home of the former MEP, Mr Ashley Mote

The house of the former MEP, Mr Ashley Mote, was raided by ten police officers on 5 March 2013, five weeks after the publication of his book ('A Mote in Brussels' Eye') on 31 January.

The material seized included some EU-related documents.

Is the Commission aware of any institution of the EU that would wish to investigate Mr Mote, and for what purpose?

The Commission might have data protection concerns regarding this matter, but Mr Mote is aware of my question and has no objection.

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(28 May 2013)

The Commission is normally not informed about OLAF's investigations concerning other Institutions.

For the benefit of answering this question, the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) has informed the Commission that it carried out an investigation relating to Mr Ashley MOTE from December 2008 to November 2010 and that the final case report was transmitted both to the European Parliament and to the UK Judicial Authorities who will consider whether a criminal offence may have been committed under national law ([1]).

([1]) Article 10 of Regulation 1073/1999.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004705/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(26 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Rigetto da parte del Tribunale dell'Unione europea del ricorso proposto dall'Italia contro il blocco dei fondi FESR per il «Programma operativo Campania»

Nel 2000 la Commissione europea ha cofinanziato, attraverso il Fondo di sviluppo regionale (FESR), il «Programma operativo Campania», per le spese effettuate fra il 5 ottobre 1999 e il 31 dicembre 2008, destinate alle operazioni di ristrutturazione del sistema di smaltimento rifiuti della regione Campania. Scopo del programma era il miglioramento del sistema di raccolta e smaltimento rifiuti della regione al fine di adeguarlo alla direttiva 2006/12/CE ed aumentarne l'efficienza. La Regione Campania avrebbe investito più di 93 milioni di euro nei lavori previsti e 46 milioni di euro sono stati cofinanziati attraverso l'FESR. In seguito alla situazione di crisi nello smaltimento rifiuti manifestatasi in questa regione nel 2007, la Commissione ha messo in mora lo Stato italiano e la Corte di Giustizia, con la sentenza del 4 marzo 2010 (C-297/08), constatava l'inadempimento.

Nel 2008, la Commissione bloccava l'erogazione dei rimborsi spese precedentemente sbloccati attraverso il FESR alla Campania, adducendo a motivazione le procedure giudiziarie in corso. Contro tale decisione l'Italia ha proposto ricorso che è stato rigettato con sentenza del Tribunale dell'Unione europea il 19 aprile 2013 confermando la correttezza della decisione di blocco dei fondi da parte della Commissione.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Dopo la sentenza del 2010, può riferire se l'Italia ha proceduto a conformare l'infrastruttura di gestione rifiuti della Regione Campania alla normativa europea?

2. Può indicare quanti milioni sono stati effettivamente erogati dei 46 milioni di euro stanziati inizialmente attraverso l'FESR per il «Programma operativo Campania»?

3. Considerate le sentenze di cui sopra, cosa succederà ai rimborsi già erogati dal FESR?

4. È prevista l'apertura di nuove procedure di infrazione contro l'Italia per la situazione campana?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(11 giugno 2013)

Nel quadro della procedura di infrazione 2007/2195 la Commissione continua a monitorare le misure adottate dalle autorità italiane per dare esecuzione alla sentenza pronunciata dalla Corte di giustizia a marzo 2010. A settembre 2011 la Commissione ha inviato una lettera di costituzione in mora ai sensi dell'articolo 260 del TFUE in quanto riteneva che le autorità italiane non avessero ancora pienamente dato esecuzione alla sentenza adottando tutte le misure necessarie per garantire lo smaltimento dei rifiuti in Campania senza rischi per la salute e l'ambiente e per creare nella regione un'adeguata rete integrata di impianti di smaltimento. Da allora, la Commissione è stata continuamente in contatto con le autorità italiane, chiedendo di fornire i dettagli della costruzione delle infrastrutture necessarie. Le informazioni disponibili indicano che, nonostante i miglioramenti registrati nella gestione dei rifiuti nella Regione Campania, le autorità italiane non hanno ancora costruito la maggior parte delle infrastutture necessarie. La Commissione sta valutando la possibilità di deferire il caso alla Corte di giustizia per la seconda volta.

Dopo aver ritenuto accettabile il piano di gestione dei rifiuti adottato dalla Regione Campania a gennaio 2012, a marzo 2013 la Commissione ha informato le autorità italiane che il cofinanziamento a titolo del FESR, bloccato nel 2007, poteva essere sbloccato. Pertanto, la Commissione ha accettato di prendere in considerazione le spese relative alla gestione dei rifiuti nel contesto delle procedure di chiusura del «Programma operativo Campania» per il periodo 2000-2006. Le procedure sono ancora in corso.

Per quanto riguarda l'attuale periodo di programmazione 2007-2013, finora la Commissione non ha effettuato pagamenti riguardanti le spese per i rifiuti.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004705/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: General Court of the European Union's rejection of Italy's appeal against the blocking of ERDF funds for the Operational Programme for Campania

In 2000 the European Commission co-financed the Operational Programme for Campania, through the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), for expenditure incurred between 5 October 1999 and 31 December 2008 in restructuring the Campania region's waste disposal system. The programme's aim was to improve the system for the collection and disposal of the region's waste with a view to bringing it into line with Directive 2006/12/EC and to make it more efficient. Apparently, the Campania region has invested over EUR 93 million in the planned works, EUR 46 million having been co-financed through the ERDF. Following the waste disposal crisis in the region in 2007, the Commission brought formal proceedings against the Italian State, and the Court of Justice ruled, in its judgment of 4 March 2010 (C-297/08), that Italy had not complied with the law.

In 2008, the Commission blocked the repayment to Campania of expenditure that had previously been unblocked through the ERDF, on the grounds that legal proceedings were in progress. Italy brought an appeal against that decision, which was rejected by the judgment of the General Court of 19 April 2013, confirming that the Commission's decision to block the funds was correct.

1. Following the 2010 judgment, can the Commission confirm whether Italy has brought the Campania region's waste management infrastructure into line with European legislation?

2. Can it say how much of the EUR 46 million initially allocated through the ERDF for the Operational Programme for Campania has actually been paid?

3. In view of the judgments mentioned above, what will happen to the payments already made by the ERDF?

4. Are there plans to bring further infringement proceedings against Italy in relation to the situation in Campania?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2013)

In the framework of infringement procedure 2007/2195 the Commission continues monitoring the measures taken by the Italian authorities to execute the Court of Justice's judgment of March 2010. The Commission issued in September 2011 a letter of formal notice under Article 260 of the TFEU because it considered that the Italian authorities had not yet fully implemented the judgment by taking all the measures necessary to ensure that waste is managed in Campania without endangering human health and the environment; and to establish in the region an integrated and adequate network of disposal installations. Since then, the Commission has had continuous contacts with the Italian authorities asking them to provide details about the construction of the necessary infrastructures. The information available indicates that, in spite of improvements in the Campania waste management, the Italian authorities have not yet built most of the necessary infrastructures. The Commission is currently assessing the need to refer the case to the Court of Justice for a second time.

Having considered the waste management plan adopted by the Campania region in January 2012 acceptable, the Commission informed the Italian authorities in March 2013 that the 2007 freezing of the ERDF co-financing could be unblocked. Therefore, the Commission has accepted to take into consideration the expenditure related to waste management in the context of the closure procedures of the Operational Program 'Campania' 2000-2006. These procedures are still on going.

Concerning the current programming period, until now no expenditure on waste has been paid by the Commission during the 2007-2013 programming period.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004706/13
aan de Commissie
Mark Demesmaeker (Verts/ALE)
(26 april 2013)

Betreft: Omzetting richtlijn 2010/41/EU (gelijke behandeling van zelfstandig werkzame mannen en vrouwen) door België

Artikel 8(1) van Richtlijn 2010/41/EU, bepaalt dat de lidstaten de nodige maatregelen moeten nemen om te waarborgen dat vrouwelijke zelfstandigen, vrouwelijke echtgenotes en levenspartners, overeenkomstig het nationale recht een toereikende moederschapsuitkering wordt toegekend die het onderbreken van de beroepsuitoefening wegens zwangerschap of moederschap gedurende ten minste 14 weken mogelijk maakt.

Artikel 8(4) van deze richtlijn bepaalt dat vrouwelijke zelfstandigen, vrouwelijke echtgenotes en levenspartners toegang moeten hebben tot bestaande diensten voor tijdelijke vervanging of tot bestaande nationale sociale diensten. De lidstaten kunnen bepalen dat de toegang tot die diensten een alternatief is voor of een onderdeel vormt van de in artikel 8(1) bedoelde uitkering.

In het geval van België bedraagt de maximale duur van de moederschapsuitkering slechts 8 weken. De Belgische overheid tracht gebruik te maken van artikel 8(4) als alternatief. Twee maatregelen worden voorgesteld in de nationale uitvoeringsmaatregelen: 1) een database van vervangende ondernemers; 2) 105 gratis dienstencheques voor huishoudhulp.

In de praktijk blijkt dat beide flankerende maatregelen falen in de doelstelling om als alternatief te dienen voor 14 weken moederschapsuitkering. Slechts een 20-tal personen is ingeschreven als vervangende ondernemer en slechts 15 % heeft al effectief een vervanging gedaan. Slechts 34 % van de dienstencheques wordt opgenomen.

Kan België een beroep doen op artikel 8, vierde lid om af te wijken van artikel 8, eerste lid, rekening houdend met het feit dat de alternatieve maatregelen in kwestie (database + dienstencheques) in de praktijk niet werken?

Vindt de Commissie dat de door België genomen genoemde maatregelen derhalve afdoende zijn?

Antwoord van mevrouw Reding namens de Commissie
(8 juli 2013)

In overeenstemming met artikel 8, leden 1 en 4, van de Richtlijn 2010/41/EU ([1]) is het aan de lidstaten om te bepalen of de toegang tot de bestaande diensten voor tijdelijke vervanging of tot nationale sociale diensten (als bedoeld in artikel 8, lid 4) een alternatief vormt voor de uitkering als bedoeld in artikel 8, lid 1, een onderdeel hiervan vormt of er bovenop komt.

Ten tijde van de aanneming van deze richtlijn heeft België verklaard dat het Belgische systeem van dienstencheques voor de toepassing van artikel 8, lid 4, van Richtlijn 2010/41/EU, als een nationale sociale dienst dient te worden beschouwd.

De Commissie onderzoekt de situatie. Indien de aangekondigde concrete omzetting twijfels oproept over haar verenigbaarheid met Richtlijn 2010/41/EU, zal de Commissie contact opnemen met de Belgische autoriteiten.

([1]) Richtlijn 2010/41/EU van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 7 juli 2010 betreffende de toepassing van het beginsel van gelijke behandeling van zelfstandig werkzame mannen en vrouwen en tot intrekking van Richtlijn 86/613/EEG van de Raad.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004706/13
to the Commission
Mark Demesmaeker (Verts/ALE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Implementation by Belgium of Directive 2010/41/EU (equal treatment of self-employed men and women)

Article 8(1) of Directive 2010/41/EU provides that Member States must take the necessary measures to ensure that self-employed women and female spouses and life partners or self-employed workers may, in accordance with national law, be granted a sufficient maternity allowance enabling interruptions in their occupational activity owing to pregnancy or motherhood for at least 14 weeks.

Article 8(4) of the directive provides that female self-employed workers and female spouses and life partners must have access to any existing services supplying temporary replacements or to any existing national social services. The Member States may provide that access to those services is an alternative to or a part of the allowance referred to in Article 8(1).

In the case of Belgium, the maximum duration of maternity allowance is only 8 weeks. The Belgian Government is seeking to make use of Article 8(4) as an alternative. Two measures have been proposed as part of the national implementing measures: 1) a database of replacement self-employed workers; 2) 105 free home-help vouchers.

In practice, however, it appears that both supporting measures are not fulfilling their purpose of constituting an alternative to the 14-week maternity allowance. Only about 20 people have registered as replacement self-employed workers and, of those, only 15% have actually replaced the self-employed worker in question. Only 34% of vouchers have been taken up.

Is Belgium allowed to invoke Article 8(4) in order to derogate from Article 8(1), taking into account the fact that the alternative measures in question (the database and home-help vouchers) have not worked in practice?

Does the Commission, therefore, consider the said measures taken by Belgium adequate?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Reding au nom de la Commission
(8 juillet 2013)

Conformément aux paragraphes 1 et 4 de l'article 8 de la directive 2010/41 ([1]), il appartient aux États membres de décider si l'accès aux services de remplacement temporaire existants ou à des services sociaux (tels que mentionnés à l'article 8-4) constitue soit une solution de substitution à l'allocation visée à l'article 8-1, soit une partie de cette allocation ou soit s'ajoute à cette allocation.

Lors de l'adoption de cette directive, la Belgique a déclaré qu'elle considérait que son système de titres-services devait être considéré comme un service social national aux fins de l'article 8-4, de la directive 2010/41.

La Commission analyse actuellement la situation. Dans le cas où la transposition concrète notifiée soulève des doutes quant à sa compatibilité avec la directive 2010/41, la Commission contactera les autorités Belges.

([1]) Directive 2010/41/UE du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 7 juillet 2010 concernant l'application du principe de l'égalité de traitement entre hommes et femmes exerçant une activité indépendante et abrogeant la directive 86/613/CEE du Conseil.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004707/13
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(26 april 2013)

Betreft: Schending van Oslo II

Het antwoord van de Commissie op mijn vragen over de status van Palestina (E-001848/2013) brengt mij in verwarring.

De Commissie stelt in de tweede alinea van haar antwoord: „De status van het desbetreffende grondgebied is niet gewijzigd. Het grondgebied is nog steeds bezet".

1. Over welk gebied heeft de Commissie het, gegeven het feit dat de grenzen van Palestina niet zijn vastgesteld? Dat was juist de crux van mijn eerdere vraag. In het akkoord van Oslo II is afgesproken dat de landsgrenzen bij onderhandeling zouden worden vastgesteld.

De Commissie spreekt in alinea's 2 en 3 over bezette gebieden en een bezettingsmacht. Met „bezet gebied" doelt zij blijkbaar op de Westelijke Jordaanoever, een gebied dat voor 1948 geen erkende soeverein had. Na het uitroepen van de staat Israël nam Jordanië het gebied in bezit. Na de zesdaagse oorlog in 1967 deed Israël dat, naast de Sinaïwoestijn, de Golan hoogvlakte en de Gazastrook. De Sinaïwoestijn en de Golan hoogvlakte golden, c.q. gelden als bezet gebied. Israël bezet(te) immers gebied van respectievelijk Syrië en Egypte. De westelijke Jordaanoever en de Gazastrook zijn echter geen bezette gebieden. Deze gebieden kennen immers geen soeverein aan wie het gebied zou kunnen worden teruggegeven. De juiste term voor de Westelijke Jordaanoever is daarom betwist gebied.

2. Is de Commissie met mij van mening dat het door Israël bezette gebied de Golan hoogvlakte betreft?

3. Is de Commissie met mij van mening dat als de Commissie de Westelijke Jordaanoever bedoelt, gesproken moet worden van „betwist gebied"?

In de derde alinea van haar antwoord stelt de Commissie dat de onderhandelingen, waartoe bij Oslo II is besloten, nog niet zijn begonnen als gevolg van de verkiezingscampagne en regeringsonderhandelingen in Israël. Zij suggereert daarmee dat Israël sinds het sluiten van de Oslo II akkoorden niet is ingegaan op een of meer uitnodigingen van de Palestijnse Autoriteit om aan de onderhandelingstafel te verschijnen.

4. Kan de Commissie aangeven wanneer de Palestijnse Autoriteit aan Israël heeft aangeboden om over de uitwerking van Oslo II te onderhandelen, en Israël hierop afwijzend heeft gereageerd?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(8 juli 2013)

De EU beschouwt het Palestijns gebied (de Westelijke Jordaanoever met inbegrip van Oost-Jeruzalem, en de Gazastrook) en de Golan hoogvlakte als door Israël bezette gebieden.

In talrijke conclusies van de Raad (voor het laatst op 10 december 2012) heeft de EU verklaard dat zij geen wijzigingen van de grenzen van voor 1967 erkent, ook niet van Jeruzalem, die niet door de partijen zijn overeengekomen.

Onderhandelingen over kwesties in verband met de zogenaamde definitieve status in het kader van Oslo II hadden tussen 1996 en 1999 moeten plaatsvinden. Dit gebeurde echter niet. Volgende pogingen tot overleg (bijvoorbeeld Camp David in 2000, Taba in 2001 en de bijeenkomst in Annapolis van 2008) hebben geen resultaten geboekt.

De EU hoopt dat de inspanningen die momenteel worden gedaan om opnieuw rechtstreekse en uitvoerige onderhandelingen te openen tussen de partijen succesvol zullen zijn en dat deze onderhandelingen (als ze eenmaal afgesloten zijn) tot een alomvattende oplossing zal leiden voor het Arabisch-Israëlische conflict, onder meer ten aanzien van de problematiek van de grenzen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004707/13
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Breach of Oslo II

The Commission's answer to my questions concerning the status of Palestine (E-001848/2013) has thrown me into confusion.

In the second paragraph of its answer, the Commission states: 'The status of the territory concerned has not changed — it remains occupied'.

1. What territory does the Commission refer to, given the fact that the borders of Palestine have not been established? That was precisely the crux of my previous question. In the Oslo II Accords it was agreed that national borders would be determined by negotiation.

The Commission refers in the second and third paragraphs to occupied territories and an occupying power. With 'occupied territory', it appears to be referring to the West Bank, an area over which there was no recognised sovereignty prior to 1948. Jordan occupied this area after the proclamation of the state of Israel. After the Six-Day War in 1967, it was occupied by Israel, which also occupied the Sinai Desert, the Golan Heights and the Gaza Strip. The Sinai Desert and the Golan Heights were or are considered occupied territories. After all, Israel captured these territories from Syria and Egypt, respectively. The West Bank and the Gaza Strip, however, are not occupied territories. In fact, these areas do not have a sovereign to whom they could be returned. The correct term for the West Bank is therefore 'disputed territory'.

2. Does the Commission agree with me that the territory occupied by Israel refers to the Golan Heights?

3. Does the Commission agree with me that, if the Commission is referring to the West Bank, it should refer to it as a 'disputed area'?

In the third paragraph of its answer, the Commission states that the negotiations that were agreed by Oslo II have not yet commenced as a result of the election campaign and the negotiations to form a government in Israel. It therefore suggests that, since the conclusion of the Oslo II Accords, Israel has failed to respond to one or more invitations from the Palestinian Authority to sit down at the negotiating table.

4. Can the Commission indicate when it is that the Palestinian Authority offered Israel negotiations on the effectuation of Oslo II and when it is that Israel rejected them?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(8 July 2013)

The EU considers the Palestinian territory (West Bank including East Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip) as well as the Golan Heights as territories occupied by Israel.

In numerous Council Conclusions — the latest having been agreed on 10 December 2012 — the EU has stated that that it will not recognise any changes to the pre-1967 borders, including with regard to Jerusalem, other than those agreed by the parties.

Negotiations on the so-called final status issues under Oslo II were supposed to be held between the years 1996-1999. This did not happen. Subsequent attempts to hold negotiations (e.g. Camp David 2000, Taba 2001, following the Anapolis meeting in 2008) did not lead to any results.

The EU hopes that current efforts aiming at re-starting direct substantial negotiations between the parties will be successful and that these negotiations — once concluded — will lead to a comprehensive solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict, including with regard to the issue of borders.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-004709/13
do Komisji
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(26 kwietnia 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Sytuacja dziewcząt w Sudanie Południowym

Organizacja Human Rights Watch opublikowała w marcu tego roku raport na temat katastrofalnej sytuacji dziewcząt poniżej 18. roku życia, przede wszystkim przymuszaniu ich do zawierania małżeństw z dużo starszymi mężczyznami.

Oficjalne rządowe statystyki podają, że prawie połowa (48 %) nieletnich dziewcząt jest zamężna. Niektóre wyszły za mąż już w wieku 12 lat. Raport przywołuje przykłady zastraszania i przemocy stosowanej wobec nieposłusznych dziewczyn.

Zawarcie małżeństwa w tak młodym wieku zazwyczaj skutkuje wczesnym macierzyństwem i zakończeniem edukacji, co również potwierdzają statystyki rządowe (tylko 39 % uczniów szkół podstawowych i 30 % w szkołach średnich to dziewczęta). Ciąża w młodym wieku jest często zagrożeniem dla życia przyszłej matki z powodu niedożywienia oraz problemów z dostępem do podstawowej opieki medycznej.

W późniejszych latach tak młode mężatki mają trudności z wejściem na rynek pracy, gdyż nie posiadają wymaganego wykształcenia i doświadczenia, co sprawia, że znacząca grupa społeczna nie pracuje zawodowo, przez co gospodarka kraju nie rozwija pełnego potencjału.

W związku z tymi informacjami zwracam się z prośbą o odpowiedź na pytanie:

Czy Unia Europejska angażuje się w działania na rzecz dziewcząt i kobiet w Sudanie Południowym? Jeśli tak – na czym te działania polegają?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(20 czerwca 2013 r.)

Odsyłamy Szanownego Pana Posła do odpowiedzi na pytania pisemne udzielonej wspólnie na poprzednie pytania pisemne E-002876/2013 oraz E-003102/2013 ([1]).

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca ubolewa nad wysoką liczbą małżeństw zawieranych przez dzieci w Sudanie Południowym. Regularnie podnosi ona tę kwestię w rozmowach z przedstawicielami rządu Sudanu Południowego, uświadamiając im znaczenie podpisania i ratyfikowania konwencji międzynarodowych dotyczących praw człowieka takich jak Konwencja o prawach dziecka i Konwencja w sprawie likwidacji wszelkich form dyskryminacji kobiet. W ramach tego dialogu na szczeblu rządowym UE oferuje odpowiednim instytucjom i organizacjom społeczeństwa obywatelskiego pomoc w przygotowaniu przystąpienia do konwencji oraz wzmocnienie zdolności wdrażania jej postanowień, a także zerwania z głęboko zakorzenionymi tradycjami społeczno-kulturowymi.

UE przeznaczyła dla Sudanu Południowego znaczną pulę środków pomocy na rzecz rozwoju na lata 2011-2013, w ramach której priorytetem jest edukacja (41,5 mln EUR), zdrowie (61,5 mln EUR) i rolnictwo (122 mln EUR). W programach finansowanych przez UE w tych dziedzinach kładzie się duży nacisk na konieczność inwestowania w dziewczęta i kobiety w celu usunięcia nierówności w traktowaniu kobiet i mężczyzn, które są przeszkodą w rozwoju. Unijne programy w dziedzinie edukacji koncentrują się jest ułatwieniu dostępu, naboru i zatrzymania dziewcząt w systemie edukacji podstawowej; programy w dziedzinie ochrony zdrowia – uwzględniając alarmujący wskaźnik śmiertelności – wspierają szkolenie położnych. Programy w dziedzinie rolnictwa zwracają uwagę na zasadniczą rolę, jaką kobiety mogą odgrywać w rozwoju tego sektora w celu dywersyfikacji gospodarki i wspierają ich włączenie jako siły roboczej w rolnictwie. Na okres począwszy od 2014 r., priorytetem UE w Sudanie Południowym będzie nadal edukacja podstawowa, podstawowa opieka zdrowotna oraz rolnictwo. Po ratyfikacji przez Sudan Południowy umowy z Kotonu, dalsza unijna pomoc rozwojowa będzie przeznaczona na inwestowanie w dziewczęta i kobiety.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/pl/parliamentary-questions.html;jsessionid=69527CA8C19B66F0BDEA72515B987B8C.node1?tabType=wq

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004709/13
to the Commission
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Situation of girls in South Sudan

In March 2013, Human Rights Watch published a report on the desperate situation facing girls under 18 years of age, specifically on how they are forced to marry much older men.

Official government statistics show that nearly half (48%) of girls between 15 and 19 are married. Some were as young as 12 when they married. The report cites cases in which intimidation and violence have been used against girls who refuse to comply.

Marriage at such a young age usually results in early motherhood and an end to education. This is also borne out by government statistics: only 39% of primary school pupils and 30% of secondary school pupils are girls. Owing to malnutrition and difficulties in accessing basic medical care, pregnancy at such a young age often puts the mother's life at risk.

As they get older, girls who marry young find it difficult to enter the labour market, as they lack the appropriate education and experience. Consequently, a significant social group does not work, meaning that the full potential of South Sudan's economy is left untapped.

Is the European Union taking any action on behalf of girls and women in South Sudan? If so, what does this action entail?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2013)

The Honourable Member is kindly referred to the joint answer already provided to previous written questions E-002876/2013 and E-003102/2013 ([1]).

The HR/VP deplores the high number of child marriages in South Sudan and raises regularly these concerns with the Government of South Sudan, and impresses on it the importance of signing and ratifying the international conventions on human rights, including the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women. As part of this dialogue with the Government, the EU offers support to the relevant institutions and civil society to ensure accession, strengthen capacities for implementation and break with deep-rooted socio-cultural traditions.

The EU has a significant development aid portfolio in South Sudan for the period 2011-2013, which prioritises education (EUR 41.5 million), health (EUR 61.5 million) and agriculture (EUR 122 million). EU-funded programmes in these sectors put a strong emphasis on the need to invest in girls and women and close the gender disparities that act as a barrier to development. EU programmes in education focus on improvement of the access, enrolment and retention of girls in primary education, the programmes in health take account of the alarming mortality rate and support training of midwives. Programmes in agriculture are sensitive to the vital role that women can play in development of the sector to diversify the economy, and support their integration into the rural workforce. From 2014, basic education, basic health and agriculture will continue to be a priority of the EU in South Sudan, with further EU development aid devoted to investing in girls and women once South Sudan ratifies the Cotonou Agreement.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq#sidesForm

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-004710/13
do Komisji
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(26 kwietnia 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Inicjatywa „50 tysięcy turystów"

Inicjatywa „50 tysięcy turystów" przedstawiona przez komisarza A. Tajaniego i Dyrekcję Generalną ds. Przemysłu i Przedsiębiorczości jest ambitnym projektem, który może znacząco pobudzić europejski ruch turystyczny.

Pierwszy etap inicjatywy trwał od października 2012 r. do marca tego roku, a drugi etap powinien się wkrótce rozpocząć.

W związku z tym zwracam się z prośbą o odpowiedź na następujące pytania:

1. Jakie wstępne wnioski wyciągnęła Komisja po pierwszym etapie inicjatywy?

2. Czy są dostępne szacunki, ilu obywateli krajów Ameryki Południowej odwiedziło kraje UE w związku z tą akcją?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Antonio Tajaniego w imieniu Komisji
(11 czerwca 2013 r.)

Inicjatywa „50 tysięcy turystów" w istocie ma na celu zwiększenie liczby turystów przyjeżdżających do Europy, zwłaszcza poza sezonem turystycznym ([1]).

1. Celem pierwszego etapu inicjatywy ([2]) było zwiększenie ruchu turystycznego z Brazylii, Argentyny i Chile do UE. Komisja zorganizowała liczne spotkania i wspierała inicjatywę w ramach międzynarodowych wydarzeń turystycznych, jak również poprzez kampanię informacyjną na rzecz turystyki międzynarodowej ([3]). Dodatkowo partnerzy z UE przygotowali ofertę ponad 170 międzynarodowych wycieczek.

Gdy chodzi o obecność na rynku, to Komisja odnotowała w początkowym okresie wzrost ruchu turystycznego na przedmiotowych trasach ([4]). W późniejszym okresie, ze względu na globalne tendencje w ruchu lotniczym i kryzys gospodarczy, niektórzy europejscy przewoźnicy zostali zmuszeni do wycofania z rynku części swojej oferty.

Komisja zamierza pracować na rzecz dalszej poprawy realizacji tej inicjatywy w jej drugim etapie, w szczególności poprzez wzmocnienie stosunków z zainteresowanymi stronami w Ameryce Łacińskiej i rządami państw tego obszaru, oraz poprzez tworzenie specjalnych warunków dla bezpośredniej współpracy między przedsiębiorstwami, nakierowanych na unijne podmioty branży turystycznej, a także poprzez lepsze wykorzystanie istniejących sieci, takich jak Europejska Sieć Przedsiębiorczości.

2. Zważywszy na dobrowolny charakter uczestnictwa w tej inicjatywie pilotażowej, dane uzyskane od zaangażowanych w nią partnerów są nadal dość niejednorodne. Ogólna ocena realizacji projektu zostanie przeprowadzona pod koniec bieżącego roku.

([1]) Jest to złożona inicjatywa pilotażowa oparta na współpracy między Komisją i 10 państwami członkowskimi (Włochy, Hiszpania, Francja, Polska, Litwa, Grecja, Rumunia, Słowacja, Malta i Portugalia), 3 głównymi stowarzyszeniami branżowymi turystyki europejskiej (Europejskie Stowarzyszenie Organizatorów Turystyki – ETOA, Europejskie Stowarzyszenie Biur Podróży i Organizatorów Wycieczek – ECTAA), 7 dużymi liniami lotniczymi (Alitalia, Air France, British Airways, Iberia, Lufthansa German Airlines, TAP Air Portugal i Polskie Linie Lotnicze LOT), jak również 3 partnerami z sektora prywatnego (El Corte Inglés S.A., Amadeus IT Group S.A. i TUI Travel plc) oraz wieloma krajami trzecimi (w pierwszym etapie: Argentyna, Brazylia i Chile).

([2]) Od października 2012 r. do marca 2013 r.

([3]) http://europa.eu/readyforeurope/

([4]) Przedsiębiorstwo TAP poinformowało na przykład, że sprzedaż podróży z Brazylii do Europy wzrosła w pierwszym etapie, tj. w okresie od października 2012 r. do marca 2013 r. (6 miesięcy) o 3,5 %. Zdaniem TAP, odsetek ten odzwierciedla bezwzględny wzrost w porównaniu z tym samym okresem w roku poprzednim, uważa się jednak, że wpływ projektu na ten wynik jest minimalny. Amadeus IT Group poinformował, że łączna liczba rezerwacji lotów w globalnych systemach dystrybucji w biurach podróży w okresie od października 2012 r. do lutego 2013 r. z Brazylii, Argentyny i Chile do UE-27 jest nieco wyższa w porównaniu do tego samego okresu roku poprzedniego (o 0,5 % w przypadku rezerwacji lotów).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004710/13
to the Commission
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: '50 000 Tourists' initiative

The '50 000 Tourists' initiative presented by Commissioner Tajani and the Directorate-General for Enterprise and Industry is an ambitious project that could give a significant boost to European tourist traffic.

The first phase of the initiative lasted from October 2012 to March 2013, and the second phase is scheduled to begin shortly.

In connection with the above, would the Commission answer the following questions:

1. What preliminary conclusions has the Commission reached following completion of the first phase?

2. Are estimates available of the number of South Americans who have visited EU Member States as part of this initiative?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2013)

The '50 000 tourists' initiative is indeed meant to contribute to boosting tourism flows into Europe, with a particular focus on low season ([1]).

1. The 1st phase of the initiative ([2]) aimed at increasing tourism flows from Brazil, Argentina and Chile to the EU. The Commission organised several meetings and promoted the initiative in international tourism events as well as within its international tourism communication campaign ([3]). Moreover, EU partners proposed over 170 transnational packages.

In terms of market uptake, the Commission has noted that traffic has increased on the relevant routes at the beginning of the period ([4]). Later on during the relevant period, due to the global trend of traffic and economic crisis, some European carriers have been forced to withdraw some capacity from the marketplace.

The Commission intends to further improve the implementation of this initiative in its second phase, in particular by reinforcing the relations with Latin American stakeholders and Governments and creating specific business to business opportunities for EU tourist operators, also by making a better use of existing networks, such as the Enterprise Europe Network.

2. Given the voluntary nature of this pilot initiative, the data obtained from the partners involved is still quite heterogeneous. An overall assessment of the project will be carried out at the end of this year.

([1]) It is a complex pilot initiative based on the collaboration between the Commission and 10 Member States (Italy, Spain, France, Poland, Lithuania, Greece, Romania, Slovak Republic, Malta and Portugal), 3 main European tourism industry associations (the European Tour Operators Association — ETOA, the European Travel Agents' and Tour Operators' Association — ECTAA), 7 major airlines (Alitalia, Air France, British Airways, Iberia, Lufthansa German Airlines, TAP Air Portugal and LOT Polish Airlines), as well as 3 private sector partners (El Corte Inglés S.A., Amadeus IT Group S.A. and TUI Travel plc), together with several third countries (Argentina, Brazil and Chile, in a first phase).

([2]) October 2012-March 2013.

([3]) http://europa.eu/readyforeurope/

([4]) For example, TAP reported that sales from Brazil to Europe increased 3.5% during the 1st phase October 2012 — March 2013 (6 months). According to TAP, this percentage corresponds to an absolute positive variation compared to same period year-on-year, but it is felt however that the impact of the project itself in this reported result is minimal. Amadeus IT Group reported that the cumulative number of air bookings on global distribution systems in travel agencies, during October 2012 — February 2013, from Brazil, Argentina and Chile to EU-27 is slightly higher, compared to same period previous year (by 0,5% air bookings).

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-004711/13
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(26 kwietnia 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Przemoc w Bahrajnie

Niepokojące doniesienia napływają do nas z Bahrajnu. Policja przeprowadza nocne naloty na domy przywódców antyrządowej opozycji, ze szczególnym naciskiem na miasta położone w pobliżu toru Formuły 1, gdzie odbyły się wyścigi w dniach 19-21 kwietnia br.

Policjanci podczas nalotów naruszają obowiązujące przepisy, nie okazując nakazów aresztowania. Zatrzymani są obciążani zarzutami zagrożenia bezpieczeństwa publicznego, które pozwalają na przetrzymywanie ich w areszcie do 60 dni. Nie mogą również po aresztowaniu spotkać się z adwokatem.

Konieczność zapewnienia bezpieczeństwa uczestnikom i widzom wyścigu Formuły 1 jest bardzo ważna, a rażące naruszenia praw obywateli powinny zostać zauważone przez społeczność międzynarodową.

W związku z tym proszę o odpowiedź na pytanie, czy Unia Europejska zamierza podjąć działania dotyczące opisanej sytuacji w Bahrajnie?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(26 czerwca 2013 r.)

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca Catherine Ashton uważnie śledzi ogólną sytuację w Bahrajnie. Od lutego 2011 r. wydano w tej sprawie liczne oświadczenia i konkluzje Rady; doszło również do licznych kontaktów z Bahrajnem, także na najwyższym szczeblu. Wszystkie te działania świadczą o wadze, jaką UE przywiązuje do sytuacji w tym państwie. Z tego też względu do Bahrajnu wysłani zostali oficjalnie akredytowani wysocy rangą urzędnicy ESDZ, zarówno z siedziby głównej, jak z delegatury UE w Rijadzie.

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca nadal stosuje wszelkie dostępne narzędzia dyplomatyczne w celu przekazywania Bahrajnowi jednoznacznych komunikatów, zarówno publicznymi środkami przekazu, jak i drogą dyplomatyczną. Konsekwentnie wzywa ona obie strony do wstrzymania się od podżegania do przemocy, do jednoznacznego odrzucenia przemocy we wszelkiej postaci oraz do pełnego zastosowania się do zaleceń Niezależnej Komisji Dochodzeniowej w sprawie Bahrajnu. Wielokrotnie przypominała ona również, że Unia Europejska jest gotowa do wsparcia procesu prawdziwego narodowego pojednania i zapewniania lepszej ochrony praw człowieka i podstawowych wolności podczas tego procesu, o ile zażyczy sobie tego Bahrajn i kiedy państwo to wystosuje taką prośbę. Aby wsparcie to było użyteczne, musi zostać zaakceptowane przez wszystkie strony sporu. Obecnie UE opracowuje program finansowany ze środków Instrumentu na rzecz Stabilności w celu organizacji szkoleń dla sędziów i prokuratorów w dziedzinie praw człowieka. Jest to kolejnym potwierdzeniem żywego zainteresowania instytucji UE sytuacją w Bahrajnie.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004711/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Violence in Bahrain

Alarming reports have been reaching us from Bahrain. Police are conducting night-time raids on the houses of anti-government opposition leaders, with a special focus on towns located close to the Formula One track, where races were held from 19 to 21 April 2013.

During these raids, police officers break the rules by not displaying arrest warrants. Detainees are accused of threatening public safety, which means that they can be held in custody for up to 60 days. They are also unable to meet a lawyer following arrest.

Ensuring the safety of Formula One participants and spectators is extremely important, but the international community should take notice of gross violations of citizens' rights.

Does the EU intend to make representations with regard to the situation in Bahrain?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(26 June 2013)

The HR/VP is closely following the overall situation in Bahrain. Since February 2011 there have been numerous statements, Council Conclusions, and many contacts with Bahrain, also at the highest level. These do all bear witness of the importance the EU is giving to the situation, as does the dispatching of top-ranking EEAS officials to the Kingdom, both from the Headquarters and the EU Delegation in Riyadh, officially accredited to Bahrain.

The HR/VP continues to use all available diplomatic tools to convey clear messages to Bahrain, both publicly and through diplomatic channels. She has consistently been calling all sides to refrain from inciting to violence; to reject violence unequivocally in all its forms; and to fully implement the recommendations of the Bahraini Independent Commission of Inquiry. She has also recalled , on several occasions, that the European Union stands ready to provide support to achieve genuine national reconciliation and to ensure better protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms this process, if, as and when requested by Bahrain. For such support to be useful, it must be accepted by all sides in the country. For the moment, the EU is establishing a programme, funded via the Instrument for Stability, to address training of judges and prosecutors on human rights issues. This is yet another confirmation of the keen interest EU institutions have taken in the case of Bahrain.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-004712/13
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(26 kwietnia 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – dyskryminowanie organizacji pozarządowych w Rosji

25 kwietnia 2013 r. rosyjski sąd skazał na karę grzywny organizację pozarządową Gołos. Wyrok wydano na podstawie wysoce kontrowersyjnego prawa nakazującego organizacjom otrzymującym środki na działalność statutową z zagranicy rejestrowanie się w charakterze „zagranicznego agenta". Największe rosyjskie organizacje pozarządowe już wcześniej zaskarżyły tę bulwersującą ustawę do Trybunału w Strasburgu, tłumacząc, że celem ustawodawcy było napiętnowanie NGO'sów.

Stowarzyszenie Gołos zajmuje się przygotowywaniem obserwatorów wyborczych oraz dokumentowaniem przypadków łamania ordynacji wyborczych. Jest to więc niezwykle ważna instytucja w Rosji. Na podstawie zebranych informacji Gołos oskarżył władze o masowe fałszerstwa podczas ostatnich wyborów parlamentarnych i prezydenckich.

W związku z powyższym proszę o odpowiedź na następujące pytania:

1. Czy UE planuje wystąpić do władz w Moskwie z oficjalnym protestem przeciwko ww. wyrokowi?

2. Czy i jakie działania podejmuje dyplomacja europejska celem wsparcia organizacji pozarządowych w Rosji?

3. Czy we wzajemnych relacjach Unia–Rosja podejmowano, bądź planuje się podjąć starania, celem przekonania rosyjskich władz do uchylenia ustawy o tzw. „zagranicznych agentach"?

4. Czy ESDZ podejmuje w opisanej sprawie czynności na forum innych, pozaunijnych organizacji międzynarodowych?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(17 czerwca 2013 r.)

W dniu 28 kwietnia 2013 r. rzecznik Wysokiej Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącej Ashton wydał oświadczenie, w którym wyraził zaniepokojenie UE w związku ze skazaniem na karę grzywny organizacji pozarządowej GOLOS i jej dyrektor na podstawie ustawy dotyczącej „zagranicznych agentów".

Zwiększone wsparcie dla społeczeństwa obywatelskiego stanowi integralną część podejścia UE do ostatnich wydarzeń w Federacji Rosyjskiej. Niedawno opublikowano zaproszenie do składania wniosków w ramach EIDHR w Rosji. Utrzymywane są regularne kontakty z przedstawicielami społeczeństwa obywatelskiego, w szczególności w kontekście przygotowań do konsultacji UE-Rosja na temat praw człowieka, które umożliwiają lepsze ukierunkowanie wysiłków UE w tej dziedzinie.

W dniu 17 maja UE i Rosja przeprowadziły 17. rundę wzajemnych dwustronnych konsultacji na temat praw człowieka. UE wyraziła zaniepokojenie w związku z brakiem jasności pojęcia „działalności politycznej", jak również kryteriów stosowanych w celu zmuszania organizacji pozarządowych do rejestracji jako „zagranicznego agenta". UE poprzez swoją delegaturę w Moskwie będzie uważnie śledziła rozwój wydarzeń, jeśli chodzi o wdrażanie tej ustawy, a w szczególności rozprawę apelacyjną organizacji GOLOS. Szef delegatury UE w Federacji Rosyjskiej poinformował również w kontaktach wzajemnych władze rosyjskie o poważnych obawach UE i będzie śledził rosyjską propozycję dotyczącą przedłożenia ministerstwu sprawiedliwości pytań w sprawie wdrażania tej ustawy.

Ponadto UE wyraziła na forum OBWE i Rady Europy swoje zaniepokojenie w kwestii ustawy dotyczącej „zagranicznych agentów" i niedawnego procesu GOLOS.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004712/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Discrimination against NGOs in Russia

On 25 April 2013, a Russian court imposed a fine on Golos, a non-governmental organisation. The legal basis for the judgment was a highly controversial law requiring organisations that receive funding for their official activities from abroad to register as 'foreign agents'. Russia's largest NGOs have already referred this shocking law to the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg. They state that the legislator aims to use this law to stigmatise NGOs.

Golos is involved in preparing election observers and documenting violations of the electoral code. It is, therefore, an exceptionally important institution in Russia. On the basis of information that it had gathered, Golos accused the authorities of having carried out large-scale falsifications during the last parliamentary and presidential elections.

In connection with the above, would the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Does the EU plan to lodge an official protest with the authorities in Moscow against the aforementioned judgment?

2. Are European diplomats taking action to support NGOs in Russia? If so, what action?

3. Has the EU made efforts, or does it plan to do so, to persuade the Russian authorities to repeal the law on 'foreign agents'?

4. Is the EEAS taking action on this matter with any other international, non-EU organisations?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2013)

On 28 April 2013, the spokesperson of HR/VP Ashton issued a statement expressing the EU's concerns on the fact that the NGO Golos and its Director were fined on the basis of the 'foreign agents' law.

Increased support to civil society is an integral part of the EU's approach to the recent developments in the Russian Federation. Recently a call for proposals was launched under the EIDHR in Russia. There are regular contacts with civil society, notably in the context of the preparations for the EU-Russia human rights consultations which allow better targeting the EU's efforts.

On 17 May, the EU and Russia conducted the 17th round of their biannual human rights consultations. The EU expressed its concerns on the lack of clarity of the concept of 'political activity' as well as the criteria applied to force an NGO to register as 'foreign agent'. The EU will follow closely the developments in the implementation of this law through its Delegation in Moscow, and in particular the appeal trial of GOLOS. The Head of the EU Delegation to the Russian Federation has also conveyed the EU's strong concerns to the Russian authorities in bilateral contacts and will follow up to the Russian proposal to put forward questions to the Ministry of Justice on the implementation of that law.

The EU has similarly expressed its concerns vis à vis the law on 'foreign agents' and the recent trial of GOLOS in the OSCE and in the Council of Europe.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004713/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Ajudas de Estado à recapitalização da banca em Portugal

Tendo em conta que:

— Foi recentemente noticiado na imprensa escrita portuguesa que a Comissão Europeia, através da Direção-Geral da Concorrência, teria desistido, no âmbito das negociações em curso com o Ministério das Finanças e na sequência de diligências do Governador do Banco de Portugal, de obrigar o BANIF — Banco Internacional do Funchal, a concentrar a sua atividade nas regiões autónomas da Madeira e dos Açores;

— Este seria aparentemente um dos remédios radicais que a DG Concorrência pretendia impor, nomeadamente, no contexto de um conjunto de medidas que obrigassem o setor a restringir ainda mais o financiamento à economia;

— Relativamente ao BANIF, as preocupações das autoridades portuguesas centram-se na possibilidade de a DG Concorrência vir a impor uma reorientação das atividades principais na Madeira e Açores, o que poderá colocar em causa a viabilidade da instituição financeira;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Confirma que pretendeu impor ao BANIF a concentração da sua atividade apenas nas regiões autónomas da Madeira e dos Açores?

2. Em caso afirmativo, quais as razões que levam a DG Concorrência a impor tal remédio?

3. Considera que ainda há necessidade de tomar medidas em Portugal para restringir mais o financiamento da economia?

Resposta dada por Joaquín Almunia em nome da Comissão
(20 de junho de 2013)

Em resposta à sua pergunta escrita sobre auxílios estatais para recapitalizar os bancos portugueses e, em especial, o Banif, permitimo-nos salientar que a Comissão tem estado e ainda está a realizar uma análise aprofundada juntamente com Banif, os seus consultores e as autoridades portuguesas, sobre a viabilidade futura do banco no contexto do seu plano de reestruturação.

Dado que o processo está ainda em curso, a Comissão não pode comentar qualquer decisão estratégica quanto à presença atual e futura do Banif na Madeira e nos Açores, assim como o tipo de atividades que pode realizar nesses territórios.

Como é certamente do conhecimento do Senhor Deputado, os bancos em geral e o Banif em particular, depois de receberem auxílios estatais, devem passar por uma análise aprofundada da sua viabilidade, a fim de garantir que são instituições viáveis, com perspetivas futuras, e que não necessitam de novos auxílios estatais (e dinheiro dos contribuintes). Além disso, quando as instituições financeiras recebem apoio público, são necessárias medidas para limitar as distorções da concorrência devendo haver uma partilha adequada dos encargos decorrentes do auxílio estatal recebido. No caso de Banif, esta análise está ainda em curso.

Comissão não considera, nem nunca considerou, que era necessário restringir a atividade creditícia em Portugal. Tal não significa que algumas instituições não devam rever e ajustar as suas práticas de concessão de empréstimos a bem da sua própria viabilidade a longo prazo e assim, garantir que não constituem uma ameaça para a estabilidade financeira do país.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004713/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: State aid to recapitalise Portuguese bank

In the context of ongoing negotiations with the Ministry of Finance, and following efforts by the Governor of the Bank of Portugal, the Portuguese press has recently reported that the Commission, through the Directorate-General for Competition, will no longer oblige BANIF — the Funchal International Bank, to concentrate its activities in the Autonomous Regions of Madeira and the Azores.

This was apparently one of the radical solutions that the Directorate-General for Competition had intended to impose, as part of a package of measures that would oblige the sector to further restrict loans to the economy.

The Portuguese authorities' concerns regarding BANIF are based on the fact that the Directorate-General for Competition may bring about a reorientation of the main activities in Madeira and the Azores, which could threaten the financial institution's viability.

1. Can the Commission confirm that it intended to force BANIF to concentrate all its activities in the Autonomous Regions of Madeira and the Azores?

2. If so, why did the Directorate-General for Competition impose this solution?

3. Does it believe that it is still necessary to take measures in Portugal to further restrict loans to the economy?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2013)

In response to your written question on state aid to recapitalise Portuguese banks and, in particular, to BANIF, please note that Commission has been and still is undertaking an in-depth analysis, together with BANIF, its advisors and the Portuguese authorities, about the bank's future viability in the context of its restructuring plan.

As the case is still ongoing, the Commission cannot comment on any strategic decision as to the current and future presence of BANIF in Madeira and Azores and the sort of business it may conduct in those territories.

As you know, banks in general and BANIF in particular, after having received state aid, need to undergo a thorough analysis of their viability, to ensure that they are viable institutions going forward, not needing further state aid (and tax payers' money). In addition, when financial institutions receive public assistance, measures are needed to limit distortions of competition and there must be adequate burden-sharing for the state aid received. In the case of BANIF, that analysis is still ongoing.

The Commission is not, and has never been, of the view that lending in Portugal generally needs to be restricted. That does not mean that some institutions should not review and adjust their lending practices to ensure their own long-term viability and thus ensure they do not pose a threat to the financial stability of the country.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004714/13
a la Comisión
María Irigoyen Pérez (S&D)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Asunto: Programa Operativo Madrid

Al parecer, la Unión Europea ha destinado a la Comunidad de Madrid, incluida en el objetivo «Competitividad regional y empleo» en el período 2007-2013, 961 millones de euros de Fondos Europeos, de los cuales aproximadamente 538 millones de euros han sido gestionados directamente por la administración regional.

El Gobierno regional debía destinar los recursos, entre otras prioridades, al fomento de la investigación, la innovación y las tecnologías de la información, los recursos energéticos y el acceso a servicios de transporte, el desarrollo sostenible local, el desarrollo empresarial, el fomento de la empleabilidad, la inclusión social y la igualdad entre hombres y mujeres, y el aumento y la mejora del capital humano.

En un informe realizado por los auditores del Fondo Social Europeo (FSE) en junio de 2012 sobre la configuración y la eficiencia de los sistemas de gestión y control del Organismo Intermedio se pusieron en evidencia varias irregularidades relativas a la certificación de las declaraciones de gastos y las verificaciones de primer nivel, así como graves deficiencias del sistema de gestión y control. Concretamente, se detectaron diferentes deficiencias importantes en relación con los sistemas de gestión y control de la DG Educación Secundaria.

¿Puede indicar la Comisión si se han corregido esas irregularidades dentro del plazo que fijaba el informe? ¿Se han producido suspensiones de pagos debido a estas irregularidades detectadas? ¿Que porcentaje de fondos se ha gastado ya del total asignado?

A la vista de la información recibida, ¿considera la Comisión que se han cumplido los objetivos fijados en el Programa Operativo, en especial en lo relativo al aumento y la mejora del capital humano como forma de mejorar su integración laboral?

Según la Comisión, a 1 de enero de 2013 España sólo había pedido a la Comisión el pago del 50,8 % de las ayudas europeas adjudicadas para el periodo 2007-2013. ¿Cuál es el porcentaje correspondiente a la Comunidad de Madrid?

Respuesta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión
(24 de junio de 2013)

El Programa Operativo (PO) de Madrid del FSE está cofinanciado por el presupuesto de la Unión Europea con un total de 256 903 019 euros para el periodo 2007-2013. Como consecuencia del informe de auditoría de junio de 2012, este PO se encuentra bajo reserva parcial, y en febrero de 2013 se aplicó una interrupción parcial de los pagos a todos los gastos realizados por la DG Educación Secundaria.

A fin de corregir las irregularidades señaladas en el informe de auditoría, la autoridad de gestión del PO envió un plan de acción a la Comisión. La autoridad de auditoría regional está validando la correcta aplicación de este plan. Se espera disponer del informe final completo sobre la validación del plan al final del mes de mayo. A partir del informe y de la aplicación de las correcciones financieras solicitadas, la Comisión emitirá un dictamen sobre el levantamiento de la reserva parcial y la interrupción de los pagos, o bien proseguirá con una decisión de suspensión.

Hasta el 1 de enero de 2013, el PO de Madrid había certificado a la Comisión el 41,5 % del importe total que se le había asignado. La aplicación es desigual entre los diferentes ejes del PO, ya que solamente se destina el 33,59 % al eje que pone en práctica medidas para mejorar e incrementar el capital humano.

Con arreglo al informe anual de ejecución para 2012, hasta el 31 de diciembre de 2012 los gastos realizados por los beneficiarios finales eran el 69,7 % del presupuesto total; sin embargo, una parte de estos gastos aún no se habían enviado a la Comisión. No se prevé que surjan problemas con las normas de los compromisos.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004714/13
to the Commission
María Irigoyen Pérez (S&D)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Madrid Operational Programme

Apparently, the European Union has allocated EUR 961 million in European funds to the Community of Madrid, which is covered by the 'Regional competitiveness and employment' objective for the 2007-2013 period. Of this, approximately EUR 538 million was directly managed by the regional administration.

The regional government should have allocated the resources, among other priorities, to the promotion of research, innovation and information technologies, energy resources and access to transport services, local sustainable development, business development, the promotion of employability, social inclusion and equality between men and women, and increasing and improving human capital.

In a report by the auditors of the European Social Fund (ESF) in June 2012 on the configuration and efficiency of the intermediate organisation's management and control systems, various irregularities were highlighted in connection with the certification of declarations of expenditure and first-level checks, as well as serious deficiencies in the management and control system. Specifically, various significant deficiencies were identified in relation to the DG Secondary Education's management and control systems.

Can the Commission say if these irregularities have been corrected within the deadline set by the report? Have any payments been suspended as a result of the irregularities detected? What percentage of funds has already been spent of the total allocated?

In view of the information received, does the Commission believe that the objectives set in the Operational Programme have been met, particularly with regard to increasing and improving human capital as a way of improving access to work?

According to the Commission, as at 1 January 2013 Spain had only asked the Commission to pay 50.8% of the European aid allocated for the 2007-2013 period. What is the percentage for the Community of Madrid?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(24 June 2013)

The Operational Programme (OP) Madrid of the ESF is co-financed by the European Union's budget with a total of EUR 256.903.019 for the period 2007-2013. Following the audit report from June 2012, the programme is under partial reserve and a partial payment interruption was applied in February 2013 to all expenditures made by DG Secondary Education.

In order to correct the irregularities pointed out in the audit report, the OP Managing Authority sent to the Commission an Action Plan. The correct implementation of this Plan is being validated by the Regional Audit Authority. The complete final report on the validation of the Plan is expected by end of May. On the basis of the report and the implementation of the requested financial corrections the Commission will provide an opinion on lifting the partial reserve and payment interruption or continuing with a suspension decision.

Till 1 January 2013, the OP Madrid had certified to the Commission 41.5% of the total amount allocated to the OP. The implementation is uneven among the different axes of the OP, with only 33.59% for the axis implementing actions for improving and increasing human capital.

According to the draft Annual Implementation Report for 2012, till 31 December 2012 the expenditure made by final beneficiaries is 69.7% of the total budget; however part of that expenditure has not been sent to the Commission yet. No problems with the commitment rule are foreseen.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004715/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR) e Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(26 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Sfruttamento industriale di una metodica biotecnologica

Un'azienda ha stipulato con l'Università di Roma «La Sapienza» un contratto di licenza e di sfruttamento industriale del brevetto di una metodica biotecnologica che consente, attraverso il dosaggio di una serie di microRNA presenti nel sangue, di quantificare lo stato di progressione della malattia in pazienti affetti da distrofia muscolare di Duchenne. La metodica brevettata nasce da una ricerca del dipartimento di biologia e biotecnologie della Sapienza, la quale ha identificato che in pazienti affetti da distrofia muscolare di Duchenne si trovano nel plasma sanguigno microRNA normalmente presenti nelle fibre muscolari. La quantità di queste molecole è correlata alla gravità della patologia. Questa metodologia rappresenta quindi un prezioso strumento diagnostico che potrà anche permettere di definire il livello di beneficio in caso di trattamenti terapeutici. Con questo accordo la società Ylichron, una volta completati gli studi di validazione del metodo e della sua efficacia predittiva, porterà sul mercato un servizio innovativo di diagnostica medica disponibile per i centri diagnostici, gli ospedali e le istituzioni di ricerca, che consentirà una valutazione quantitativa del grado di progressione della malattia.

La Commissione:

1. è al corrente di questa metodica?

2. Non crede che questo test — un unicum nei paesi dell'UE — una volta che sia stato opportunamente validato possa essere di grande rilevanza per lo studio degli effetti delle terapie sui pazienti e sui trial clinici di nuovi farmaci, consentendone una valutazione più efficace?

3. Non ritiene che questo metodo poco invasivo, opportunamente validato, possa permettere ai centri diagnostici di determinare la gravità della patologia e la valutazione accurata e comparata dell'efficacia di diversi trattamenti terapeutici?

4. Come intende supportare l'attività di validazione del metodo e della sua efficacia predittiva, di modo che possa essere reso disponibile a tutti i possibili interessati?

5. Come intende promuovere l'assegnazione di fondi europei per progetti legati alla ricerca in questi settori?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(14 giugno 2013)

1. La Commissione è a conoscenza della metodica a cui fanno riferimento le onorevoli parlamentari. Nell'ambito del Settimo programma quadro per le attività di ricerca, sviluppo tecnologico e dimostrazione (7° PQ, 2007-2013) sono stati dedicati specificamente alla ricerca sulla distrofia muscolare di Duchenne circa 11 milioni di euro. Il progetto SKIP-NMD ([1]) finanziato dal 7° PQ sta infatti valutando l'impiego delle microRNA presenti nel sangue per controllare la risposta agli interventi terapeutici nella distrofia muscolare di Duchenne.

2. Ylichron porterà sul mercato uno strumento diagnostico innovativo al fine di valutare l'avanzamento della distrofia muscolare di Duchenne. Tali metodiche non invasive, una volta convalidate, potrebbero rivelarsi di grande importanza per monitorare il progredire della malattia e la risposta alla terapia negli esperimenti clinici, nonché negli studi di osservazione in cui vengono confrontati i trattamenti.

3. La convalida di biomarcatori è essenziale per tradurre le scoperte in diagnostica clinica e applicazioni di monitoraggio. In tal modo si potrebbe contribuire anche a confrontare l'efficacia delle diverse terapie.

4. La questione della convalida della metodica è stata affrontata nel 7° PQ e potrebbe anche essere affrontata nell'ambito di «Orizzonte 2020», il programma di finanziamenti di prossima generazione per la ricerca e l'innovazione (2014-2020).

([1]) http://cordis.europa.eu/search/index.cfm?fuseaction=proj.document&PJ_LANG=IT&PJ_RCN=13404408&pid=98&q=57F24203FFB3C3496B6EF75CC25158DE&type=pro

5. Analogamente, si prevede inoltre che l'impegno della Commissione a sostegno della ricerca sulle malattie rare continuerà attraverso il programma «Orizzonte 2020», nonché attraverso un importante contributo finanziario per il conseguimento degli obiettivi del Consorzio internazionale per la ricerca sulle malattie rare.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004715/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR) and Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Industrial exploitation of a biotechnology method

A company has entered into a contract with the 'La Sapienza' University of Rome for the licensing and industrial exploitation of the patent for a biotechnology method that makes it possible, by measuring a series of microRNAs present in blood, to quantify disease progression in patients suffering from Duchenne muscular dystrophy. The method that has been patented is the result of research by the biology and biotechnology department at La Sapienza, which found that in patients suffering from Duchenne muscular dystrophy microRNAs that are normally present in the muscular fibres are seen in blood plasma. The quantity of these molecules is correlated to the severity of the disease. This method therefore represents a valuable diagnostic tool that may also make it possible to determine the level of benefit produced by therapeutic treatments. Under this agreement, once the studies have been completed to validate the method and its predictive effectiveness, Ylichron will bring to market an innovative medical diagnostic service available to diagnostic centres, hospitals and research institutes that will make it possible to quantitatively assess the progression of the disease.

1. Is the Commission aware of this method?

2. Does it not believe that once this test — which is unique within the EU — has been properly validated it could be of great importance in studying the effects of treatments on patients and in clinical trials of new medicines, allowing them to be assessed more effectively?

3. Does it not believe that once this non-invasive method has been properly validated, it could enable diagnostic centres to determine the severity of a disease and carry out accurate comparative evaluations of the efficacy of different therapeutic treatments?

4. How does it intend to support the validation of the method and its predictive effectiveness, so that it can be made available to all those who may be interested?

5. How does it intend to promote the allocation of European funds to projects linked to research in these sectors?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(14 June 2013)

1. The Commission is aware of the method mentioned by the Honourable Member. Under the Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013) around EUR 11 million have been dedicated specifically to Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy (DMD) research. The FP7 funded SKIP-NMD-project ([1]) is in fact assessing circulating microRNAs for monitoring the response to therapeutic interventions in DMD.

2. Ylichron will bring to the market an innovative diagnostics tool to assess the progression of DMD. Such non-invasive methods, once validated, could be of great importance for monitoring disease progression and the response to therapy in clinical trials as well as in observational studies where treatments are compared.

3. The validation of biomarkers is indeed essential for translating discoveries into clinical diagnostics and monitoring applications. This could also help comparing the efficacy of different therapies.

4. The issue of validation of the method has been addressed in FP7 and could be envisaged to also be addressed in Horizon 2020, the next generation funding programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020).

5. Likewise, it is also envisaged that the Commission's strong commitment towards supporting rare diseases research will continue in Horizon 2020, as well as through a major financial contribution towards the objectives of the International Rare Disease Research Consortium.

([1]) http://cordis.europa.eu/search/index.cfm?fuseaction=proj.document&PJ_LANG=EN&PJ_RCN=13404408&pid=98&q=57F24203FFB3C3496B6EF75CC25158DE&type=pro

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004716/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Desfibrilhadores automáticos

Considerando que:

— O desfibrilhador automático externo (DAE) é um dispositivo portátil que permite, através de elétrodos adesivos colocados no tórax de uma vítima em paragem cardiorrespiratória, analisar o ritmo cardíaco e recomendar ou não um choque elétrico;

— De acordo com o Instituto Nacional de Emergência Médica de Portugal, a utilização de DAE por pessoal não médico em ambiente extra-hospitalar aumenta significativamente a probabilidade de sobrevivência das vítimas em paragem cardiorrespiratória de origem cardíaca;

Pergunto à Comissão:

Considera adequada a definição de regras que determinem a obrigação de dotar determinados espaços públicos, ou outros, de desfibrilhadores automáticos nos 27 países de UE?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(11 de junho de 2013)

A Comissão está ciente da evolução nos Estados-Membros no que respeita aos «desfibrilhadores automáticos externos» em espaços públicos.

No entanto, dado que a adoção de disposições relativas à colocação de desfibrilhadores automáticos externos em locais públicos é uma questão da responsabilidade dos Estados-Membros, a Comissão não está em posição de avaliar a adequação desta legislação.

A legislação europeia sobre dispositivos médicos não regulamenta a sua utilização no âmbito dos sistemas nacionais de saúde, mas impõe requisitos relativos aos produtos com vista a garantir a segurança e o desempenho destes dispositivos.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004716/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Automated defibrillators

An Automated External Defibrillator (AED) is a portable device that analyses the heartbeat of someone suffering from cardiac arrest, through adhesive electrodes placed on the victim's chest, and recommends whether or not to administer an electric shock.

According to INEM, the Portuguese National Institute of Emergency Medicine, the use of AEDs by non-medical professionals outside the hospital environment significantly increases the survival chances of those suffering from cardiac arrest.

Does the Commission believe the regulations obliging certain public and other spaces in the 27 EU countries to be equipped with automated defibrillators are adequate?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2013)

The Commission is aware of developments in Member States regarding 'Automated External Defibrillators' in public places.

However, as the adoption of provisions for placing automated external defibrillators in public places is an issue which falls within the responsibility of Member States, the Commission is not in a position to evaluate whether these regulations are adequate.

European legislation on medical devices does not regulate their use in the national healthcare systems but imposes product-related requirements aiming to guarantee the safety and performance of these devices.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004717/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Surto de Língua Azul detetado em Espanha

Recentemente, foi detetado um surto de Língua Azul em Espanha, próximo da fronteira com as regiões portuguesas da Beira Baixa e do Alentejo.

A Língua Azul é uma doença de origem vírica, que infeta todos os ruminantes, mas que apenas se manifesta de forma grave na espécie ovina.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Que procedimentos foram adotados para evitar a propagação da doença aos países vizinhos, particularmente a Portugal?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(6 de junho de 2013)

O vírus da febre catarral ovina tem circulado na Península Ibérica durante a última década. Em especial, a febre catarral ovina do serótipo 1 continua a propagar-se nessa região e, consequentemente, Portugal continental e a Espanha estão sujeitos a restrições por causa da presença deste serótipo, conforme previsto na legislação da UE ([1]).

Devido a casos mais recentes da doença, as autoridades espanholas estão a aplicar um programa de vacinação obrigatória numa determinada zona, que abrange as regiões da Extremadura, de Castilla y Leon e de Castilla-La Mancha. A Comissão continua a acompanhar a situação da febre catarral ovina em Espanha no âmbito do Comité Permanente da Cadeia Alimentar e da Saúde Animal ([2]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/controlmeasures/bt_restrictedzones-map_2012.jpg
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/committees/regulatory/scfcah/animal_health/presentations/15012013_bluetongue_situation_spain.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004717/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Bluetongue outbreak in Spain

A recent outbreak of bluetongue has been detected in Spain, near the border with the Portuguese regions of Beira Baixa and Alentejo.

Bluetongue is a viral disease that infects all ruminants, but is at its most acute in sheep.

What procedures have been adopted to prevent this disease from spreading to neighbouring countries, in particular to Portugal?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2013)

Bluetongue virus has been circulating in the Iberian Peninsula for the last decade. In particular bluetongue serotype 1 is still circulating in that region and therefore continental Portugal and Spain are subjected to restrictions due to this serotype as laid down in the EU legislation ([1]).

Due to the most recent cases of the disease, the Spanish authorities are implementing a compulsory vaccination programme in a defined area covering the regions of Extremadura, Castilla y Leon and Castilla-La Mancha. The Commission continues to follow the bluetongue situation in Spain in the framework of the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health ([2]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/controlmeasures/bt_restrictedzones-map_2012.jpg
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/committees/regulatory/scfcah/animal_health/presentations/15012013_bluetongue_situation_spain.pdf

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004718/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Descoberto método que aumenta cortiça

Um grupo de investigadores portugueses, do Centro de Estudos Florestais do Instituto Superior de Agronomia, da Universidade Técnica de Lisboa, em parceria com uma empresa do setor da cortiça, descobriu um tratamento para a cortiça que aumenta o seu volume através da utilização do micro-ondas.

Estes investigadores asseguram tratar-se de um processo amigo do ambiente, pois não utiliza produtos químicos.

Assim, pergunta-se à Comissão:

— Como avalia e que apoios justifica esta descoberta com previsíveis vantagens do ponto de vista industrial?

Resposta dada por Máire Geoghegan-Quinn em nome da Comissão
(17 de junho de 2013)

O método que aumenta o volume da cortiça através da utilização de micro-ondas, desenvolvido pelo Grupo Amorim e registado no Instituto Europeu de Patentes, promete ajudar a centenária indústria da cortiça, bem como contribuir para uma produção ecológica e sustentável de rolhas de cortiça para garrafas de vinho.

A produção de cortiça foi sempre um domínio apoiado por investigação financiada pela UE. Um exemplo recente é o projeto Neatcork ([1]) PQ7 ([2]), financiado através da componente «Investigação em benefício das PME». Este projeto tem por objetivo desenvolver um novo método de descontaminação de TCA (trichloroanisol), a integrar nas linhas de engarrafamento de vinho atuais. A disponibilidade desta tecnologia beneficiará milhares de vinhas europeias através da redução das perdas anuais no valor de 700 milhões de EUR associadas ao «gosto a rolha».

A Comissão congratula-se com todas as descobertas e patentes que possam ser benéficas para a indústria. Além disso, a recente proposta Horizonte 2020 para a investigação e a inovação (2014-2020) faz referência à «silvicultura sustentável», visando, *inter alia*, produzir biomassa de forma sustentável, prestando a devida atenção aos aspetos económicos, ecológicos e sociais da silvicultura, bem como às diferenças regionais. O desenvolvimento e a transferência de tecnologia, ou mais investigação no domínio das tecnologias da cortiça, tal com a descrita pelo Senhor Deputado, continuarão provavelmente a ter acesso a financiamento competitivo no âmbito do programa Horizonte 2020.

([1]) http://www.neatcork.eu/
([2]) Sétimo Programa-Quadro de atividades em matéria de investigação, desenvolvimento tecnológico e demonstração (PQ7, 2007-2013).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004718/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Discovery of new cork-expansion method

A group of Portuguese researchers from the Centre for Forest Studies at the Technical University of Lisbon's High Institute of Agronomy, in partnership with a cork company, have discovered a new treatment that uses microwaves to increase cork's volume.

The researchers assure that the process is environmentally friendly as it does not use chemical products.

What does the Commission think of this discovery and its predicted advantages from an industrial perspective? What support does this discovery warrant?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2013)

The method for cork expansion using microwaves, developed by the Amorim Group, and registered at the European Patent Office, promises to help the centuries-old cork industry and supports the environmentally friendly, sustainable production of cork stoppers for wine bottles.

Cork production has always been an area supported through EU-funded research. One current example is the NEATCORK ([1]) FP7 ([2]) project funded under 'Research for the Benefit of SMEs'. This project aims to develop a new TCA (trichloroanisole) decontamination method to be integrated into existing wine bottling lines. The availability of this technology will benefit thousands of European vineyards by reducing the EUR 700 million annual loss associated with 'cork taint'.

The Commission welcomes all discoveries and patents that could be of benefit to industry. In addition, the current Horizon 2020 proposal for Research and Innovation (2014-2020), includes a reference to 'Sustainable forestry', aiming, inter-alia, to sustainably produce biomass, with due attention being paid to the economic, ecological and social aspects of forestry as well as to regional differences. Technology development and transfer, or further research into cork technologies such as the one described by the Honourable Member, will likely continue to have access to competitive funding under Horizon 2020.

([1]) http://www.neatcork.eu/
([2]) Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013).

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004719/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Atentados no Iraque

Considerando que:

— De acordo com as autoridades iraquianas, uma série de ataques coordenados atingiram o Iraque esta semana, deixando um rasto de, pelo menos, 55 mortos e mais de 200 feridos;

— Os ataques, a maioria envolvendo carros-bomba, acontecem menos de uma semana antes das primeiras eleições desde a retirada das tropas americanas em 2011;

— Os ataques acontecem a poucos dias das eleições, que estão a ser vistas como um teste à estabilidade do país após a saída das tropas dos Estados Unidos, e ainda como uma indicação da força política do primeiro-ministro, Nouri al-Maliki, o que poderá dar alguma indicação para as eleições de 2014;

Pergunto à Comissão:

Como avalia os riscos para a estabilidade do Iraque, enquanto país, após a saída definitiva das tropas norte-americanas?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(24 de junho de 2013)

A AR/VP acompanha muito de perto a situação no Iraque. Condenou sistematicamente a continuação de elevados níveis de violência no Iraque, nomeadamente a onda de ataques que ocorreu antes das eleições provinciais. Manifestou igualmente a sua preocupação em relação às crescentes tensões políticas que comprometem a estabilidade no Iraque.

A AR/VP apelou repetidamente a que o governo e os grupos políticos iraquianos encetassem um diálogo inclusivo e genuíno, a fim de resolverem as divergências políticas, sublinhando a importância de assegurar uma governação democrática inclusiva e efetiva em todo o Iraque, baseada no Estado de direito e no respeito da Constituição.

A AR/VP lançou um debate sobre o Iraque nas reuniões do Conselho «Negócios Estrangeiros» de fevereiro e março, nas quais os Ministros dos Negócios Estrangeiros chegaram a um acordo sobre a importância de promover a estabilidade política no Iraque e reforçar o compromisso da UE com o país. Por conseguinte, o Conselho «Negócios Estrangeiros» de abril adotou conclusões especificamente sobre a situação no Iraque.

A UE tem apoiado sistematicamente os esforços democráticos do Iraque e incentivado a reconciliação nacional, como uma condição prévia para um sistema democrático inclusivo e efetivo. A UE continuará a acompanhar de muito perto a evolução do Iraque.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004719/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Attacks in Iraq

According to Iraqi authorities, a wave of coordinated attacks tore through Iraq this week killing at least 55 people and leaving over 200 injured.

The attacks, most involving car bombs, took place less than a week ahead of the first elections since the US troop withdrawal in 2011.

The attacks came only a few days before the elections, which are being seen as a test of the country's stability following the departure of US troops and of Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki's political clout, since they may provide an indication of the 2014 election results.

What is the Commission's assessment of the risks to Iraq's stability as a country following the definitive departure of US troops?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(24 June 2013)

The HR/VP follows the situation in Iraq very closely. She has condemned consistently the continuing high levels of violence in Iraq, including the spate of attacks ahead of the provincial elections. She also expressed concern about the increased political tensions undermining Iraq's stability.

The HR/VP has called repeatedly on the Government and Iraqi political groups to engage in an inclusive and genuine dialogue to address political differences, stressing the importance of ensuring effective and inclusive democratic governance in all of Iraq, underpinned by rule of law and respect of the Constitution.

The HR/VP initiated a discussion on Iraq at the February and March Foreign Affairs Council (FAC) meetings where EU Foreign Ministers agreed on the importance of promoting political stability in Iraq and enhancing EU's engagement with the country. Consequently, April FAC adopted conclusions specifically on the situation in Iraq.

The EU has consistently supported Iraq's democratic endeavours and encouraged national reconciliation as a prerequisite for an inclusive and effective democratic system. The EU will continue to follow the internal developments in Iraq very closely.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004720/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Israel — Síria usou armas químicas

Segundo notícias veiculadas pelo Twitter, na página oficial do exército israelita, o responsável dos serviços de inteligência israelitas diz que a Síria usou armas químicas.

Por seu lado, também o *New York Times* cita o general Brun durante uma conferência no Instituto de Estudos de Segurança Nacional de Israel, onde afirmou que «é claro que usaram armas químicas prejudiciais», apontando «diferentes sinais», incluindo fotografias de vítimas a «espumar da boca».

1. Tem a Comissão conhecimento da situação descrita?

2. Possui a Comissão alguma informação que a confirme?

Resposta dada por Štefan Füle em nome da Comissão
(14 de junho de 2013)

Com base nas informações de fonte aberta atualmente disponíveis, há razões para suspeitar que foram de facto usadas substâncias químicas de que resultaram vítimas mortais.

As investigações efetuadas pela missão designada pelo Secretário-Geral Ban-ki Moon, a qual inclui membros da Organização para a Proibição de Armas Químicas (OPCW), procurará determinar exclusivamente se foram ou não usadas armas químicas, não tirando conclusões sobre a atribuição do uso das mesmas. Esperamos que o acordo (por parte do regime sírio) para o envio da missão seja alcançado em breve.

A UE apoia a Comissão Internacional Independente de Inquérito, que no seu segundo relatório de 4 de junho de 2013 afirma que existem motivos razoáveis para crer que os agentes químicos têm sido usados como armas. Os agentes precisos, sistemas de entrega ou autores não puderam ser identificados.

A UE continuará a acompanhar de perto esta questão em consulta com os seus parceiros.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004720/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Israel — Syria has used chemical weapons

According to Twitter reports, Israeli's head of military intelligence research has claimed, on the Israel Defence Forces official website, that Syria has used chemical weapons.

During a conference at the Israeli Institute for National Security Studies, the *New York Times* also quoted General Brun as saying that 'it is quite clear that they used harmful chemical weapons', and citing 'different signs' including photographs of victims 'foaming at the mouth'.

1. Is the Commission aware of this situation?

2. Does it have any data to confirm this information?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(14 June 2013)

On the basis of currently available open source information, there is reason to suspect that chemical substances might in fact have been used leading to a number of casualties.

The investigation by the mission appointed by SG Ban-ki Moon that includes members of the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) will seek to determine only whether or not chemical weapons were used and will not draw any conclusions as to the attribution of any use. We hope the agreement (by the Syrian regime) to send it will be reached soon.

The EU supports the International Independent Commission of Inquiry, which in its second report of 4 June 2013 states that there are reasonable grounds to believe that chemical agents have been used as weapons. The precise agents, delivery systems or perpetrators could not be identified.

The EU will continue to monitor very closely this matter in consultation with its partners.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004722/13
ao Conselho
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Resultado das eleições na Croácia

A sensivelmente dois meses e meio da adesão oficial da Croácia à União Europeia, o resultado das eleições que elegeram os primeiros eurodeputados ficaram aquém das expectativas em termos de participação dos cidadãos croatas. A participação na referida eleição rondou os 20 %, o que mostra um claro afastamento dos Croatas em relação à adesão ao projeto comunitário.

Pergunto ao Conselho:

De que forma interpreta a fraca adesão dos eleitores croatas nas recentes eleições europeias?

Resposta
(24 de junho de 2013)

Não compete ao Conselho comentar os resultados das eleições do Parlamento Europeu na Croácia.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004722/13
to the Council
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Result of elections in Croatia

With only two and a half months to go until Croatia officially joins the EU, the result of the country's first elections to the European Parliament did not meet expectations where voter participation was concerned. An electoral turnout of around 20% showed that Croatians are clearly unmoved by the prospect of joining the EU.

How does the Council interpret the lack of participation by Croatian voters in the country's recent European elections?

Reply
(24 June 2013)

It is not for the Council to comment on the results of elections to the European Parliament in Croatia.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004723/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Declarações de Guido Mantega

Segundo notícia veiculada pela comunicação social brasileira, o ministro brasileiro das Finanças, Guido Mantega, acusou recentemente os EUA e a UE de colocarem em perigo «a legitimidade e credibilidade» do Fundo Monetário Internacional (FMI) ao bloquearem reformas que reforçariam o peso dos países emergentes na instituição.

Pergunto à Comissão:

De que forma interpreta as declarações do ministro das finanças brasileiro?

Tem conhecimento de algum bloqueio por parte da UE relativamente ao Brasil?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(24 de junho de 2013)

Em 2010, o Conselho de Governadores do FMI aprovou uma profunda reforma das quotas e da governação do FMI. Importa sublinhar que todos os 27 Estados-Membros concluíram plenamente os procedimentos nacionais de ratificação relativos à proposta de alteração da reforma do Diretório Executivo do FMI e à décima quarta revisão geral das quotas do FMI. Encorajamos todos os outros membros do FMI que ainda não concluíram os procedimentos nacionais a fazê-lo rapidamente, de modo a permitir a entrada em vigor da reforma. Uma vez efetiva, a reforma das quotas e da governação do FMI de 2010 terá como resultado uma melhor estrutura de governação que refletirá de forma mais adequada as realidades da economia mundial.

Os Estados-Membros da UE também estão a atuar no sentido de pôr em prática o compromisso assumido relativamente a uma maior representação dos mercados emergentes e dos países em desenvolvimento no Diretório Executivo do FMI, através da redução de dois lugares na representação no Diretório dos países europeus avançados. A UE continuará a desempenhar um papel construtivo nas discussões sobre a revisão do atual sistema de quotas do FMI e da 15.ª revisão geral das quotas no prazo acordado de janeiro de 2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004723/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Guido Mantega's statements

According to reports in the Brazilian media, the Brazilian finance minister Guido Mantega recently accused the United States and the EU of threatening the 'legitimacy and credibility' of the IMF by blocking reforms that would give emerging countries greater influence within the institution.

What is the Commission's interpretation of the Brazilian finance minister's statements?

Does it know of any attempts made by the EU to block Brazil?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(24 June 2013)

In 2010, the IMF Board of Governors agreed on a comprehensive reform of IMF quota and governance. It is important to note that all 27 EU Member States have fully concluded national ratification procedures for the 2010 Proposed Amendment on the Reform of the IMF Executive Board and the Fourteenth General Review of IMF Quotas. We encourage all other IMF members that have not yet completed domestic procedures to do so expeditiously to allow for the entry into force of the reform. Once effective, the 2010 IMF quota and governance reform will result in an improved governance structure that better reflects the realities of the world economy.

EU Member States are also working to implement the commitment for greater representation for emerging market and developing countries at the IMF Executive Board through a reduction of the representation of advanced European countries at the Board by two seats. The EU will continue to play a constructive role in the discussions on the review of the current IMF quota formula and the 15th General Review of Quotas by the agreed deadline of January 2014.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004724/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Desemprego em Espanha

Segundo dados recentes do Instituto Nacional de Estatística (INE), a taxa de desemprego em Espanha subiu para 27,16 % no final do primeiro trimestre, o pior registo em mais de 37 anos, ultrapassando pela primeira vez os seis milhões de desempregados.

1. Pode a Comissão indicar quais são as expectativas da UE quanto à reversão desta realidade?

2. Possui a Comissão indicadores que o demonstrem?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(24 de junho de 2013)

1. A Comissão considera que um dos principais desafios que se colocam à Espanha atualmente é o nível elevado e sem precedentes da sua taxa de desemprego e, em especial, o facto de um em cada dois jovens estar desempregado. As previsões económicas europeias da primavera ([1]) sugerem que a sensibilidade acrescida dos salários às condições do mercado de trabalho, um dos principais objetivos da reforma do mercado de trabalho de 2012, deverá contribuir para moderar a queda do emprego, mas prevê-se que o desemprego continue a aumentar, embora menos do que em 2012.

No Semestre Europeu de 2012, a Comissão propôs e o Conselho aprovou recomendações específicas para a Espanha sobre esta questão. A Comissão está a acompanhar a evolução da situação no mercado de trabalho espanhol e as medidas empreendidas, tendo apresentado a sua avaliação global nas recomendações específicas por país em 2013, adotadas em 29 de maio de 2013. Na opinião da Comissão, deverá ser dada uma atenção especial aos jovens que não têm emprego, não frequentam nenhum sistema de ensino nem qualquer formação, às pessoas pouco qualificadas, aos trabalhadores mais velhos e aos desempregados de longa duração.

2. Prevê-se que o mercado de trabalho continue a sofrer os efeitos da contração da economia a partir de 2012. A procura interna como segundo principal indicador, deve manter-se fraca. Por último, um forte crescimento da produtividade do trabalho, juntamente com uma atenção permanente à moderação salarial, deverá reduzir ainda mais os custos unitários nominais da mão-de-obra em 2013.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/eu/forecasts/2013_spring/es_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004724/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Unemployment in Spain

According to recent data from Statistics Portugal, Spain's unemployment rate rose to 27.16% at the end of the first quarter, its highest rate in over 37 years, with over six million unemployed for the first time ever.

1. Can the Commission indicate what the EU's expectations are with regard to turning these figures around?

2. Does it have any indicators to show this?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(24 June 2013)

1. The Commission considers that one of the main challenges currently facing Spain is its record-high unemployment rate and especially the fact that one in two young people are jobless. The Spring European Economic Forecast ([1]) suggests that the increased sensitivity of wages to labour market conditions, one of the key objectives of the 2012 reform of the labour market, should contribute to moderate the fall in employment, but that unemployment is forecast to continue to rise, albeit less than in 2012.

During the 2012 European Semester, the Commission proposed and the Council endorsed country-specific recommendations for Spain on this issue. The Commission is monitoring developments on the Spanish labour market and the measures adopted and presented its overall assessment in the 2013 country-specific recommendations adopted by the Commision on 29 May 2013. In the Commission's view, special attention should be paid to young people not in employment, education or training, the low-skilled, older workers and the long-term unemployed.

2. The employment market should continue to suffer from the large carry-over effect of the economy contraction from 2012. Domestic demand as second main indicator should remain weak. Finally, strong labour productivity growth, together with continued attention to wage moderation, should further reduce the nominal unit labour costs in 2013.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/eu/forecasts/2013_spring/es_en.pdf

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004725/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Grécia reivindica reparações de guerra à Alemanha

Considerando que:

— O Governo grego reivindicou recentemente uma dívida de aproximadamente 162 mil milhões de euros à Alemanha por reparações da II Guerra mundial.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Terá o Governo grego feito este pedido no contexto do programa de ajustamento económico em curso?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(26 de junho de 2013)

A Comissão gostaria de informar o Senhor Deputado de que o assunto em questão não é da competência da Comissão. A questão colocada é da competência exclusiva das autoridades nacionais dos países em questão.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004725/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Greece's claim for war reparations from Germany

The Greek Government recently claimed that Germany owes Greece around EUR 162 billion in reparations for the Second World War.

Is Greece's claim in any way connected with the ongoing economic adjustment programme?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(26 June 2013)

The Commission would like to inform the Honorable Member that the matter in question is not within the Commission's remit. The question asked is a matter solely for the national authorities concerned.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004726/13
ao Conselho
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Declarações de Guido Mantega

Segundo notícia veiculada pela comunicação social brasileira, o ministro brasileiro das Finanças, Guido Mantega, acusou recentemente os EUA e a UE de colocarem em perigo «a legitimidade e credibilidade» do Fundo Monetário Internacional (FMI) ao bloquearem reformas que reforçariam o peso dos países emergentes na instituição.

Pergunto ao Conselho:

Tem conhecimento de algum bloqueio por parte da UE relativamente a países emergentes como o Brasil?

Resposta
(10 de junho de 2013)

Não compete ao Conselho comentar artigos publicados na imprensa.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004726/13
to the Council
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Guido Mantega's statements

According to reports in the Brazilian media, the Brazilian finance minister Guido Mantega recently accused the United States and the EU of threatening the 'legitimacy and credibility' of the IMF by blocking reforms that would give emerging countries greater influence within the institution.

Does the Council know of any attempts made by the EU to block emerging countries like Brazil?

Reply
(10 June 2013)

It is not for the Council to comment on articles appearing in the press.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004727/13
ao Conselho
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Declarações de Angela Merkel

Considerando que:

A Chanceler Alemã afirmou que «os Estados-Membros têm de estar preparados para ceder a soberania, em determinados domínios, às instituições europeias».

Pergunto ao Conselho:

— Consideram igualmente que a sustentabilidade da zona euro implicará necessariamente perdas de soberania?

— E em que termos?

Resposta
(11 de setembro de 2013)

Não compete ao Conselho comentar as declarações públicas feitas por chefes de Estado ou de Governo dos Estados-Membros ou por membros dos Governos dos Estados-Membros.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004727/13
to the Council
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Angela Merkel's statements

The German Chancellor has stated that 'Member States must be prepared to cede control over certain policy domains to European institutions'.

Does the Council also believe that sustaining the euro area will necessarily involve losses of sovereignty?

On what terms?

Reply
(11 September 2013)

It is not for the Council to comment on public statements made by the Heads of State or Government of Member States or by members of Member States' governments.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004728/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Declarações de Angela Merkel

Considerando que:

A Chanceler Alemã afirmou que «os Estados-Membros têm de estar preparados para ceder a soberania, em determinados domínios, às instituições europeias».

Pergunta-se:

Consideram igualmente que a sustentabilidade da zona euro implicará necessariamente perdas de soberania?

E em que termos?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(17 de junho de 2013)

Os pontos de vista da Comissão sobre as medidas necessárias para avançar no sentido de uma União Económica e Monetária sustentável figuram no Plano pormenorizado para uma União Económica e Monetária efetiva e aprofundada, publicado em 30 de novembro de 2012. O Plano pormenorizado define um roteiro com as etapas a realizar a curto, médio e longo prazos para avançar no sentido de uma união bancária, orçamental, económica e política. Tal como afirmado no Plano pormenorizado, a Comissão é de opinião que, para conseguir uma União Económica e Monetária efetiva e aprofundada, todas as principais decisões de política económica e orçamental dos Estados-Membros devem ser objeto de maior coordenação, validação e supervisão a nível europeu. Uma União Económica e Monetária deste tipo deve ter por base uma capacidade orçamental autónoma e suficiente que permita apoiar efetivamente as escolhas políticas resultantes do processo de coordenação.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004728/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Angela Merkel's statements

The German Chancellor has stated that 'Member States must be prepared to cede control over certain policy domains to European institutions'.

Does the Commission also believe that sustaining the euro area will necessarily involve losses of sovereignty?

On what terms?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2013)

The Commission's views on the necessary steps to move towards a sustainable EMU are laid down in the Blueprint for a Deep and Genuine EMU published on 30 November 2012. The Blueprint provides a roadmap with steps to be taken in the short, medium and long term to move towards banking, fiscal, economic and political union. As stated in the Blueprint, the Commission is of the opinion that in such a deep and genuine EMU all major economic and fiscal policy choices of its Member States should be subject to deeper coordination, endorsement and surveillance at the European level. Such an EMU should also be underpinned by an autonomous and sufficient fiscal capacity that allows the policy choices resulting from the coordination process to be effectively supported.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004729/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Gaston Franco (PPE) και Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(26 Απριλίου 2013)

Θέμα: Στρατηγικό πλαίσιο για τα μεσογειακά δάση

Στις 21 Μαρτίου 2013, ορισμένες χώρες της Λεκάνης της Μεσογείου (Αλγερία, Ισπανία, Γαλλία, Ιταλία, Λίβανος, Μαρόκο, Πορτογαλία, Τυνησία και Τουρκία) ενέκριναν ένα στρατηγικό πλαίσιο για τα μεσογειακά δάση (CSFM) που προετοιμάστηκε με την υποστήριξη του FAO στο Tlemcen (Αλγερία). Με βάση την ανησυχητική κατάσταση που περιγράφεται στην πρώτη έκθεση σχετικά με την κατάσταση των μεσογειακών δασών (2013), αυτό το στρατηγικό πλαίσιο προτείνει συστάσεις για τη συστηματική προώθηση των οικοσυστημικών αγαθών και υπηρεσιών, τη βελτίωση της ανθεκτικότητας των μεσογειακών δασικών οικοσυστημάτων, καθώς και την ενίσχυση των ανθρώπινων ικανοτήτων και την κινητοποίηση πρόσθετων πόρων. Το CSFM προτείνει ειδικότερα την προσαρμογή των υπαρχόντων χρηματοδοτικών μηχανισμών, καθώς και τη δημιουργία καινοτόμων μηχανισμών χρηματοδότησης προκειμένου να στηριχθεί η υλοποίηση των προτεινόμενων στρατηγικών προσανατολισμών τόσο σε περιφερειακό ή εθνικό όσο και σε τοπικό επίπεδο, ούτως ώστε να υπάρξει ανταπόκριση στις ειδικές ανάγκες ορισμένων μεσογειακών εδαφών.

1. Τα μεσογειακά δασικά οικοσυστήματα θα επηρεαστούν όλως ιδιαιτέρως από τις επιπτώσεις της κλιματικής αλλαγής. Ποια ιδιαίτερη αντιμετώπιση προτίθεται να δώσει η Επιτροπή στην υλοποίηση του CSFM που εγκρίθηκε από διάφορα κράτη μέλη (Ισπανία, Ιταλία, Γαλλία και Πορτογαλία) και χώρες του νότιου τμήματος της Μεσογείου, και ποιες αρθρώσεις μπορούν να σχεδιαστούν με τις άλλες ευρωπαϊκές δυναμικές για τα δάση (νομικά δεσμευτική συμφωνία για τα δάση στην Ευρώπη και ευρωπαϊκή στρατηγική για τα δάση);

2. Ποια οικονομική στήριξη προτίθεται να παράσχει η Επιτροπή στη βελτίωση των γνώσεων όσον αφορά τον αντίκτυπο της κλιματικής αλλαγής στα δασικά οικοσυστήματα, στην εξέλιξη των κινδύνων δασικών πυρκαγιών και άλλων βιοτικών κινδύνων, καθώς και στην παραγωγή αγαθών και υπηρεσιών από τους συγκεκριμένους δασικούς χώρους της λεκάνης της Μεσογείου;

3. Σύμφωνα με τον στόχο της ολοκλήρωσης των κοινοτικών πολιτικών (διαρθρωτικά ταμεία, πλαίσιο για την έρευνα και ανάπτυξη, κοινή γεωργική πολιτική, μέσο LIFE, μηχανισμοί εταιρικής σχέσης με τα θεσμικά όργανα των Ηνωμένων Εθνών, μέσο ENPI και άλλα μέσα που είναι ικανά να ευνοήσουν μια πραγματική ευρωμεσογειακή συνεργασία), με ποιον τρόπο σχεδιάζει η Επιτροπή τη βελτίωση των υφιστάμενων χρηματοδοτικών μέσων, προκειμένου να ενθαρρύνει πραγματικές ευρωμεσογειακές δυναμικές μεταξύ των δασικών εδαφών της Λεκάνης της Μεσογείου;

Απάντηση του κ. Potočnikon εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(11 Ιουνίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή συνέβαλε ενεργά στην κατάρτιση του στρατηγικού πλαισίου για τα μεσογειακά δάση (CSFM) και παραμένει σε στενή επαφή με την Silva Mediterranea του FAO, καθώς και με τη Σύμπραξη Συνεργασίας για τα μεσογειακά δάση. Η Επιτροπή επέκτεινε τη συμμετοχή της ομάδας της, τα μέλη της οποίας είναι εμπειρογνώμονες σε θέματα πυρκαγιάς των δασών, στις χώρες της Βόρειας Αφρικής και της Μέσης Ανατολής.

Στο στάδιο αυτό, δεν προγραμματίζονται δεσμοί στο πλαίσιο μιας νομικά δεσμευτικής συμφωνίας για τα δάση. Βρίσκονται σε εξέλιξη οι εργασίες για μια νέα δασική στρατηγική της ΕΕ και η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει ότι υπάρχουν πιθανές συνέργειες με το CSFM.

Προς όφελος των δασών και του δασικού τομέα σε όλα τα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ, η πολιτική αγροτικής ανάπτυξης της ΕΕ θα συνεχίσει να παρέχει στήριξη σε επενδύσεις, κατάρτιση και ετήσιες στρεμματικές ενισχύσεις με στόχο την ενίσχυση της βιωσιμότητας του κλάδου — ιδίως όσον αφορά τη βελτίωση του περιβάλλοντος.

Στο πλαίσιο του ευρωπαϊκού μέσου γειτονίας, το 2012 αποδόθηκαν 37 εκατ. ευρώ με σκοπό τη βελτίωση της διαχείρισης των δασών στο Μαρόκο. Επί του παρόντος, η διμερής συνεργασία της ΕΕ με τις νότιες γειτονικές χώρες διέπεται από σειρά εθνικών σχεδίων δράσης. Τα σχέδια αυτά περιλαμβάνουν κοινές προτεραιότητες που θα κατευθύνουν τον προγραμματισμό της βοήθειας της ΕΕ από το 2014 και μετά, για τις συμμετέχουσες χώρες.

Σε περιφερειακό επίπεδο, η συνεργασία στη Μεσόγειο πραγματοποιείται στο πλαίσιο της Ένωσης για τη Μεσόγειο. Μολονότι επικεντρώνονται κυρίως στη ρύπανση της Μεσογείου, τα υπό εξέλιξη περιφερειακά προγράμματα για τις νότιες γειτονικές χώρες, θα συμβάλουν στη βελτίωση των γνώσεων στον τομέα των δασικών οικοσυστημάτων στην περιοχή. Για παράδειγμα, το πρόγραμμα για το Νότο της CLIMA, το οποίο δρομολογήθηκε πρόσφατα, θα παράσχει τεχνική βοήθεια προκειμένου να στηριχθούν ο μετριασμός/προσαρμογή της κλιματικής αλλαγής και να αναπτυχθούν πιλοτικά έργα σχετικά με προσεγγίσεις βασιζόμενες το οικοσύστημα.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004729/13
à la Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE) et Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(26 avril 2013)

Objet: Cadre stratégique sur les forêts méditerranéennes

Le 21 mars 2013, plusieurs pays du pourtour de la Méditerranée (Algérie, Espagne, France, Italie, Liban, Maroc, Portugal, Tunisie et Turquie) ont adopté un cadre stratégique sur les forêts méditerranéennes (CSFM) préparé avec le soutien de la FAO à Tlemcen (Algérie). Sur la base de la situation alarmante décrite dans le premier rapport sur l'état des forêts méditerranéennes (2013), ce cadre stratégique propose des recommandations pour la promotion systématique des biens et services écosystémiques, l'amélioration de la résilience des écosystèmes boisés méditerranéens, ainsi que le renforcement des capacités humaines et la mobilisation de ressources additionnelles. Le CSFM propose notamment l'adaptation des mécanismes financiers existants ainsi que la création de mécanismes de financement innovants pour appuyer la mise en œuvre des orientations stratégiques proposées aussi bien aux niveaux régional ou national que local pour répondre aux besoins spécifiques de certains territoires méditerranéens.

1. Les écosystèmes forestiers méditerranéens seront tout particulièrement concernés par les impacts du changement climatique. Quel traitement particulier la Commission compte-t-elle accorder à la mise en œuvre du CSFM adopté par plusieurs États membres (Espagne, Italie, France et Portugal) et des pays du sud de la Méditerranée et quelles articulations peuvent être envisagées avec les autres dynamiques européennes sur les forêts (accord juridiquement contraignant sur les forêts en Europe et stratégie européenne sur les forêts)?

2. Quel soutien financier la Commission compte-t-elle apporter à l'amélioration des connaissances en matière d'impact du changement climatique sur ces écosystèmes boisés, sur l'évolution des risques de feux de forêts et autres risques biotiques ainsi que sur la production de biens et services par ces espaces boisés du pourtour méditerranéen?

3. Conformément à l'objectif d'intégration des politiques communautaires (fonds structurels, cadre pour la recherche et le développement, politique agricole commune, instrument LIFE, instruments de partenariat avec les institutions des Nations unies, instrument ENPI et autres instruments susceptibles de favoriser une véritable coopération euro-méditerranéenne), comment la Commission envisage-t-elle l'amélioration des instruments financiers existants pour encourager de véritables dynamiques euro-méditerranéennes entre les territoires forestiers du pourtour de la Méditerranée?

Réponse donnée par M. Potočnik au nom de la Commission
(11 juin 2013)

La Commission a activement contribué à la mise en place du cadre stratégique pour les forêts méditerranéennes (CSFM) et reste en contact étroit avec *Silva Mediterranea*, un organe de la FAO, ainsi qu'avec le partenariat de collaboration sur les forêts méditerranéennes. La Commission a ouvert l'adhésion à son propre groupe d'experts sur les incendies de forêt à des pays d'Afrique du Nord et du Proche-Orient.

Il n'est pas prévu à ce stade d'établir des liens avec un accord juridiquement contraignant sur les forêts. Des travaux portant sur la nouvelle stratégie forestière de l'Union européenne sont en cours et la Commission est consciente des synergies possibles avec le CSFM.

Dans l'intérêt des forêts et du secteur forestier dans tous les États membres de l'Union, la politique de développement rural de l'Union continuera de soutenir les investissements, la formation et les paiements annuels liés à la surface visant à renforcer la viabilité du secteur, en particulier du point de vue de l'environnement.

Dans le cadre de l'instrument européen de voisinage, 37 millions d'euros ont été octroyés en 2012 pour améliorer la gestion des forêts au Maroc. La coopération bilatérale de l'Union avec ses voisins du Sud est actuellement régie par une série de plans d'action nationaux. Ces plans prévoient un ensemble de priorités communes qui guideront la programmation de l'aide de l'Union à partir de 2014 pour les pays participants.

Au niveau régional, la coopération en Méditerranée s'effectue dans le cadre de l'Union pour la Méditerranée. Bien que principalement axés sur la pollution de la mer Méditerranée, les programmes régionaux en cours en faveur du voisinage du Sud contribueront à améliorer les connaissances sur les écosystèmes forestiers de la région. Par exemple, le programme CLIMA South lancé récemment fournira une assistance technique afin de soutenir la lutte contre le changement climatique et l'adaptation à celui-ci et concevoir des projets pilotes concernant les approches écosystémiques.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004729/13
to the Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE) and Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Strategic framework on Mediterranean forests

On 21 March 2013, several Mediterranean countries (Algeria, Spain, France, Italy, Lebanon, Morocco, Portugal, Tunisia and Turkey) adopted a strategic framework on Mediterranean forests (SFMF) drafted with the support of the FAO in Tlemcen (Algeria). In view of the alarming situation described in the first report on the state of Mediterranean forests (2013), this strategic framework offers recommendations for systematically promoting ecosystem goods and services, making Mediterranean forest ecosystems more resilient, strengthening human resources and mobilising additional resources. The SFMF proposes in particular adapting existing financial mechanisms and creating innovative financial mechanisms to support the implementation of the strategic guidelines proposed at both regional and national level and at local level in order to respond to the specific needs of some Mediterranean countries.

1. Mediterranean forest ecosystems will be particularly affected by the impact of climate change. How does the Commission intend to address the implementation of the SFMF adopted by several Member States (Spain, Italy, France and Portugal) and southern Mediterranean countries and what links might be planned with other European initiatives on forests (legally binding agreement on forests in Europe and European forest strategy)?

2. What financial support does the Commission intend to provide to improve knowledge about the impact of climate change on these forest ecosystems, about the risk of forest fires and other biotic risks and about the production of goods and services using these forest areas across the Mediterranean?

3. In accordance with the objective to integrate Community policies (structural funds, framework for research and development, common agricultural policy, LIFE instrument, partnership instruments with UN institutions, ENPI instrument and other instruments which could be used to promote real Euro-Mediterranean cooperation), how does the Commission intend to improve the existing financial instruments to encourage real Euro-Mediterranean dynamics between forest regions across the Mediterranean?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2013)

The Commission actively contributed to the establishment of the Strategic Framework on Mediterranean Forests (SFMF) and stays in close contact with FAO-Silva Mediterranea, as well as with the Collaborative Partnership on Mediterranean Forests. The Commission has extended membership of its own group of experts on forest fires to North African and Middle Eastern countries.

There are no links planned with a legally binding agreement on forest at this stage. Work on the new EU Forest Strategy is underway and the Commission is aware of possible synergies with the SFMF.

For the benefit of forests and the forest sector in all EU Member States, the EU's rural development policy will continue to offer support for investments, training and annual area-based payments designed to strengthen the sector's sustainability — especially in environmental terms.

In the context of the European Neighbourhood Instrument, 37 MEUR were attributed in 2012 to improve forest governance in Morocco. EU bilateral cooperation with southern neighbours is currently governed by a series of National Action Plans. These plans contain a set of joint priorities that will guide the programming of EU assistance from 2014 onwards for participating countries.

At regional level, cooperation in the Mediterranean takes place under the Union for the Mediterranean. While mainly focused on Mediterranean sea pollution, ongoing regional programmes for the southern neighbourhood will contribute to improve knowledge on forest ecosystems in the region. For example the recently launched CLIMA South programme will provide technical assistance to support climate change mitigation/adaptation and develop pilot projects on ecosystems-based approaches.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004730/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Atentado na embaixada de França

A França está envolvida, com extensos meios militares, na luta contra o extremismo islâmico no norte do Magrebe. A embaixada francesa na Líbia sofreu o primeiro atentado a uma embaixada na capital, que provocou o desmoronamento de parte do muro de segurança da embaixada e que destruiu a entrada do edifício. O atentado não foi reivindicado por nenhum grupo. No entanto, e de acordo com declarações veiculadas na rede social Twitter, a Al-Qaida para o norte de África e o Magrebe (AQUIM) afirmou que iria retaliar contra o apoio francês ao governo do Mali contra grupos extremistas islâmicos, que também incluem cidadãos líbios.

Pode a Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante indicar como avalia esta situação?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(2 de julho de 2013)

O atentado de 23 de abril de 2013 contra a Embaixada Francesa em Trípoli representa uma escalada de violência que visa a comunidade internacional na Líbia, constituindo, portanto, motivo de grande preocupação para a UE.

A AR/VP emitiu uma declaração no mesmo dia, em que condena veementemente o ataque e exprime a mais profunda solidariedade da UE para com as famílias das vítimas e as autoridades francesas, e exorta as autoridades líbias a realizarem as investigações necessárias para que os responsáveis sejam julgados.

Este ataque recorda ainda a necessidade permanente de se alcançar a estabilidade em todas as partes da Líbia, para que o povo deste país possa ter um futuro mais seguro, mais pacífico e mais próspero. A UE continuará a apoiar as autoridades e o povo líbios na sua resposta a estes desafios.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004730/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Attack on the French embassy

France is heavily involved, in military terms, in the fight against Islamic extremism in the northern Maghreb. The French embassy in Libya has become the first in the capital to come under attack, which demolished part of its security wall and destroyed the entrance to the building. No group has claimed responsibility for the attack. However, according to statements on the Twitter social network, al-Qaida in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM) has promised retaliation against France for its support of the Mali Government against Islamic extremists, some of whom are Libyan nationals.

How does the Vice-President/High Representative view this situation?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(2 July 2013)

The attack against the French embassy in Tripoli on 23 April 2013 represents an escalation of violence targeting the international community in Libya and therefore constitutes a cause of great concern for the EU.

The HR/VP released a statement on the day condemning in the strongest terms the attack, expressing EU deepest sympathy to the families of the victims and to the French authorities and calling on the Libyan authorities to undertake the necessary investigations to bring the perpetrators to justice.

This attack is also a reminder of the continuing need to achieve stability in all parts of Libya so that its people can have a safer, more peaceful and prosperous future. The EU will continue to support the Libyan authorities and people in dealing with these challenges.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004731/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Oposição Síria — Pedido de armas ao G8

O conflito sírio esteve entre os temas dominantes na reunião dos ministros dos Negócios Estrangeiros dos países do G8, em Londres. Foi discutida a possibilidade de fornecer armas aos rebeldes. Os britânicos defendem a retirada do embargo da União Europeia sobre o fornecimento de armas à rebelião síria, mas esta questão dividiu os integrantes do G8, uma vez que são conhecidas relações entre a fação rebelde síria Al-Nusra e os terroristas da Al-Qaida.

Pode a Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante indicar qual a posição da UE relativamente a esta matéria?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(2 de julho de 2013)

A reunião do Conselho «Negócios Estrangeiros» de 27 de maio de 2013 acordou em adotar medidas restritivas contra a Síria, por um período de 12 meses, nos domínios especificados na Decisão do Conselho 2012/739/CFSP, excetuados os das armas e do equipamento utilizado para fins de repressão interna. Doravante, estes dois últimos domínios relevarão das políticas nacionais dos Estados-Membros.

Numa declaração que acompanha a citada decisão, os Estados-Membros comprometeram-se a proceder, nas suas políticas nacionais referentes às eventuais exportações de armas para a Síria, destinadas à Coligação Nacional da Oposição Síria e às Forças Revolucionárias, para proteção dos civis, com base em garantias adequadas e numa base casuística, tendo em conta todos os critérios fixados na Posição Comum 2008/944/PESC do Conselho, de 8 de dezembro de 2008, que define as regras comuns aplicáveis ao controlo das exportações de tecnologia e equipamento militares.

Os Estados-Membros comprometeram-se igualmente a não avançar, nesta fase, para a entrega do equipamento supramencionado. O Conselho reverá a sua posição antes de 1 de agosto de 2013, com base num relatório a elaborar pela AR/VP, após consulta ao Secretário-Geral da ONU, sobre a evolução da iniciativa EUA-Rússia e sobre o empenho das partes sírias.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004731/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Syrian opposition — Request for arms at the G8

The conflict in Syria was high on the agenda at the meeting of G8 foreign ministers in London. The possibility of supplying arms to the rebels was discussed. The UK advocated lifting the EU embargo on supplying arms to the Syrian rebels, but the G8 members were divided on the issue as the Syrian al-Nusra Front rebel faction was known to have links to Al-Qaida.

Can the Vice-President/High Representative say what the EU's position is on this matter?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(2 July 2013)

The Foreign Affairs Council of 27 May 2013 agreed to adopt for a period of 12 months restrictive measures against Syria in fields specified in Council Decision 2012/739/CFSP, except for arms and equipment for internal repression. This will from now on be a matter of national policies of Member States.

In a declaration accompanying this decision, Member States committed to proceed in their national policies with regard to the possible export of arms to Syria for the Syrian National Coalition for Opposition and Revolutionary Forces and intended for the protection of civilians on the basis of adequate safeguards and on a case-by-case basis, taking full account of the criteria set out in Council Common Position 2008/944/CFSP of 8 December 2008 defining common rules governing control of exports of military technology and equipment.

Member States also committed not to proceed at this stage with the delivery of the equipment mentioned above. The Council will review its position before 1 August 2013 on the basis of a report by the HR/VP, after having consulted the UN Secretary General, on the developments related to the US-Russia initiative and on the engagement of the Syrian parties.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004732/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Israel — A Síria usou armas químicas

Segundo notícias veiculadas pelo Twitter, o responsável dos serviços de inteligência israelitas declara, na página oficial do exército israelita, que a Síria usou armas químicas.

Por seu lado, também o New York Times cita o general Brun que, durante uma conferência no Instituto de Estudos de Segurança Nacional de Israel, afirmou que a Síria utilizou amas químicas, apontando diferentes provas, nomeadamente fotografias de vítimas a «espumar da boca».

Considerando que o Presidente Obama afirmou que a utilização de armas químicas é uma «linha vermelha» que pode levar à intervenção militar norte-americana num conflito que dura há três anos,

Pergunta-se à Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante:

1. De que dados dispõe relativamente à situação atual na Síria?

2. Considera iminente uma intervenção militar norte-americana?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(8 de julho de 2013)

Com base nas informações do domínio público atualmente disponíveis, os serviços da UE consideram que poderão ter sido efetivamente utilizadas substâncias químicas a um nível limitado, com um número reduzido de vítimas.

A missão de inquérito nomeada pelo Secretário-Geral Ban-Ki Moon, que inclui membros da Organização para a Proibição de Armas Químicas (OPAQ/OPCW), procurará unicamente determinar se foram ou não utilizadas armas químicas e não tirará conclusões sobre a atribuição de qualquer utilização. Esperamos que o acordo (por parte do regime sírio) sobre o envio desta missão seja alcançado em breve.

A UE continuará a acompanhar de perto este assunto, em consulta com os seus parceiros.

A Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente está em contacto regular com os seus homólogos da Administração norte-americana no que diz respeito à situação na Síria. Ambas as partes estão empenhadas no êxito da organização da conferência de paz sobre a Síria, que constitui uma prioridade urgente, nas próximas semanas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004732/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Israel — Syria has used chemical weapons

According to reports on Twitter, the head of Israel's intelligence service stated on the Israeli army's official website that Syria has used chemical weapons.

Also, according to the New York Times, General Brun stated at a conference at the Israeli Institute for National Security Studies that Syria has used chemical weapons. General Brun offered several pieces of evidence, including photographs of victims 'foaming at the mouth'.

President Obama has said that the use of chemical weapons is a 'red line' that could lead to US military intervention in a conflict that has lasted three years.

1. What information does the High Representative/Vice-President have on the current situation in Syria?

2. Does she believe that US military intervention is imminent?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(8 July 2013)

On the basis of currently available open source information, the EU services assess that chemical substances might in fact have been used at a limited level with limited number of casualties.

The investigation by the mission appointed by SG Ban-ki Moon that includes members of the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) will seek to determine only whether or not chemical weapons were used and will not draw any conclusions as to the attribution of any use. We hope the agreement (by the Syrian regime) to send it will be reached soon.

The EU will continue to monitor very closely this matter in consultation with its partners.

HR/VP is in regular contact with her counterparts in the US administration with regards to the situation in Syria. Both sides are committed to a successful organisation of the peace conference on Syria, which is now of urgent priority, in the weeks to come.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004733/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Ataque ao Supremo Tribunal da Somália

Segundo notícia recentemente veiculada pela comunicação social portuguesa, nove militares da guerrilha Al-Shabaab entraram no Supremo Tribunal da capital da Somália em plena sessão, disparando contra os presentes. O balanço provisório é de vinte mortos, incluindo os nove guerrilheiros.

De que dados dispõe a Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante relativamente à situação atual na Somália?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(1 de julho de 2013)

Conforme afirmámos na Declaração AR/VP de 15 de abril, condenamos totalmente os ataques de 14 de abril, perpetrados em Mogadíscio contra o Supremo Tribunal. Continuaremos a acompanhar de perto a evolução da situação, mas mantemos a convicção de que atos de desespero como estes não farão retroceder os progressos notáveis a que se assiste na Somália. Prova disso é a recente eleição do governo, assim como a presença e a influência significativamente reduzidas do Al-Shabaab em geral. Os recentes ataques sublinham a necessidade de um apoio internacional forte e continuado à segurança e ao desenvolvimento da Somália, mas não retiram importância aos progressos substanciais realizados ou em curso.

A União Europeia está empenhada em cooperar estreitamente com o Governo da Somália e com a comunidade internacional alargada, para dar um apoio abrangente, que corresponda às necessidades daquele país. Aguardamos, por isso, com expectativa a conferência que se realizará em Bruxelas, em setembro. Essa conferência, organizada conjuntamente pela UE e pela Somália, centrar-se-á neste país e no compromisso internacional de resolver as questões políticas, de segurança e socioeconómicas prioritárias mais críticas nos termos de um novo «pacto».

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004733/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Attack on Somalia's Supreme Court

According to recent reports in the Portuguese media, nine Al-Shabaab militants stormed the Supreme Court in Mogadishu and opened fire while the court was in full session. Twenty people are believed to have been killed, including the nine militants.

What data does the Vice-President/High Representative have on the current situation in Somalia?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(1 July 2013)

As expressed in an HR/VP statement of 15 April, we utterly condemn the attacks on the Courthouse in Mogadishu on 14 April. We will continue to closely monitor developments, however we remain confident that these acts of desperation shall not reverse the remarkable progress we are seeing in Somalia, demonstrated through the recent government election and the significantly reduced presence and influence of Al-Shabaab overall. The recent attacks underline the need for continued strong international support to security and development in Somalia, but they do not diminish the substantial progress that has been and is being made.

The EU is committed to continuing to work closely with the Somali government and wider international community to provide comprehensive support in line with Somali needs. In this regard, we look forward to the Brussels Conference in September. This EU-Somalia co-hosted conference will focus on Somali and international commitment to addressing the most critical political, security, and socioeconomic priorities under a New Deal 'Compact'.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004734/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Corte pela Agência Fitch do rating do Reino Unido

Considerando que **a** dívida de longo-prazo do Reino Unido perdeu hoje o triplo AAA da Agência Fitch e que esta última justifica corte com receios económicos e alerta para subida do endividamento dos britânicos — «*O downgrade dos ratings soberanos do Reino Unido reflete as perspetivas frágeis em termos económicos e orçamentais e, por isso, a revisão em alta das projeções para os défices orçamentais e endividamento público britânicos*».

Pergunto à Comissão:

1. Como analisa este corte no *rating* do Reino Unido?

2. Significará uma perda do perfil creditício sólido que apresentava o Reino Unido?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(19 de julho de 2013)

A fim de preservar a independência das agências de notação de risco no processo de emissão das suas notações, o quadro regulamentar da UE relativo às agências de notação estabelece que nem as autoridades competentes nem os Estados-Membros devem interferir no conteúdo das decisões de notação. Por conseguinte, a Comissão não tenciona comentar as decisões tomadas por uma determinada agência de notação.

No entanto, dado que as notações não são simples opiniões mas um serviço regulamentado, as agências de notação que funcionam na União Europeia estão sujeitas a normas de transparência e de qualidade. Estas normas foram alteradas pelo Regulamento relativo às agências de notação de risco (Regulamento ANR3 ([1])), que entrou em vigor em 20 de junho de 2013. As novas regras destinam-se, nomeadamente, a melhorar a qualidade e a transparência do processo de notação, a reforçar a concorrência no setor da notação de risco e a limitar os conflitos de interesses. Visam ainda introduzir a responsabilidade civil das ANR no quadro das suas atividades. Além disso, desde 1 de julho de 2011, as agências de notação são supervisionadas pela Autoridade Europeia dos Valores Mobiliários e dos Mercados (ESMA), mandatada para tomar medidas de supervisão em caso de violação do Regulamento ANR.

Por outro lado, a Comissão realiza a sua própria análise da sustentabilidade das finanças públicas dos Estados-Membros da UE (ver Relatório de sustentabilidade orçamental 2012 ([2]) e Previsões da primavera ([3])). No contexto do Semestre Europeu, a Comissão publicou, em 29 de maio de 2013, a sua avaliação dos programas de estabilidade e convergência dos Estados-Membros.

([1]) Regulamento (UE) n.° 462/2013 do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho que altera o Regulamento (CE) n.° 1060/2009 relativo às agências de notação de risco e Diretiva 2013/14/UE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho que altera: a Diretiva 2003/41/CE relativa às atividades e à supervisão das instituições de realização de planos de pensões profissionais, a Diretiva 2009/65/CE, que coordena as disposições legislativas, regulamentares e administrativas respeitantes a alguns organismos de investimento coletivo em valores mobiliários (OICVM) e a Diretiva 2011/61/UE relativa aos gestores de fundos de investimento alternativos.

([2]) Disponível em: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/2012/pdf/ee-2012-8_en.pdf (páginas 133-134).

([3]) Disponível em: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/2013/pdf/ee-2012-8_en.pdf (páginas 94-95).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004734/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Fitch's downgrading of the UK's credit rating

The UK's long-term debt has been stripped of its AAA rating by Fitch Ratings, which justified the downgrade by highlighting economic fears and by warning of the rise in British debt: 'The downgrade of the UK's sovereign ratings primarily reflects a weaker economic and fiscal outlook and hence the upward revision to Fitch's medium-term projections for UK budget deficits and government debt'.

1. What is the Commission's view of the downgrading of the UK's credit rating?

2. Will it threaten the UK's solid credit profile?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(19 July 2013)

In order to preserve the independence of credit rating agencies in the process of issuing its ratings, the EU regulatory framework on credit rating agencies requires that neither the competent authorities nor the Member States should interfere in the substance of individual rating decisions. Therefore, the Commission does not intend to comment on rating decisions taken by a particular rating agency.

Nevertheless, given that credit ratings are not mere opinions but are a regulated service, credit rating agencies operating in the EU are subject to transparency and quality standards. These rules have been amended by the CRA3 regulation ([1]), which entered into force on 20 June 2013. They are designed, among others, to improve the quality and transparency of the rating process, to enhance competition in the rating sector and to mitigate conflicts of interest. They also introduce civil liability of CRAs for their activities. Furthermore, since 1 July 2011, credit rating agencies are supervised by the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) which is mandated to take supervisory action in case the CRA regulation is violated.

Separately, the Commission carries out its own analysis of the sustainability of government finances of EU Member States (see Fiscal Sustainability Report 2012 ([2]) and Spring forecast ([3])). In the context of the European Semester, the Commission published on 29 May 2013 its assessment of Member States' Stability and Convergence Programmes.

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 462/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EC) No 1060/2009 on credit rating agencies and related Directive 2013/14/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council amending: Directive 2003/41/EC on the activities and supervision of institutions for occupational retirement provision, Directive 2009/65/EC on the coordination of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to undertakings for collective investment in transferable securities (UCITS) and Directive 2011/61/EU on Alternative Investment Funds Managers.

([2]) Available from http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/2012/pdf/ee-2012-8_en.pdf (pages 133-134).

([3]) Available from http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/2013/pdf/ee2_en.pdf (pages 94-95).

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004735/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Entrada da Sérvia na UE

Considerando que:

— Após meses de negociações com a Comissão Europeia, a Sérvia e o Kosovo assinaram um acordo histórico proposto pela União Europeia.

— No seguimento deste acordo, a Comissão Europeia propôs, esta segunda-feira, que começassem as conversações de adesão da Sérvia à União Europeia.

— Na União Europeia, a maioria dos Estados-Membros considera o Kosovo independente, à exceção de Espanha, Grécia, Roménia, Eslováquia e Chipre. No Conselho de Segurança da ONU, a Rússia e a China também não reconhecem a independência daquele território.

— A Sérvia sublinhou, entretanto, que o acordo, com o qual as zonas de maioria sérvia do norte do Kosovo ganharam mais autonomia, não estabelece a independência deste território.

Considera a Comissão estarem reunidas as condições para o início das conversações para a adesão da Sérvia à União Europeia?

Resposta dada por Štefan Füle em nome da Comissão
(20 de junho de 2013)

A Comissão, no seu parecer ([1]) sobre o pedido de adesão à União Europeia apresentado pela Sérvia, de outubro de 2011, recomendou que «sejam abertas as negociações para a adesão da Sérvia à União Europeia, logo que este país obtiver progressos suplementares significativos no cumprimento das seguintes prioridades essenciais: medidas adicionais para normalizar as relações com o Kosovo ([2]), no que respeita as condições do Processo de Estabilização e de Associação […]».

O relatório conjunto ([3]) da Comissão e da Alta Representante sobre progressos da Sérvia, de 22 de abril de 2013, concluiu que «a Sérvia tomou medidas muito significativas para a melhoria visível e sustentável das relações com o Kosovo, em conformidade com as conclusões do Conselho de dezembro de 2012. A Sérvia empenhou-se de forma ativa e construtiva no diálogo com Pristina, apoiado pela UE, e encetou discussões sobre uma grande variedade de questões necessárias para obter uma melhoria visível e sustentável nas relações com o Kosovo. Nesta base, a Comissão considera que a Sérvia cumpriu a prioridade fundamental de adotar medidas conducentes a uma melhoria visível e sustentável das relações com o Kosovo. A Sérvia cumpre agora de forma suficiente os critérios políticos e as condições constantes do Processo de Estabilização e de Associação».

A Comissão recomendou, por conseguinte, que sejam abertas com a Sérvia as negociações de adesão à União Europeia.

([1]) COM(2011) 668 — http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2011/package/sr_rapport_2011_pt.pdf
([2]) Esta designação não prejudica as posições relativas ao estatuto, e está conforme com a RCSNU 1244/99 e o parecer do TIJ sobre a declaração de independência do Kosovo.
([3]) JOIN (2013) 7 — http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2013/sr_spring_report_2013_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004735/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Serbia's entry into the EU

After months of negotiations with the Commission, Serbia and Kosovo have signed a historic agreement proposed by the EU.

Following this agreement, the Commission this Monday proposed that talks on Serbia's membership of the EU should begin.

Most Member States consider Kosovo to be independent, with the exception of Spain, Greece, Romania, Slovakia and Cyprus. On the UN Security Council, Russia and China also do not recognise Kosovo's independence.

Meanwhile, Serbia has stressed that the agreement, under which Serbian-majority areas to the north of Kosovo will gain greater autonomy, does not establish Kosovo's independence.

Does the Commission believe that the conditions are right to begin talks on Serbia's membership of the EU?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2013)

The Commission, in its Opinion ([1]) on Serbia's application for membership of October 2011, recommended that 'negotiations for accession to the European Union should be opened with Serbia as soon as it achieves further significant progress in meeting the following key priority [of taking] further steps to normalise relations with Kosovo ([2]) in line with the conditions of the Stabilisation and Association Process […]'.

The Joint Report ([3]) of the Commission and the High Representative on Serbia's progress of 22 April 2013 concluded that 'Serbia has taken very significant steps towards visible and sustainable improvement in relations with Kosovo, in line with the Council conclusions of December 2012. Serbia has actively and constructively engaged in the EU-facilitated dialogue with Pristina and entered discussions on the whole range of issues necessary to achieve visible and sustainable improvement in relations with Kosovo. […] On this basis, the Commission considers that Serbia has met the key priority of taking steps towards a visible and sustainable improvement of relations with Kosovo. […] Serbia now sufficiently fulfils the political criteria and the conditions of the Stabilisation and Association Process'.

The Commission therefore recommended that negotiations for accession to the European Union should be opened with Serbia.

([1]) COM(2011) 668 — http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2011/package/sr_rapport_2011_en.pdf
([2]) This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSCR 1244/1999 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo declaration of independence.
([3]) JOIN (2013) 7 — http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2013/sr_spring_report_2013_en.pdf

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004736/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Uma em cada cinco crianças no mundo não é vacinada

Considerando que:

— Uma em cada cinco crianças no mundo não beneficia das vacinas que se estima salvarem a vida de 2 a 3 milhões de crianças por ano, segundo dados da Unicef;

— A Unicef estima que 1 milhão e meio de crianças não teriam morrido em 2011 se tivessem sido vacinadas;

— Segundo a organização, mais de 70 % das crianças que não são vacinadas vivem em 10 países: Afeganistão, África do Sul, Chade, Etiópia, Filipinas, Índia, Indonésia, Nigéria, Paquistão e República Democrática do Congo.

Pergunto à Comissão:

1. Como analisa os dados apresentados?

2. Que posição assume a União Europeia perante a falta de esforços globais para vacinação de todas as crianças?

Resposta dada por Andris Piebalgs em nome da Comissão
(20 de junho de 2013)

1. Estes dados são coerentes com o Plano Ação de Vacinação Global, validado pelos 194 membros da Assembleia Mundial da Saúde, em maio de 2012, que estabelece um roteiro para evitar milhões de mortes até 2020 através do acesso equitativo às vacinas existentes para as pessoas em todas as comunidades. A falta de vacinas não é o único obstáculo a impedir que as crianças recebam as vacinas de que necessitam. A realidade é mais complexa, incluindo os aspetos do financiamento da saúde, as capacidades em matéria de recursos humanos, de logística e da mobilização social.

2. Os esforços mundiais para vacinar todas as crianças são significativos e existem recentemente um número de marcos que comprovam este facto. A Comissão gostaria, por exemplo, de mencionar a reunião da Aliança Mundial para Vacinas e Imunização (GAVI), em 2011, e a mais recente Cimeira sobre Vacinação Global, em Abu Dhabi, onde foram anunciados compromissos substanciais. Em ambos os casos, foi reafirmada a determinação da União Europeia em contribuir para os esforços mundiais, através de um compromisso financeiro de 5 milhões de EUR, para além do apoio mais abrangente aos sistemas de saúde que a UE proporciona aos países.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004736/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: One in every five children worldwide is not vaccinated

According to Unicef data, one in every five children in the world does not receive the vaccines that save the lives of an estimated 2 to 3 million children every year.

Unicef estimates that 1.5 million children would not have died in 2011 if they had been vaccinated.

According to the organisation, over 70% of the children who have not been vaccinated live in one of ten countries: Afghanistan, South Africa, Chad, Ethiopia, the Philippines, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Pakistan and the Democratic Republic of Congo.

1. What is the Commission's view of these data?

2. What is the EU's position on the lack of global efforts to vaccinate all children?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2013)

1. These data are coherent with the Global Vaccine Action Plan, endorsed by the 194 members of the World Health Assembly in May 2012, which provides a roadmap to prevent millions of deaths by 2020 through equitable access to existing vaccines for people in all communities. The lack of vaccines is not the only barrier preventing children from receiving the vaccines they need. The reality is more complex than this, including aspects of health financing, human resource capacity, logistics and social mobilisation.

2. Global efforts to vaccinate all children are significant and there are a number of recent milestones which demonstrate this. The Commission would like for instance to name the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunisation (GAVI) replenishment meeting in 2011 and the more recent Abu Dhabi Global Vaccine Summit where substantial pledges were announced. In both cases the EU's determination to contribute to global efforts has been reaffirmed and translated into financial commitments, with recently a pledge of EUR 5 million to the polio eradication, which come on top of the more comprehensive health systems support the EU is providing to countries.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004737/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Plataforma para combate à fraude fiscal

Considerando que a Comissão lançou, recentemente, uma plataforma para a boa governação fiscal, no sentido de acompanhar as ações dos 27 Estados-Membros no combate aos paraísos fiscais e ao planeamento fiscal agressivo.

Pergunto à Comissão:

1. Como será composta esta plataforma?

2. Quais as principais medidas a inscrever no plano de ação?

Resposta dada por Algirdas Šemeta em nome da Comissão
(7 de junho de 2013)

Na sequência da Comunicação de 6 de dezembro de 2012 sobre um plano de ação para reforçar a luta contra a fraude e a evasão fiscais ([1]), a Comissão adotou, em 23 de abril de 2013, uma decisão sobre a criação de um grupo de peritos da Comissão («decisão»), designado como Plataforma para a boa governação fiscal, o planeamento fiscal agressivo e a dupla tributação, a seguir designado («Plataforma»), C (2013) 2236 final.

A Plataforma deverá ter um máximo de 45 membros, incluindo as autoridades fiscais de todos os Estados-Membros e um máximo de 15 organizações representantes das empresas, da sociedade civil e dos profissionais da fiscalidade, tal como estabelecido no artigo 4.° dessa decisão. As organizações serão selecionadas a partir das respostas ao convite à apresentação de candidaturas, também lançado em 23 de abril. O convite foi publicamente divulgado no portal da DG TAXUD ([2]), bem como nas notícias do registo dos grupos de peritos da Comissão e de outras entidades similares. O prazo para o envio das candidaturas foi 8 de maio de 2013. A Comissão nomeará as organizações selecionadas em devido tempo. A primeira reunião da Plataforma está fixada para 10 de junho de 2013.

As tarefas da Plataforma foram definidas no artigo 2.° da decisão e incluem a assistência à Comissão para a elaboração do relatório sobre a aplicação das suas recentes recomendação sobre o planeamento fiscal agressivo ([3]) e a recomendação relativa a medidas destinadas a encorajar os países terceiros a aplicar normas mínimas de boa governação em matéria fiscal ([4]). A Plataforma decidirá o seu próprio programa de trabalho, em conformidade com o disposto na decisão.

([1]) COM(2012) 722 final de 6.12.2012 «Plano de ação para reforçar a luta contra a fraude e a evasão fiscais».
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/index_en.htm
([3]) COM(2012) 8806 final.
([4]) COM(2012) 8805 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004737/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Platform for fighting tax fraud

The Commission recently launched a platform for tax good governance to monitor the 27 Member States' efforts to tackle tax havens and aggressive tax planning.

1. How will this platform be constituted?

2. What will be the main measures set down in the action plan?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(7 June 2013)

Following the announcement in the communication of 6 December 2012 on an Action Plan to strengthen the fight against tax fraud and tax evasion ([1]), the Commission on 23 April 2013 adopted a decision on setting up a Commission Expert Group ('Decision') to be known as the Platform for Tax Good Governance, Aggressive Tax Planning and Double Taxation ('Platform'), C (2013) 2236 final.

The Platform will have a maximum of 45 members, including the tax authorities of all Member States and up to 15 business, civil society and tax practitioner organisations, as set out in Article 4 of the decision. The organisations will be selected from replies received to the Call for Applications which was also launched on 23 April. The call was publicly advertised on DG TAXUD's website ([2]) as well as in the news section of the Commission Register for Expert Groups and similar entities. The deadline for sending in applications was 8 May 2013. The Commission will appoint the organisations selected in due course. The first meeting of the Platform has been scheduled for 10 June 2013.

The tasks of the Platform have been laid down in Article 2 of the decision and will include assisting the Commission in preparing its report on the implementation of its recent Recommendations on aggressive tax planning ([3]) and regarding measures intended to encourage third countries to apply minimum standards of good governance in tax matters ([4]). The Platform will decide its own work program in accordance with the terms of the decision.

([1]) COM(2012)722 final (An Action Plan to strengthen the fight against tax fraud and tax evasion) of 6.12.2012.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/index_en.htm
([3]) COM(2012) 8806 final.
([4]) COM(2012) 8805 final.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004738/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Efeitos dos medicamentos biossimilares

Considerando que:

— Não existem estudos suficientes que demonstrem quais os efeitos secundários provocados pelos novos medicamentos biossimilares (do grupo dos biológicos);

— A indústria farmacêutica assegura que são eficazes e seguros, mas reconhece que os ensaios clínicos são mais limitados;

— A grande vantagem que os novos medicamentos apresentam é a redução do preço, podendo ser mais baratos 30 % a 40 % do que o medicamento original.

— A diminuição da despesa com biossimilares pode levar as administrações hospitalares à substituição automática dos medicamentos biológicos por biossimilares.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Sabendo que a troca de um medicamento biológico por um biossimilar pode provocar anticorpos no doente com consequências desconhecidas, dispõe a Comissão de dados que permitam comprovar os efeitos nos doentes?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(11 de junho de 2013)

Os medicamentos biossimilares e os medicamentos em geral só podem ser introduzidos no mercado caso a sua segurança para uso humano tenha sido adequadamente comprovada.

Para garantir o nível mais elevado possível proteção da saúde pública aos cidadãos de toda a União Europeia, todos os medicamentos para uso humano devem ser autorizados quer no Estado-Membro quer a nível da União, antes de poderem ser introduzidos no mercado da UE ([1]).

Os processos de autorização de mercado incluem dados clínicos e de segurança que são cuidadosamente analisados antes de ser concedida uma autorização de introdução no mercado. No caso dos medicamentos biossimilares, também são necessários estudos de comparabilidade entre o novo medicamento biossimilar e o medicamento de referência autorizado na União escolhido para o efeito, que confirmem a sua natureza similar em termos de qualidade, de segurança e de eficácia.

([1]) Artigo 6.°, n.° 1, da Diretiva 2001/83/CE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004738/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Effects of biosimilar medicines

There are insufficient studies on the side effects of new biosimilar medicines.

The pharmaceutical industry has guaranteed that they are effective and safe, but it recognises that clinical trials are limited.

The great advantage of the new medicines is that they can be 30% to 40% cheaper than the original medicine.

The lower costs associated with biosimilar medicines could lead hospital administrations to automatically replace biological medicinal products with biosimilar ones.

Given that exchanging a biological medicine for a biosimilar one could cause patients to develop antibodies with unknown consequences, does the Commission have any data on the effects on patients?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2013)

Biosimilar medicines, and medicines in general, can only be put on the market if their safety for human use has been adequately proven.

To guarantee the highest possible level of public health to citizens across the European Union, all medicinal products for human use have to be authorised either at Member State or Union level before they can be placed on the EU market ([1]).

Market authorisation dossiers include safety and clinical data that are carefully screened before a market authorisation is granted. In the case of biosimilar medicines, comparability studies substantiating the similar nature, in terms of quality, safety and efficacy, of the new similar biological medicinal product and the chosen reference medicinal product authorised in the Union are also required.

([1]) Article 6(1) of Directive 2001/83/EC.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004739/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Nova estirpe do vírus da gripe das aves

Considerando que:

— Apesar do número de vítimas mortais não ser tão elevado como há 10 anos, o H7N9 já matou 22 pessoas das 108 infetadas na China desde março deste ano.

— Crescem os receios de uma pandemia, uma vez que metade dos pacientes infetados não teve qualquer contacto conhecido com aves;

— A Organização Mundial de Saúde alerta para a maior facilidade de transmissão do vírus aos humanos, considerando a nova estirpe do vírus da gripe uma das mais letais.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Como analisa a situação descrita, sabendo que os testes até agora efetuados ainda não conseguiram concluir se o vírus se transmite ou não entre humanos?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(14 de junho de 2013)

A Comissão é informada diariamente pela delegação da UE em Pequim, pela Organização Mundial de Saúde (OMS) e pelo Centro Europeu de Prevenção e Controlo das Doenças (CEPCD) sobre a evolução da situação da gripe A (H7N9) na China. Foram comunicados à Organização Mundial de Saúde (OMS) um total de 131 casos humanos confirmados laboratorialmente, incluindo 36 mortes. Até 17 de maio de 2013, os Estados-Membros da UE não notificaram qualquer caso no respetivo território.

No que se refere à questão da transmissão entre casos humanos, não se confirmou uma transmissão contínua entre seres humanos. Tal significa que, até à data, a doença não se tem propagado entre os seres humanos.

A Comissão espera que nas próximas semanas surjam novos casos esporádicos e que a zona geográfica em causa na China aumente. Não se pode excluir a importação de casos humanos individuais para a Europa. Os Estados-Membros têm de reforçar a sua capacidade para detetar e diagnosticar esses casos. Por esta razão, uma definição provisória de casos de gripe A (H7N9) e um protocolo para a rápida identificação de eventuais casos foram acordados na UE e partilhados com as autoridades de saúde nos Estados-Membros, através do sistema de alerta rápido e de resposta. A rede de laboratórios de referência nacionais contra a gripe na UE está igualmente pronta a responder em caso de necessidade.

A Comissão continua a acompanhar a situação em estreito contacto com a OMS e o CEPCD. Na eventualidade de surgirem casos confirmados nos Estados-Membros da UE, estes seriam notificados à Comissão e à OMS, e a coordenação das medidas seria rapidamente ativada em consulta com o Comité de Segurança da Saúde da UE e a rede do sistema de alerta rápido e de resposta.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004739/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: New strain of the bird-flu virus

Although the number of fatalities is lower than it was 10 years ago, H7N9 has killed 22 of the 108 people infected in China since March this year.

Fears of a pandemic are growing, as half of those infected had no known contact with birds.

The World Health Organisation has warned that the virus is more easily transmitted to humans, and it considers the new strain of flu virus to be one of the most deadly.

What is the Commission's view of the situation, given that the tests to date have yet to determine whether the virus can be transmitted between humans?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(14 June 2013)

The Commission is updated on a daily basis by the EU Delegation in Beijing, by the World Health Organisation (WHO) and by the European Centre for Diseases Prevention and Control (ECDC) on the development of the situation of influenza A(H7N9) in China. A total of 131 laboratory-confirmed human cases, including 36 deaths have been reported to the World Health Organisation (WHO). Until 17 May 2013 no cases have been reported from the EU Member States.

Concerning the issue of transmission among human cases there is no confirmed sustained human-to-human transmission on going. It means that so far the disease is not spreading from human to human.

The Commission expects over the coming weeks new sporadic cases and an expansion of the geographic area involved in China. Individual imported human cases to Europe cannot be ruled out. Member States need to strengthen their preparedness for detecting and diagnosing such cases. For this reason an interim case definition of Influenza A(H7N9) and a protocol for the rapid identification of possible cases has been agreed within the EU and shared with the Health Authorities in Member States through the Early Warning and Response System. The Network of the National influenza reference laboratories in the EU is also ready to respond in case of need.

The Commission continues to monitor the situation in close contact with the WHO and the ECDC. In the event of cases being confirmed in EU Member States these would be notified to the Commission and the WHO and coordination of measures would be rapidly activated in consultation with the EU Health Security Committee and the Network of the EU Early Warning and Response System.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004740/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: 17 Estados-Membros da UE violam Pacto de Estabilidade

Considerando que, apesar da austeridade imposta na UE, e segundo dados do Eurostat, 17 Estados-Membros da UE violam o Pacto de Estabilidade.

Pergunta-se:

Continua a considerar a austeridade como a melhor solução para a UE sair da crise que atravessa?

Para quando medidas concretas para incentivar o crescimento económico em toda a UE?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(7 de junho de 2013)

A Comissão considera que uma política macroeconómica credível deverá incluir diferentes elementos, nomeadamente políticas orçamentais sustentáveis e reformas estruturais que estimulem o crescimento e a competitividade e promovam o emprego. Esses objetivos de política económica estão consagrados na Estratégia Europa 2020. Para mais informações, consultar o sítio web: (http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/index_en.htm), nomeadamente no que respeita às medidas que visam estimular o crescimento a nível nacional e da UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004740/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: 17 EU Member States are in breach of the Stability and Growth Pact

According to Eurostat data, 17 EU Member States are in breach of the Stability and Growth Pact, despite the austerity imposed within the EU.

Does the Commission still believe that austerity is the best way out of the EU financial crisis?

When will concrete measures be implemented to encourage economic growth across the EU?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(7 June 2013)

The Commission is of the view that credible macroeconomic policy should comprise different elements, including sustainable fiscal policies, structural reforms to boost growth and competitiveness and to promote employment. These objectives of the economic policy are enshrined in the Europe 2020 strategy. More information can be found on the following website: http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/index_en.htm, including measures to boost growth at national and EU level.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004741/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Dependência da tecnologia

Considerando que:

— O número de pessoas que se tornaram dependentes de novas tecnologias aumentou 30 % nos últimos três anos e os viciados apresentam os mesmos sintomas que os alcoólicos ou toxicodependentes;

— De acordo com alguns especialistas, as crianças que usam computadores e «tablets» desde bebés podem ter problemas de saúde a longo prazo, como comportamentos compulsivos, entre outros;

— No Reino Unido, um em cada sete pais admitiu deixar o filho usar aparelhos tecnológicos durante, pelo menos, 4 horas por dia;

Pergunto à Comissão:

Tem conhecimento desta situação?

A Comissão possui algum estudo sobre o impacto das novas tecnologias na saúde das crianças?

Resposta dada por Neelie Kroes em nome da Comissão
(6 de junho de 2013)

A Comissão está ciente do problema da utilização excessiva da Internet entre os menores. A fim de avaliar de forma realista o problema da utilização excessiva da Internet entre os menores na Europa, a Comissão financiou, ao abrigo do programa «Para uma Internet mais segura», um vasto estudo sobre a utilização da Internet e a dependência da Internet por parte dos menores na Europa ([1]).

O objetivo desse estudo consistia em identificar e analisar as causas e a evolução dos comportamentos de dependência da Internet por parte dos menores na Europa. O estudo europeu apresenta um conjunto de dados impressionante: foram inquiridos cerca de 14 000 adolescentes de 7 países europeus, com idades compreendidas entre os 14 e os 17 anos. As recomendações finais aos pais, professores e responsáveis políticos, com base neste estudo, será divulgado dentro em pouco através do sítio Web bem como dos meios de comunicação social.

De todos os adolescentes inquiridos, 1,2 % mostravam sinais de um comportamento aditivo à Internet (*Internet Addictive Behaviour* — IAB) ([2]), ao passo que 12,7 % indicavam sinais de disfuncionamento de comportamento em relação à Internet (*Dysfunctional Internet Behaviour*). O inquérito em linha «EU Kids» ([3]), que também foi financiado pelo programa «Para uma Internet mais segura», revelou que, apesar de haver um número de crianças (29 %) que apresentam um ou mais dos cinco componentes associados a uma utilização excessiva da Internet, muito poucos (1 %) apresentam níveis de utilização patológicos.

O facto de passar muito tempo em linha não é necessariamente um sinal de que a criança tem problemas relacionados com a utilização da Internet. Tendo em vista proteger as crianças do uso excessivo da Internet, recomenda-se aos pais que se impliquem diretamente nas atividades em linha dos respetivos filhos mediante apoio e debate.

([1]) www.eunetadb.eu
([2]) IAB é definido como um padrão comportamental que se caracteriza por uma perda de controlo em relação à utilização da Internet. O IAB conduz potencialmente a isolamento e a negligência de atividades sociais, académicas e recreativas ou de higiene e saúde pessoal.
([3]) http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/47344/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004741/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Addiction to technology

The number of people addicted to new technologies has risen by 30% in the past three years, and addicts present the same symptoms as alcoholics or drug addicts.

According to some experts, children who begin using computers and tablets when they are babies may suffer long-term health problems such as compulsive behaviour.

In the United Kingdom, one in every seven parents has admitted allowing their child to use technological devices for at least 4 hours a day.

Is the Commission aware of this situation?

Does it possess any studies on the impact of new technologies on children's health?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2013)

The Commission is aware of the problem of excessive Internet use among minors. In order to realistically assess the problem of excessive Internet use among minors in Europe, the Commission funded under the Safer Internet Programme an extensive study on the Internet use and Internet addictive behaviour of minors in Europe ([1]).

The goal of this study was to identify and analyse the determinants and development of Internet addictive behaviour of minors in Europe. The study generated an impressive European dataset: around 14 000 adolescents were surveyed, aged 14-17, from 7 European countries. The final recommendations for parents, teachers and policy-makers based on this study will be shortly disseminated through the website as well as social media.

Of all the adolescents surveyed 1.2% showed signs of Internet Addictive Behaviour (IAB) ([2]), while 12.7% showed signs of Dysfunctional Internet Behaviour. The EU Kids Online survey ([3]) also funded under the Safer Internet Programme showed that while a number of children (29%) experienced one or more of the five components associated with excessive Internet use, very few (1%) can be said to show pathological levels of use.

Spending a lot of time online is not necessarily a sign of a child having problems related to Internet use. To protect children from excessive Internet use, it is recommended that parents involve themselves actively in their child's online activities through support and discussion.

([1]) www.eunetadb.eu
([2]) IAB is defined as a behavioral pattern characterised by a loss of control over Internet use. IAB potentially leads to isolation and neglect of social, academic and recreational activities or personal hygiene and health.
([3]) http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/47344/

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004742/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Bitcoins

Considerando que:

— O bitcoin é uma moeda virtual que permite fazer transferências de dinheiro de forma instantânea, gratuita e anónima para qualquer parte do mundo através da internet. Cada utilizador tem um porta-moedas eletrónico com uma chave pública que permitir receber bitcoins e uma chave privada e secreta que permite fazer pagamentos;

— Nenhum organismo nem banco central controla ou valida as transações.

Pergunto à Comissão:

1. Sabendo que são os algoritmos matemáticos e robustas técnicas de encriptação que controlam e validam as transações, considera estarem as mesmas dotadas de suficiente segurança?

2. Poderão ou não ser utilizados em eventuais fugas de capitais?

Resposta dada por Michel Barnier em nome da Comissão
(21 de junho de 2013)

A Comissão está a acompanhar a evolução das bitcoins e gostaria de salientar o seguinte: se os ciberataques contra os bitcoins, que tiveram lugar no passado, podem servir de indicação das potenciais vulnerabilidades das moedas eletrónicas, o ponto fraco essencial parece prender-se mais com a possibilidade de roubo dos bitcoins existentes dos servidores que os armazenam do que com os algoritmos e a codificação utilizados no processo de cunhagem.

Conforme indicado na resposta à E-4223/2013, as atuais características da oferta de bitcoins, que se baseiam num algoritmo, parecem limitar fortemente a quantidade de bitcoins em circulação. O volume total de bitcoins em circulação está limitado a 21 milhões, valor que deverá ser alcançado em 2040. Este aspeto parece tornar os bitcoins inadequados para utilização em transações de valor elevado e excluí-los como veículo para movimentos de capitais em grande escala.

A Comissão continuará a acompanhar esta evolução, tendo em vista, designadamente, eventuais questões de prudência no contexto dos bitcoins.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004742/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Bitcoins

Bitcoin is a virtual coin that allows money to be transferred instantaneously, anonymously and without charge to anywhere in the world over the Internet. All users have an electronic wallet with a public key that allows them to receive bitcoins and a private, secret key that allows payments to be made.

No institution or central bank controls or validates the transactions.

1. Are the algorithms and encryption techniques used to control and validate Bitcoin transactions sufficiently secure?

2. Could they be used to enable capital flight?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(21 June 2013)

The Commission is following the development around bitcoins and would note the following: if the past cyber-attacks against bitcoins can be used as an indication of the potential vulnerabilities in the context of electronic currencies, the main weakness would appear to relate to the possibilities of theft of existing bitcoins from the servers storing them rather than to the algorithms and encryption used in the process of mining.

As indicated in the reply to E-4223/2013 the current supply characteristics of bitcoins, which are based on an algorithm, would appear to severely limit the quantity of bitcoins in circulation. The total amount of bitcoins in circulation is limited to 21 million bitcoins, to be achieved in 2040. This would appear to make bitcoins unfit for use for any high value transactions and would appear to disqualify bitcoins as a vehicle for large-scale capital movements.

The Commission will continue to monitor this development, notably with a view to potential prudential concerns in the context of bitcoins.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004743/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Teste rápido ao sangue

Considerando que:

— Uma investigadora da Universidade do Minho, em Portugal, inventou um dispositivo portátil que permite, em poucos minutos, detetar o grupo sanguíneo da pessoa analisada;

— A investigadora explicou que «o procedimento demora no máximo cinco minutos, tem baixo custo e é adequado a situações de emergência» e ainda que o dispositivo «fornece informações precisas que pretendem auxiliar os profissionais de saúde em situações de emergência, reduzindo os riscos de incompatibilidade e erro humano, nomeadamente em situações de transfusão»;

Pergunto à Comissão:

Tem conhecimento desta nova invenção?

Como a avalia?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(17 de junho de 2013)

Os dispositivos médicos inovadores podem trazer aos doentes benefícios assinaláveis. A Comissão está, por isso, empenhada em manter um quadro regulamentar que garanta plenamente a segurança dos dispositivos médicos na União Europeia e incentive a inovação neste domínio, bem como em apoiar a inovação e a investigação científicas. A Comissão está atualmente a trabalhar com o Parlamento Europeu e o Conselho em propostas legislativas que, uma vez adotadas, garantam tanto a inovação como a segurança dos dispositivos médicos ([1]).

Todavia, não cabe à Comissão avaliar ou comentar um dispositivo médico específico como o mencionado pelo Senhor Deputado.

([1]) Consultar: http://ec.europa.eu/health/medical-devices/documents/revision/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004743/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Quick blood test

A researcher at the University of Minho, Portugal, has invented a portable device that detects a patient's blood group in just a few minutes.

According to the researcher, 'the procedure lasts no more than five minutes, is cheap and is suitable for emergency situations' and the device 'provides precise information aimed at helping healthcare professionals in emergency situations, thereby reducing the risk of incompatibility and human error, particularly with transfusions'.

Is the Commission aware of this new invention?

What is its assessment of it?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2013)

Innovative medical devices can bring major benefits to the patients. The Commission is therefore committed to maintain a regulatory framework, which fully ensures the safety of medical devices in the European Union and stimulates innovation in this area, and to support scientific innovation and research. The Commission is currently working with the Parliament and the Council on legislative proposals that once adopted, will ensure both innovation and safety of medical devices ([1]).

However, it is not the Commission's role to assess or comment on a particular medical device such as the one referred to by the Honourable Member.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/medical-devices/documents/revision/index_en.htm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004744/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Atentados da milícia islâmica na Somália

Considerando que:

— A Somália enfrenta há duas décadas um estado de guerra desde a deposição do Presidente Siad Barre, em 1991, e continua a ser palco de atentados da milícia «Al Shabab», que deteve o controlo de grande parte da capital até 2011;

— Numa altura em que vários países ocidentais têm vindo a conferir legitimidade política ao Presidente Hassan Sheikh Mohamud e em que o Ministro das Finanças, Mohamud Hassan Suleiman, está empenhado em obter o apoio internacional para a recuperação económica de um dos países mais pobres do mundo, a Somália volta a ser palco de dois atentados da milícia islâmica na capital, Mogadíscio;

Pergunto à Comissão:

De que forma os acontecimentos recentes podem vir a afetar o apoio à Somália por parte da comunidade internacional?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(12 de junho de 2013)

A UE, em conjunto com a comunidade internacional mais alargada, está plenamente empenhada em aumentar o seu já forte apoio à estabilidade e ao desenvolvimento na Somália. Este apoio já fez uma diferença substancial na Somália, onde em 2012 assistimos à tomada de posse de um governo eleito, pela primeira vez, a uma forte diminuição da influência da milícia Al-Shabaab e à redução para níveis insignificantes dos casos de pirataria bem-sucedidos.

Como é óbvio, continuam a subsistir inúmeros desafios, mas os recentes ataques em Mogadíscio não porão em causa o empenhamento da UE na continuação do apoio ao país. O seu único efeito será o de confirmar a importância que a UE atribui ao apoio ao setor da segurança, através do reforço do mandato da Missão de Formação da UE, para além do substancial financiamento em apoio das forças da Amisom e de diversos outros programas da Comissão.

A UE adotou uma abordagem abrangente para a Somália, no âmbito da qual utiliza todas as suas capacidades a nível político, de desenvolvimento e das missões PCSD. Continuaremos a assegurar que este apoio seja integralmente coerente com a atuação dos outros doadores internacionais e adequado ás necessidades da Somália. Nesse contexto, aguardamos com expectativa a conferência que terá lugar em Bruxelas em setembro. Esta conferência UE-Somália será centrada no compromisso assumido pela Somália e pela comunidade internacional no sentido de enfrentar as prioridades mais críticas nos domínios político, de segurança e socioeconómico, no âmbito do chamado «Pacto *New Deal*».

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004744/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Attacks by the Islamist militia in Somalia

For the two decades since President Siad Barre was deposed in 1991, Somalia has been in a state of war, and it remains the scene of attacks by the Al-Shabaab militia, which controlled large parts of the capital until 2011.

At a time when several Western countries have begun to officially recognise President Hassan Sheikh Mohamud and when the Minister of Finance, Mohamud Hassan Suleiman, is seeking international support for the economic recovery of one of the world's poorest countries, the Somali capital Mogadishu has once again been the scene of two attacks by the Islamist militia.

How may recent events affect the international community's support for Somalia?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2013)

The EU working together with the wider International Community is fully committed to enhancing its already strong support to stability and development in Somalia. This support has already made a substantial difference in Somalia, where in 2012 we have seen a government elected for the first time, Al-Shabaab influence seriously diminished, and successful piracy attacks brought back down to negligible levels.

There are clearly many challenges remaining, but the recent attacks in Mogadishu will not diminish the EU's commitment to provide support. They only serve to demonstrate the importance that the EU is placing on supporting the security sector, through the enhanced mandate for the EU Training Mission, the substantial funding in support of Amisom forces and the many other Commission programmes.

The EU adopts a Comprehensive Approach to Somalia using all its capabilities, political, developmental and CSDP missions. We will continue to ensure that this support is fully coherent with other international donors and in line with Somali needs. In this regard, we look forward to the Brussels Conference in September. This EU-Somalia co-hosted conference will focus on Somali and international commitment to addressing the most critical political, security, and socioeconomic priorities under a New Deal 'Compact'.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004745/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Erro na fórmula que sustenta políticas de austeridade

Considerando que:

— Um dos estudos que sustenta as políticas de austeridade terá, na sua base, um erro na fórmula de Excel;

— O estudo em causa — «Crescimento em tempo de dívida» — foi assinado por dois economistas da Universidade de Harvard, que tiveram nos últimos anos cargos de alta responsabilidade no Fundo Económico e Monetário;

— Este estudo foi citado em mais de 500 artigos universitários e mencionado pelo comissário europeu para os Assuntos Económicos, Olli Rehn;

— A investigação agora divulgada revela que da fórmula Excel usada pelos dois investigadores para calcular a taxa média de crescimento no caso de a dívida ser superior a 90 % foram retirados cinco países — Austrália, Áustria, Bélgica, Canadá e Dinamarca —, e que este erro reduziu o valor do crescimento médio de 2,2 % para - 0,1 %

Pergunto à Comissão:

Tem conhecimento do referido estudo?

Como o avalia?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(19 de junho de 2013)

A Comissão não concebe as suas políticas com base num único estudo. A relação entre os níveis de endividamento e de crescimento é complexa, afetada por um grande número de fatores especificamente nacionais. Os estudos dos serviços da Comissão sobre as finanças públicas podem ser consultados em:
http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004745/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Error in the formula on which austerity policies are based

There is an error in the Excel formula in one of the studies on which austerity policies are based.

The study in question — *Growth in Times of Debt* — is by two Harvard economists who have held senior posts in the International Monetary Fund in recent years.

This study has been cited in over 500 academic articles and has been referred to by Olli Rehn, the European Commissioner for Economic and Monetary Affairs.

Recently published research shows that the Excel formula used by the two researchers to calculate the average growth rate where the debt ratio exceeded 90% missed out five countries — Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada and Denmark — and that this error reduced the average growth rate from 2.2% to -0.1%.

Is the Commission aware of this study?

What is its opinion of it?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2013)

The Commission does not design it's policies on the basis of one single piece of research. The relationship between debt levels and growth is complex , affected by many country-specific factors. Commission services research on public finances is found at: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/index_en.htm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004746/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Aquecimento global: consequências para o vinho português

Um estudo internacional denominado «Climate change, wine, and conservation» aponta Portugal como um dos países mais afetados pelo aquecimento global na produção vitivinícola.

Assim, pergunta-se à Comissão:

Tem conhecimento do referido estudo?

Que avaliação faz do mesmo?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(18 de julho de 2013)

O estudo referido está disponível no sítio Web das publicações oficiais da Academia Nacional de Ciências dos Estados Unidos (*Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America — PNAS*). Refere-se a um estudo global sobre o impacto e a resposta às alterações climáticas a nível mundial e usa a produção de uvas de vinho como um caso-teste, uma vez que as vinhas têm um efeito de longa duração na qualidade do *habitat* e podem ter um forte impacto nos recursos de água doce.

O estudo apresenta um cenário interessante em termos de potencial produção de vinho na UE num futuro próximo. Em termos de atenuação das alterações climáticas, as iniciativas para criar capacidade de resistência nas vinhas em Portugal deverão ser abrangidas pelo setor denominado LULUCF (utilização dos solos, reafetação dos solos e silvicultura).

Em termos de adaptação, o recentemente aprovado pacote sobre a estratégia da UE de adaptação às alterações climáticas define quais são as principais prioridades:
http://ec.europa.eu/clima/news/articles/news_2013041601_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004746/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Global warming: consequences for Portuguese wine

An international study called *Climate Change, Wine and Conservation* singles out Portugal as one of the countries whose wine production is most affected by global warming.

Is the Commission aware of this study?

What is its assessment of it?

Answer given by Mr Cioloș on behalf of the Commission
(18 July 2013)

The study mentioned is freely available on the website of 'Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America — PNAS'. It concerns a global study on the impacts of and response to climate change on world level using wine grape production as a test case, as vineyards have a long-lasting effect on habitat quality and may significantly impact freshwater resources.

This study presents an interesting scenario in terms of EU wine production prospectives in a near future. In terms of climate change mitigation, initiatives to build resilience in vineyards in Portugal would be covered by the socalled LULUCF (Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry) sector

In terms on adaptation, the recently released EU climate change adaptation strategy package sets out the overall priorities: http://ec.europa.eu/clima/news/articles/news_2013041601_en.htm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004747/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Cidadania cipriota

O Presidente cipriota, Nicos Anastasiades, vai propor aos investidores estrangeiros que perderam três milhões de euros ou mais devido ao programa de resgate europeu que se tornem cidadãos cipriotas.

Esta e outras medidas, como os incentivos fiscais, estão a ser debatidas com o objetivo de manter o interesse dos investidores neste país.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

Tem conhecimento da intenção anunciada?

Qual a posição da UE relativamente a esta matéria?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(11 de junho de 2013)

As decisões relativas aos requisitos nacionais em matéria de nacionalidade são da competência exclusiva dos Estados-Membros. A Comissão não tem competência nesta matéria.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004747/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Cypriot citizenship

The Cypriot President, Nicos Anastasiades, is to propose that foreign investors who have lost EUR 3 million or more as a result of the European bailout measures become Cypriot citizens.

This, along with other measures such as tax incentives, is being studied as means of maintaining investor interest in the country.

Is the Commission aware of this intention?

What is the EU's stance on this issue?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2013)

Decisions as regards national citizenship requirements are of the exclusive competence of the Member States. The Commission has no competence in this regard.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004748/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Limitação de emigrantes na Suíça

A Suíça tem uma cláusula nos acordos europeus que lhe permite limitar a entrada de europeus, caso o número de imigrantes ultrapasse em mais de 10 % a média dos últimos três anos. O número de emigrantes europeus na Suíça cresceu apenas 4,1 % no ano passado, apesar do cenário de recessão no Velho Continente, enquanto a taxa de desemprego continua baixa, pouco acima dos 3 %. Na Suíça já vigora a limitação do acesso a cidadãos de oito países do leste europeu e, de acordo com a imprensa helvética, o governo suíço deverá decidir na próxima semana se vai ou não restringir a entrada aos imigrantes oriundos dos 17 países da zona euro, incluindo Portugal.

A aplicação desta restrição a mais países pode constituir uma violação do acordo de livre circulação na União Europeia. De acordo com uma representante do serviço de Catherine Ashton, as restrições a cidadãos de oito Estados-Membros já são contrárias ao acordo de livre circulação e sê-lo-ão ainda mais se forem aplicadas restrições a emigrantes de outros 17 países.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

Como avalia a UE a situação descrita?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(17 de junho de 2013)

A 24 de abril de 2013, o Conselho Federal decidiu manter as restrições quantitativas, adotadas no ano passado, à livre circulação de cidadãos da UE nacionais de oito Estados-Membros e estender provisoriamente estas restrições aos nacionais dos outros Estados-Membros. A 16 de maio, o Conselho Federal confirmou a extensão das restrições aos Estados-Membros da UE17.

Tal como na sua anterior declaração de 18 de abril de 2012, a AR/VP Catherine Ashton voltou a lamentar as medidas adotadas a 24 de abril de 2013.

Tal como indicado pela AR/VP na sua declaração, visto que estabelecem diferenças entre grupos de Estados-Membros, as medidas adotadas pelo Governo suíço não respeitam o Acordo sobre a Livre Circulação de Pessoas, na medida em que, após o termo dos respetivos períodos transitórios, o artigo 10.°, n.° 4, do acordo é aplicável a todos eles (exceto no caso da Bulgária e da Roménia, ainda em período transitório) sem distinção.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004748/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Limitation on emigrants to Switzerland

Switzerland has a clause in the European agreements that enables it to limit the entry of EU citizens if the number of immigrants is more than 10% above the average for the previous three years. The number of EU immigrants in Switzerland increased by only 4.1% last year, despite the recession in Europe, while unemployment there remains low at just over 3%. Switzerland already limits access for the citizens of eight East European countries and the Swiss press is now reporting that the Swiss Government is to decide next week whether to restrict the entry of immigrants from the remaining 17 euro area countries, including Portugal.

Applying this restriction to more countries could constitute a breach of the agreement on freedom of movement within the EU. According to a representative of the European External Action Service, restrictions on the citizens of eight Member States already breach the agreement on freedom of movement and this will be even truer if these restrictions are applied to emigrants from the other 17 countries.

What is the EU's view of this situation?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2013)

On the 24 April 2013 the Federal Council decided to continue the quantitative limitations adopted last year to the free movement of EU citizens who are nationals of eight Member States and to provisionally extend such restrictions to the nationals of the other Member States. On the 16 May the Federal Council confirmed the extension of the restrictions to the EU17 Member States.

As in her previous statement on 18 April 2012, HR/VP Catherine Ashton repeated her regret for the measures adopted on 24 April 2013.

As indicated by the HR/VP in her statement, the measures adopted by the Swiss Government are contrary to the Agreement on the Free Movement of Persons since they differentiate between groups of Member States as, after the termination of the respective transitional periods, Article 10(4) of the Agreement applies to all of them (except for Bulgaria and Romania, still under transitional period) without distinction.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004749/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Doenças relacionadas com o envelhecimento

Considerando o seguinte:

— Um grupo de cientistas, em que participam portugueses, identificou características de uma proteína que contribui para vários problemas de doenças como a doença de Alzheimer, Parkinson ou Huntington;

— A proteína envolvida na destruição de neurónios em várias doenças relacionadas com o envelhecimento, que normalmente existe no corpo humano, fica alterada nestas doenças e gera moléculas tóxicas que contribuem para problemas como a demência. Com esta descoberta, pretende-se «prevenir a morte neuronal que causa as doenças» degenerativas.

Assim, pergunta-se à Comissão:

Tem conhecimento desta importante descoberta?

Existe algum tipo de apoio comunitário relativamente a esta investigação? Qual?

Resposta dada por Máire Geoghegan-Quinn em nome da Comissão
(7 de junho de 2013)

A Comissão tem conhecimento das recentes descobertas feitas pela equipa do Professor Scrutton e colaboradores sobre o papel da enzima KMO (quinurenina 3-monooxigenase) nas doenças neurodegenerativas. Contudo, estas descobertas necessitam ainda de mais investigação. Uma aplicação clínica, que poderá resultar em compostos que bloqueiam a ação da enzima KMO, está ainda em fase de desenvolvimento e validação e só dentro de vários anos poderá tornar-se realidade. Concretamente, será necessária mais investigação para desenvolver inibidores da KMO com capacidade para ultrapassar a barreira hematoencefálica.

Embora este estudo não tenha beneficiado de apoio do Sétimo Programa-Quadro de Investigação, Desenvolvimento Tecnológico e Demonstração (7.° PQ, 2007-2013), desde 2007 o 7.° PQ investiu 401 milhões de EUR na investigação sobre as doenças neurodegenerativas. Esta inclui investigação sobre o tratamento das diferentes doenças incluídas neste grupo. O projeto LUPAS ([1]), por exemplo, visa desenvolver novos agentes luminescentes e métodos de diagnóstico, prevenção da agregação das proteínas e tratamento da doença de Alzheimer e das doenças causadas por priões. A Comissão apoia igualmente a execução da iniciativa de programação conjunta sobre as doenças neurodegenerativas, em especial a doença de Alzheimer (JPND) ([2]), uma iniciativa liderada pelos Estados-Membros, que visa aumentar o impacto da investigação europeia nesta área através da coordenação de esforços entre os países.

O Horizonte 2020, o próximo programa-quadro de investigação e inovação da UE, pode oferecer novas oportunidades de apoio à investigação sobre as doenças neurodegenerativas.

([1]) http://www.lupas-amyloid.eu/
([2]) http://www.neurodegenerationresearch.eu/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004749/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Age-related diseases

A group of scientists, which includes some Portuguese, has identified the characteristics of a protein that contributes to the development of several diseases such as Alzheimer's, Parkinson's and Huntington's.

The protein is involved in the destruction of neurons in various age-related diseases and normally exists in the human body. However, it is altered in these diseases and generates toxic molecules that contribute to problems like dementia. The aim of this discovery is to 'prevent the neuron death that causes these diseases'.

Is the Commission aware of this important discovery?

Is there any EU support for this research, and if so what?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(7 June 2013)

The Commission is aware of the recent findings by the team of Professor Scrutton and collaborators on the role of kynurenine 3-monooxygenase (KMO) in neurodegenerative diseases. However, these discoveries require further research. A clinical translation, which could result into compounds targeting KMO, is still to be developed and validated, and cannot be expected before several years. In particular, further research will be needed to develop KMO inhibitors able to cross the brain-blood barrier.

Although this study was not supported by the Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013), FP7 has since 2007 invested EUR 401 million in research on neurodegenerative diseases. This includes research on the treatment of different neurodegenerative diseases. The LUPAS ([1]) project, for instance, aims to develop novel luminescent agents and methods for the diagnostic, prevention of protein aggregation, and treatment of Alzheimer's and prion diseases. The Commission also supports the implementation of the Joint Programming Initiative on Neurodegenerative Diseases, in particular Alzheimer's (JPND) ([2]), a Member State-led initiative that aims at increasing the impact of European research in this area by coordinating efforts across countries.

Horizon 2020, the next EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation, may provide further opportunities to support research on neurodegenerative diseases.

([1]) http://www.lupas-amyloid.eu/
([2]) http://www.neurodegenerationresearch.eu/

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-004750/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(26 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Il mercato STEP in Francia, gli strumenti in esso negoziati e la BCE: quali dubbi ed eventuali azioni da adottare

Recentemente alcuni giornali economici on line tedeschi hanno trattato il caso del mercato STEP (*Short Term European Papers*) in Francia. Si tratta di un mercato non regolamentato sul quale istituzioni finanziarie e non emettono e negoziano *papers*, ossia obbligazioni a breve scadenza meno esposte al rischio di credito. Ad oggi il volume dello STEP si attesta tra i 400 e i 500 miliardi di euro, una cifra considerevole se ad esempio si pensa che l'intero ammontare del debito pubblico della Grecia è di poco superiore ai 350 miliardi di euro. In particolare, però, vanno rilevati alcuni fattori dubbi: — circa il 50 % dei *papers* negoziati è emesso da istituti bancari che hanno sede in Francia; — la Banca centrale di Francia, i cui gruppi sono molto attivi sul mercato STEP, utilizza i dati raccolti da una nota società privata francese con un volume di affari di circa 22 miliardi di euro; — prima di concedere il contante ad una banca, la BCE si trova a valutare il rischio di ogni collaterale, usando i dati che nella pratica provengono dalle stesse banche, senza effettuare ulteriori controlli. Tali circostanze potrebbero innescare due importanti distorsioni: — considerato che i *papers* degli istituti bancari in questione sono accettati dalla BCE come garanzia collaterale nelle periodiche aste di rifinanziamento, un aumento sproporzionato di volume del mercato STEP può indirettamente causare diverse possibilità di accesso al principale canale di approvvigionamento per le banche europee quale è, appunto, lo strumento delle aste indette dalla BCE; — se i dati trasmessi dalla Banca centrale di Francia alla BCE fossero inesatti, generando una sopravvalutazione dei rating, lo scarto, applicato ai titoli portati in garanzia da una certa banca sarebbe troppo esiguo, con il risultato che essa beneficerebbe di un finanziamento maggiore di quanto le sarebbe spettato.

Considerato che:

— la situazione esposta potrebbe causare conseguenze negative per la concorrenza del settore bancario europeo e aumentare le tensioni sociali, soprattutto nell'attuale fase di *credit crunch* per molti paesi europei, su tutti quelli maggiormente esposti alle misure di austerità;

— il mercato STEP può essere considerato un mercato *over the counter*, cioè non regolamentato, e quindi più esposto a possibili episodi fraudolenti da parte degli operatori;

può la Commissione:

1. Riferire sulla situazione sopra esposta e verificare se sussistono condizioni di concorrenza sleale a danno degli altri istituti bancari nazionali ed europei che non avrebbero beneficiato del meccanismo in questione?

2. Indicare quali azioni possono essere adottate per aumentare la trasparenza del mercato STEP?

Risposta data da Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(21 giugno 2013)

La politica monetaria è di esclusiva competenza della BCE, che agisce in piena indipendenza conformemente al mandato fissato dal trattato.

Il mercato francese dei *paper* a breve termine è riconosciuto e accettato dalla BCE al pari di altri sistemi analoghi in altri Stati membri della zona euro. L'etichetta STEP ([1]) non è di per sé sufficiente perché questi titoli siano considerati idonei a essere conferiti come garanzia delle operazioni di rifinanziamento dell'Eurosistema. Devono infatti essere soddisfatti tutti i criteri di idoneità stabiliti nella documentazione generale ([2]), emessa dalla BCE.

Come altri fornitori di dati STEP (compresi *Euroclear Bank*, *Euroclear France*, *Euroclear Belgique* e *Clearstream*), la *Banque de France* fornisce alla BCE i dati giornalieri sui volumi delle emissioni sul mercato primario i dati sui tassi sul mercato primario ripartiti per codice ISIN ([3]).

([1]) http://www.stepmarket.org/assets/files/STEP%20Docs/Background%20information%20on%20the%20STEP%20initiative%20240413.pdf
([2]) http://www.ecb.int/pub/pdf/other/gendoc2011en.pdf
([3]) Numero internazionale di identificazione dei titoli.

Ciascuna banca centrale nazionale è responsabile della valutazione dell'idoneità dei titoli emessi e depositati nella propria giurisdizione e trasmette queste informazioni alla banca dati delle attività idonee dell'Eurosistema, una banca dati pubblica istituita presso la BCE. A ciascuna banca nazionale centrale spetta inoltre il compito di mantenere aggiornate tali informazioni.

Per quanto riguarda i prezzi di mercato di tali titoli, il *Common Eurosystem Pricing Hub* (CEPH), sviluppato e gestito dall'Eurosistema, fornisce i prezzi di tutte le attività negoziabili idonee per operazioni di rifinanziamento dell'Eurosistema su base giornaliera ([4]).

Più in generale, il miglioramento della trasparenza del mercato finanziario è uno dei principali obiettivi delle proposte della Commissione volte alla modifica della direttiva relativa ai mercati degli strumenti finanziari (riesame della MiFID) ([5]). Le norme in materia di miglioramento della trasparenza si applicheranno agli strumenti del mercato monetario.

([4]) http://www.ecb.int/mopo/assets/risk/valuation/html/index.en.html

([5]) Proposta di regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio sui mercati degli strumenti finanziari e che modifica il regolamento [EMIR] sugli strumenti derivati OTC, le controparti centrali e i repertori di dati sulle negoziazioni, COM(2011)652), e proposta di direttiva del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio relativa ai mercati degli strumenti finanziari che abroga la direttiva 2004/39/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio (COM(2011)656) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0656:FIN:IT:PDF.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004750/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: The STEP market in France, the instruments negotiated in it and the ECB — doubts that have arisen and possible measures to be adopted

Recently, some German online economic newspapers dealt with the case of the STEP market (Short-Term European Paper) in France. It is an unregulated market on which financial and non-financial institutions issue and negotiate 'papers', namely short-term securities that are less exposed to credit risk. To date, the volume of STEP has reached somewhere between EUR 400 and 500 billion — a considerable sum given that the entire government debt of Greece amounts to just over EUR 350 billion.

More specifically, however, some dubious issues need to be pointed out: around 50% of the papers negotiated are issued by banks based in France; the French Central Bank, whose groups are very active on the STEP market, uses the data collected by a well-known French private company with a turnover of around EUR 22 billion; before giving cash to a bank, the ECB has to assess the risk of all collateral, using data which, in practice, come from the same banks, without carrying out any further checks. These circumstances could trigger two major distortions: firstly, given that the papers of the banks in question are accepted by the ECB as collateral in the regular refinancing auctions, a disproportionate increase in the volume of the STEP market could indirectly lead to various opportunities for access to the main supply channel for European banks — the instrument of ECB-held auctions; secondly, if the data transmitted by the Central Bank of France to the ECB were inaccurate, resulting in an overestimation of credit ratings, the spread applied to the securities provided as collateral by a given bank would be too low, resulting in that bank benefiting from a larger loan than it was due.

Given that:

— the situation set out above could have a negative impact on competition in the European banking sector and increase social tensions, especially during the current credit crunch in many European countries, especially those which are the most exposed to austerity measures;

— the STEP market can be considered an over-the-counter market, i.e. unregulated, and thus more exposed to possible fraud on the part of operators;

can the Commission:

1. report on the situation described above and ascertain whether there may be any unfair competition taking place, to the detriment of other national and European banks that have not benefited from the scheme in question;

2. say what measures can be taken to increase the transparency of the STEP market?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(21 June 2013)

Monetary policy is the exclusive competence of the ECB, which acts in full independence in line with its mandate set out by the Treaty.

The French short term paper market is recognised and accepted by the ECB in the same way as similar regimes in other Eurozone states. The STEP label ([1]) is not in itself sufficient to be granted eligibility as collateral for the Eurosystem's refinancing operations. All the eligibility criteria set out in The General Documentation, issued by the ECB ([2]), must also be met.

As with other STEP data suppliers (including Euroclear Bank, Euroclear France, Euroclear Belgique and Clearstream), the Banque de France provides the ECB with daily data on primary issuance market volumes and primary market rate data broken down per ISIN ([3]).

([1]) http://www.stepmarket.org/assets/files/STEP%20Docs/Background%20information%20on%20the%20STEP%20initiative%20240413.pdf
([2]) http://www.ecb.int/pub/pdf/other/gendoc2011en.pdf
([3]) International securities identification number.

Each national central bank is responsible for assessing the eligibility status of securities issued and deposited in its jurisdiction and reports this information to the Eligible Assets Database, a public database located at the ECB. Each NCB is also responsible for maintaining this information updated.

Regarding these securities' market prices, the Common Eurosystem Pricing Hub (CEPH), developed and operated by the Eurosystem, produces prices for all marketable assets eligible to Eurosystem refinancing operations on a daily basis ([4]).

More generally, enhancing the transparency of financial market is one of the main objectives of the Commission proposals amending the directive on Markets in Financial Instruments (the MiFID review) ([5]). The enhanced transparency rules will apply to money market instruments.

([4]) http://www.ecb.int/mopo/assets/risk/valuation/html/index.en.html

([5]) Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on Markets in financial instruments and amending Regulation [EMIR] on OTC derivatives, central counterparties and trade repositories (COM(2011) 652) and Proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on markets in financial instruments repealing Directive 2004/39/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council (COM(2011) 656): http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0656:FIN:EN:PDF

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004751/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Crime organizado mexicano na Europa

Considerando que:

— O Serviço Europeu de Polícia (Europol) advertiu, recentemente, que grupos criminosos mexicanos estão a tentar estabelecer-se como principais intervenientes no mercado europeu da droga, estando ainda envolvidos em casos de tráfico de armas e de pessoas no continente;

— De acordo com dados recolhidos pela Europol, os grupos mexicanos de narcotráfico já são os «coordenadores» à escala global do tráfico de cocaína para a Europa e Estados Unidos e também da produção e distribuição de drogas sintéticas nesses dois mercados e na Ásia.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Tem conhecimento desta situação?

2. Que dados dispõe relativamente a esta matéria?

Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão
(1 de julho de 2013)

A Comissão não procede à recolha de informações operacionais, mas tem conhecimento das atividades dos gangues de droga mexicanos através de relatórios das agências da UE competentes. O primeiro relatório da UE sobre o mercado das drogas ([1]), publicado em janeiro de 2013 pelo Observatório Europeu da Droga e da Toxicodependência (OEDT) e a Europol, inclui informações circunstanciadas sobre o tráfico de droga no que se refere às diferentes substâncias e às respostas, a nível europeu e internacional, às atividades de tráfico. Quanto à cocaína, o relatório indica, na página 47, que «as informações dos serviços secretos sugerem que os GCO ([2]) também estabelecem acordos com os cartéis mexicanos, que estão a assumir um papel mais importante na cadeia de fornecimento entre países produtores e mercados de destino. A extensão do seu impacto na situação do crime organizado europeu é difícil de avaliar neste momento, sendo necessário seguir a situação mais de perto».

([1]) Observatório Europeu da Droga e da Toxicodependência, Relatório sobre o mercado das drogas — uma análise estratégica, Luxemburgo: Serviço das Publicações da União Europeia, 2013 (disponível só em EN).
([2]) Grupos criminosos organizados.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004751/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Mexican organised crime in Europe

The European Police Office (Europol) has recently warned that Mexican criminal gangs are attempting to establish themselves as the main players in the European drug market, and are even involved in cases of gun running and people trafficking within Europe.

Data collected by Europol show that on a global level Mexican drug gangs already control cocaine trafficking into Europe and the US, and the production and distribution of synthetic drugs in these two markets and in Asia.

1. Is the Commission aware of this situation?

2. What information does it have on this issue?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(1 July 2013)

The Commission does not collect operational intelligence but is aware of the activities of Mexican drug gangs from the reports presented by relevant EU agencies. The first EU Drugs Market Report ([1]), published in January 2013 by the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA) and Europol, provides more detailed information on drug trafficking as regards different substances and the responses, at European and international level, to these trafficking activities. As regards cocaine, it is pointed out on page 47 of this report that 'intelligence suggests that European OCGs ([2]) also arrange cocaine deals with the Mexican cartels, which are taking a more significant role in the supply chain between producing countries and destination markets. The extent of their impact on the European organised crime situation is difficult to assess at the moment and needs a close follow-up of the situation'.

([1]) European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction, Europol, EU Drugs Market Report, A Strategic Analysis, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2013.

([2]) Organised crime groups.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004752/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Eventual surto de doenças tropicais

Considerando que:

— Nas vésperas do II Congresso Nacional de Medicina Tropical, que decorreu de 22 a 23 de abril, Paulo Ferrinho admitiu que a comunidade científica está preocupada com os recentes surtos de doenças tropicais, nomeadamente, o de dengue na Madeira e os de chickungunya em Itália e na Grécia;

— O diretor do Instituto de Higiene e Medicina Tropical admitiu ainda que Portugal continental pode vir a enfrentar um surto de uma doença tropical como a malária ou a chickungunya.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Existe algum plano concertado de combate às referidas doenças?

2. Qual a estratégia da UE relativamente a esta matéria?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(11 de junho de 2013)

A Comissão está ciente do risco existente de um surto de doenças tropicais na UE. A propagação de espécies do mosquito «*Aedes*» na UE é um problema crescente devido à globalização do comércio e das viagens, à urbanização contínua e às alterações climáticas.

Estes mosquitos são vetores eficazes de doenças potencialmente graves, como a febre de dengue e Chikungunya. Os viajantes que regressam de países afetados por doenças endémicas representam um risco de introdução de dengue e Chikungunya, bem como de reintroduzir a malária na UE.

As doenças transmitidas por vetores devem ser notificadas ao abrigo da legislação da UE em matéria de vigilância e controlo das doenças transmissíveis ([1]) e os Estados-Membros têm a obrigação de notificar acontecimentos não usuais associados a estas doenças através do sistema de alerta rápido para doenças transmissíveis.

O Centro Europeu de Prevenção e Controlo das Doenças (CEPCD) criou a iniciativa Vbornet ([2]), uma rede que reúne médicos entomólogos e peritos em saúde pública para recolher dados sobre vetores, fornecidos por estudos científicos ou atividades locais de vigilância. Além disso, o CEPCD elaborou orientações para a vigilância das espécies de mosquitos invasivos na Europa ([3]) e colabora estreitamente com a Organização Mundial de Saúde, a fim de desenvolver o quadro regional para a vigilância e o controlo de mosquitos invasivos enquanto vetores e doenças reemergentes transmitidas por vetores. O principal objetivo deste quadro consiste em proporcionar uma atualização sobre a situação dos mosquitos invasivos enquanto vetores com a tónica na espécie de mosquito «*Aedes*» e nos relacionados com a febre de dengue e Chikungunya e fornecer os componentes de um quadro regional de ação para dar resposta ao eventual ressurgimento de doenças transmitidas por vetores.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:1998D2119:20090807:PT:PDF
([2]) http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/activities/diseaseprogrammes/emerging_and_vector_borne_diseases/Pages/VBORNET_maps.aspx
([3]) http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/Publications/TER-Mosquito-surveillance-guidelines.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004752/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Possible outbreak of tropical diseases

On the eve of the Second National Congress on Tropical Medicine, which took place in Portugal on 22 and 23 April, Paulo Ferrinho admitted that the scientific community is concerned by recent outbreaks of tropical diseases, particularly dengue fever in Madeira and chikungunya in Italy and Greece.

The Director of the Portuguese Institute of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (IMHT) also declared that mainland Portugal could face an outbreak of a tropical disease like malaria or chikungunya.

1. Is there a concerted plan to combat these diseases?

2. What is the EU strategy on this issue?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2013)

The Commission is aware of the existing risk of an outbreak of tropical diseases in the EU. The spread of 'Aedes' mosquito species into the EU is a growing problem driven by the globalisation of trade and travel, continuous urbanization and climate change.

Such mosquitoes are effective vectors of potentially severe diseases such as dengue and chikungunya fevers. Travellers returning from disease-endemic countries are at risk of introducing dengue and chikungunya and to re-introduce malaria into the EU.

Vector borne diseases must be reported under the EU legislation on surveillance and control of communicable diseases ([1]) and Member States have the obligation to notify unusual events linked to these diseases through the EU alert system for communicable diseases.

The European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) has established the VBORNET ([2]) initiative that brings together medical entomologists and public health experts to collect data on vectors from scientific studies or local surveillance activities. In addition, the ECDC has developed guidelines for the surveillance of invasive mosquito species in Europe ([3]) and closely cooperates with the World Health Organisation to develop the oncoming Regional Framework for Surveillance and Control of Invasive Mosquito Vectors and Re-emerging Vector-Borne Diseases. The main objective of this framework is to provide an update on the situation of invasive mosquito vectors with a focus on 'Aedes' mosquito species and the related dengue and chikungunya fevers, and to provide the components of a Regional framework for action to be prepared and to respond to the possible re-emergence of vector-borne diseases.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:1998D2119:20090807:EN:PDF
([2]) http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/activities/diseaseprogrammes/emerging_and_vector_borne_diseases/Pages/VBORNET_maps.aspx
([3]) http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/Publications/TER-Mosquito-surveillance-guidelines.pdf

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004753/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Corte nos medicamentos para os hemofílicos

Considerando que:

— As medidas de austeridade impostas em alguns países da UE obrigaram a muitos cortes na área da saúde;

— A hemofilia é uma doença incapacitante que tem na base dois tipos de tratamento: um para situações em que o doente tem hemorragias e outro profilático para prevenir as hemorragias e ter mais qualidade de vida. Em Portugal, há 700 pessoas registadas com problemas de coagulação e estima-se que, por cada 10 mil nascimentos, haja um caso de hemofilia;

— A Associação Portuguesa de Hemofilia (APH) denunciou que os hospitais estão a reduzir a dosagem dos medicamentos, o que aumenta os riscos de os doentes terem hemorragias, e a obrigar os doentes a deslocarem-se mais vezes para recolher a medicação, impondo em alguns casos deslocações semanais ao hospital, causando assim sérios entraves à medicação profilática;

— Segundo a APH, existem casos em que a redução das dosagens está relacionada com razões orçamentais.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Tem a conhecimento desta situação?

2. Uma vez que a medicação profilática tem um grande impacto na qualidade de vida dos doentes hemofílicos, como avalia este retrocesso?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(6 de junho de 2013)

A Comissão está ciente das disparidades entre Estados-Membros no que toca à acessibilidade aos medicamentos por parte dos doentes com doenças raras. Estas disparidades podem ser agravadas pela atual crise económica. Contudo, nos termos do artigo 168.° do Tratado sobre o Funcionamento da União Europeia, a ação da UE no domínio da saúde pública tem de respeitar plenamente as responsabilidades dos Estados-Membros pela organização e prestação de serviços de saúde e cuidados médicos. É da responsabilidade de cada Estado-Membro garantir um acesso adequado a cuidados de saúde de elevada qualidade para os seus cidadãos.

Neste contexto, as autoridades nacionais são livres de fixar os preços dos medicamentos e de designar os tratamentos que pretendem reembolsar ao abrigo do seu sistema de segurança social, desde que as suas decisões sejam tomadas de forma transparente e em conformidade com a legislação da UE ([1]). Significa isto que há medicamentos que podem ser reembolsados em alguns Estados-Membros e não noutros, em função dos objetivos nacionais de saúde pública, da análise custo-eficácia e de uma variedade de outros fatores.

([1]) Ver, em particular, a Diretiva 89/105/CEE do Conselho, de 21 de dezembro de 1988, relativa à transparência das medidas que regulamentam a formação do preço das especialidades farmacêuticas para uso humano e a sua inclusão nos sistemas nacionais de seguro de saúde, JO L 40 de 11.2.1989.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004753/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Cuts in medication for haemophiliacs

The austerity measures imposed in some EU countries have made many healthcare cuts necessary.

Haemophilia is a debilitating disease with two key treatment types: one for when patients suffer haemorrhages, and another preventative measure to stop them from suffering haemorrhages and thereby increase their quality of life. In Portugal, 700 people are registered as having coagulation disorders and it is thought that one in 10 000 people born is haemophilic.

The Portuguese Haemophilia Association (APH) has reported that hospitals are reducing medication, which increases the risk that patients will suffer haemorrhages, and obliges patients to travel more often to collect their medication. In some cases, weekly trips to the hospital are necessary, representing a serious obstacle to preventative medicine.

According to the APH, there are cases in which there are budgetary reasons for reduced doses.

1. Is the Commission aware of this situation?

2. Given that the preventative medication has a major impact on haemophiliac's quality of life, what is its view of this step backwards?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2013)

The Commission is aware of the disparities between Member States in the accessibility to medicinal products by patients suffering from a rare disease. These disparities might be exacerbated in the current economic crisis. However, pursuant to Article 168 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, EU action in the field of public health must fully respect the responsibilities of the Member States for the organisation and delivery of health services and medical care. It is the responsibility of each Member State to ensure appropriate access to high quality healthcare for its citizens.

In this framework, the national authorities are free to set the prices of medicinal products and to designate the treatments that they wish to reimburse under their social security system, provided that their decisions are made in a transparent manner in accordance with EU law ([1]). This means that specific medicines may be reimbursed in some Member States but not in others, depending on national public health objectives, cost-effectiveness analyses and a variety of other factors.

([1]) See in particular Council Directive 89/105/EEC of 21 December 1988 relating to the transparency of measures regulating the pricing of medicinal products for human use and their inclusion within the scope of national health insurance system, OJ L 40, 11.2.1989.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004754/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Fármacos contra a osteoporose associados a problemas cardíacos

Considerando que:

— Em Portugal, de acordo com uma recomendação da Agência Europeia do Medicamento, a prescrição dos medicamentos Protelos e Osseor, utilizados no tratamento da osteoporose na mulher pós-menopáusica para redução do risco de fraturas vertebrais e do colo do fémur, foi restringida devido a um «risco aumentado» de problemas cardíacos.

— O Comité de avaliação do Risco em Fármacovigilância (PRAC) defendeu uma avaliação mais aprofundada da relação benifício-risco destes medicamentos.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Tem conhecimento desta situação?

Possui algum estudo que confirme estas conclusões?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(11 de junho de 2013)

Os medicamentos Protelos e Osseor, que contêm ranelato de estrôncio, foram autorizados para tratamento da osteoporose pela Comissão desde 2004.

A Agência Europeia de Medicamentos recomendou uma restrição na sua utilização ([1]) ([2]), na sequência de uma avaliação dos dados que indicam um maior risco de graves problemas cardíacos. A análise foi realizada no âmbito de uma avaliação de rotina da relação benefício-risco dos produtos, conhecida como avaliação do relatório periódico de atualização em matéria de segurança. Os principais dados foram obtidos a partir de estudos clínicos em cerca de 7 500 doentes.

Os dados de estudos clínicos mostraram um maior risco de ataque cardíaco com Protelos/Osseor do que com um placebo, sem aumento observado do risco de mortalidade. Tendo em conta os outros riscos graves (coágulos sanguíneos e reações cutâneas graves e raras) previamente identificados com o medicamento ([3]), a Agência concluiu que as restrições da utilização do medicamento devem permanecer em vigor para que a relação benefício-risco se mantenha favorável e que é necessária uma nova avaliação aprofundada dos benefícios e dos riscos do medicamento.

O parecer científico da Agência foi transmitido à Comissão para uma decisão juridicamente vinculativa. O processo de tomada de decisão está em curso.

À luz do parecer científico ([1]), a Comissão iniciou uma nova análise alargada da relação benefício-risco dos medicamentos que contenham ranelato de estrôncio, nos termos do artigo 20.° do Regulamento (CE) n.° 726/2004, que será agora realizada pela Agência.

Entretanto, as restrições à utilização do medicamento destinam-se a minimizar o risco de problemas cardíacos graves.

([1]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/news_and_events/news/2013/04/news_detail_001774.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058004d5c1
([2]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Medicine_QA/human/000560/WC500142021.pdf
([3]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/medicines/human/public_health_alerts/2012/03/human_pha_detail_000057.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058001d126

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004754/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Osteoporosis medicines associated with heart problems

In accordance with a recommendation by the European Medicines Agency, Portugal has restricted prescriptions of the medicines Protelos and Osseor, used to treat osteoporosis in post-menopausal women and reduce the risk of fractures to the vertebrae and femur neck, because of an 'increased risk' of heart problems.

The Pharmacovigilance Risk Assessment Committee has advocated a more in-depth assessment of the risk/benefit relationship of these medicines.

Is the Commission aware of this situation?

Does it have any research that confirms these findings?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2013)

Strontium ranelate-containing medicinal products Protelos and Osseor have been authorised for the treatment of osteoporosis by the Commission since 2004.

The European Medicines Agency has recommended a restriction in their use ([1]) ([2]) following an assessment of data showing an increased risk of serious heart problems. The review was carried out as part of a routine benefit-risk assessment of the products, known as a Periodic Safety Update Report assessment. The key data were obtained from clinical studies in about 7 500 patients.

Data from clinical studies have shown a higher risk of heart attack with Protelos/Osseor than with placebo, with no observed increase in mortality risk. Given the other serious risks (blood clots and rare serious skin reactions) previously identified with the product ([3]), the Agency concluded that restrictions in the use of the medicine should be in place for the benefit-risk balance to remain favourable and that a further in-depth evaluation of the benefits and risks of the medicine was needed.

The Agency's scientific opinion has been sent to the Commission for a legally binding decision. The decision-making process is ongoing.

In light of the scientific opinion, the Commission has initiated a further wide-ranging review of the benefit-risk balance of strontium ranelate-containing medicines under Article 20 of Regulation (EC) No 726/2004, which will now be conducted by the Agency.

In the meantime, the restrictions in the use of the medicine are intended to minimise the risk of serious heart problems.

([1]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/news_and_events/news/2013/04/news_detail_001774.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058004d5c1
([2]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Medicine_QA/human/000560/WC500142021.pdf
([3]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/medicines/human/public_health_alerts/2012/03/human_pha_detail_000057.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058001d126

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004755/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Sida, tuberculose e malária

Considerando que:

— O Fundo Global contra a Sida, a Tuberculose e a Malária é uma instituição internacional de financiamento dedicada a atrair e distribuir recursos para prevenir e tratar a sida, tuberculose e malária;

— Desde que foi criado, em 2002, já apoiou mais de mil programas em 151 países, tendo fornecido tratamento para a sida a 4,2 milhões de pessoas, tratamento contra a tuberculose a 9,7 milhões de pessoas e 310 milhões de redes mosquiteiras para a prevenção da malária;

— De acordo com a estimativa das necessidades para 2014-2016 e um balanço dos resultados e impactos do trabalho feito nos últimos anos, o Fundo Global alertou os dadores para a necessidade de angariar 11,5 mil milhões de euros, sob pena de se enfrentar um recuo de uma década nos avanços já atingidos;

— Combinada com outros financiamentos, incluindo 37 mil milhões de dólares que se estima virem dos orçamentos domésticos e 24 mil milhões de outras fontes internacionais, a verba agora pedida pelo Fundo Global permitiria cobrir 87 por cento dos recursos necessários para combater as três doenças, estimados em 87 mil milhões de dólares;

— O diretor executivo do Fundo Global alertou que resta à comunidade internacional uma de duas opções: «investir agora ou pagar para sempre», acrescentando ainda que «as inovações na ciência e na implementação deram-nos uma oportunidade para controlar completamente estas doenças. Se não o fizermos, os custos de longo prazo serão desconcertantes».

Pergunto à Comissão:

Como avalia estas declarações?

Possui algum estudo que valide os dados e os números apresentados por esta organização?

Resposta dada por Andris Piebalgs em nome da Comissão
(28 de junho de 2013)

As estimativas a que o Senhor Deputado se refere baseiam-se nas projeções, publicadas pela Organização das Nações Unidas, relativas aos recursos globais necessários para atingir metas globais no combate às três doenças. As declarações sobre essas projeções visam desencadear um debate sobre as metas realistas mas ambiciosas que a comunidade mundial e o Fundo Mundial devem procurar atingir no próximo período de reconstituição dos recursos e perspetivar as contribuições internas e externas (tanto bilaterais como através do Fundo Mundial). Prevê-se, por exemplo, que, nos países de baixo rendimento, a maior contribuição para suprir o défice de recursos venha, incontestavelmente, dos recursos nacionais. Pela primeira vez, o financiamento interno para as três doenças nos países de baixo rendimento deverá igualar o financiamento externo do controlo das três doenças (37 contra 39 mil milhões de dólares dos EUA) ([1]).

A Comissão não dispõe de um projeto de investigação específico nem de cálculos próprios que possam confirmar (ou infirmar) os valores/ estimativas citados pelo Senhor Deputado na sua pergunta. No entanto, as estatísticas foram produzidas de forma transparente e contêm informações conceptuais importantes para estruturar o muito necessário debate sobre os modos de complementar e alavancar os esforços nacionais através de financiamento externo suplementar, para controlar as doenças de forma sustentável.

([1]) Global Fund Fourth Replenishment April 2013 Needs Assessment 2014-2016
http://www.theglobalfund.org/en/donors/replenishment/fourth/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004755/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria

The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (GFATM) is an international funding institution dedicated to raising and distributing funds for AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria prevention and treatment.

Since its foundation in 2002 it has already supported over 1 000 programmes in 151 countries, providing AIDS treatment for 4.2 million people, tuberculosis treatment for 9.7 million people and 310 million mosquito nets for malaria prevention.

In line with its estimated requirements for 2014-2016, and an analysis of the results and impacts of work done in recent years, the GFATM has warned its donors that it needs a further EUR 11.5 billion or it will face falling back a decade from progress already made.

When combined with other funds, including an estimated USD 37 billion from domestic budgets and USD 24 billion from other international sources, the sum now requested by the GFATM will cover 87% of the funds necessary to combat these three diseases, which is estimated at USD 87 billion.

The Executive Director of the GFATM has warned that the international community has two options: 'invest now or pay forever', adding that 'Innovations in science and implementation have given us a historic opportunity to completely control these diseases. If we do not, the long-term costs will be staggering'.

What is the Commission's view of these statements?

Does it have any research that backs up this organisation's statistics?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(28 June 2013)

These estimates are based on United Nations (UN) published projections of the overall resources required to achieve global targets for the three diseases. The purpose of the related statements is to discuss what realistic and ambitious targets the global community and the Global Fund should strive to achieve in the next replenishment period and to put domestic and external contributions (both bilateral and through the Global Fund) into perspective. It is for instance projected that by far the biggest contribution to closing the resource gap will be coming from domestic resources in low income countries. For the first time, domestic financing for the three diseases in low income countries is expected to match the external financing on controlling the three diseases (USD 37 vs. 39 billion) ([1]).

The Commission does not have a specific research project or in-house calculations that could confirm (or contradict) the figures/estimates quoted in the Honourable Member's question. However, the statistics were produced in a transparent way and provide important conceptual information to frame the much needed discussion about how additional external finance can complement and leverage domestic efforts to control the diseases in a sustainable manner.

([1]) Global Fund Fourth Replenishment April 2013 Needs Assessment 2014-2016: http://www.theglobalfund.org/en/donors/replenishment/fourth/

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004757/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Doença invasiva pneumocócica

Considerando que:

— A infeção por *Streptococcus pneumoniae* provoca efeitos devastadores no sistema nervoso central e sequelas, como casos de surdez definitiva e perturbações motoras graves;

— Em Portugal entre 2010 e 2012 registaram-se 165 casos de doença invasiva pneumocócica (DIP), 18 % dos quais meningite, 7,8 % de sépsis e 49 % de pneumonia;

Pergunto à Comissão:

Tem conhecimento desta situação?

A Comissão dispõe de algum estudo sobre a incidência, morbilidade e mortalidade da DIP em Portugal e nos restantes Estados-Membros da UE?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(11 de junho de 2013)

A Comissão monitoriza a doença invasiva pneumocócica na UE através da rede europeia da Doença Invasiva Pneumocócica, coordenada pelo Centro Europeu de Prevenção e Controlo das Doenças (CEPCD).

Em 2010, a taxa de notificação total na UE/EEE foi de 5,2 por 100 000 pessoas. Os países escandinavos e a Bélgica apresentaram as taxas de notificação mais elevadas, entre 14,8 e 17,3 por 100 000 pessoas, ao passo que sete países tiveram uma taxa de notificação inferior a 1 por 100 000 pessoas.

Analisando a distribuição por faixa etária, a taxa de comunicação mais elevada verificou-se entre as crianças com idade inferior a 1 ano (18,5 por 100 000 pessoas), seguida dos adultos com 65 anos ou mais (15,6). Os quadros clínicos mais frequentes foram de pneumonia (48 % dos casos), seguida de septicemia (29 %) e meningite (18 %), sendo a meningite a mais frequente entre as crianças com idade inferior a 1 ano (42 %).

Só em 20,5 % desses casos houve informações disponíveis sobre os resultados. No total, foram comunicadas ao CEPCD 450 mortes em 2010. Apenas 46,1 % dos casos tinham informações sobre o serótipo. Analisando o serótipo e a distribuição etária, as vacinas antipneumocócicas poderiam eventualmente ter evitado 60 % dos casos que ocorreram em crianças até 1 ano de idade e mais de 50 % dos casos em todos os grupos etários (exceto na faixa etária dos 5-14 anos). No que respeita à situação específica de Portugal, não há informações disponíveis relativamente a 2010 e 2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004757/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Invasive pneumococcal disease

Infections caused by *Streptococcus pneumoniae* can have a devastating effect on the central nervous system, with side-effects such as permanent deafness and serious motor impairment.

Between 2010 and 2012, Portugal recorded 165 cases of invasive pneumococcal disease, including meningitis (18%), sepsis (7.8%) and pneumonia (49%).

Is the Commission aware of this situation?

Does the Commission have any information about the incidence, morbidity and mortality rates associated with invasive pneumococcal disease in Portugal and other EU Member States?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2013)

The Commission monitors invasive pneumococcal disease in the EU through the European Invasive Pneumococcal Disease network coordinated by the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC).

In 2010, the overall EU/EEA notification rate was 5.2 per 100 000 people. The Scandinavian countries and Belgium presented the highest notification rates, ranging from 14.8 to 17.3 per 100 000 people, while 7 countries reported a notification rate below 1 per 100 000 people.

Looking at the age group distribution, the highest notification rate was reported among children aged below 1 year (18,5 per 100 000 people), followed by adults aged 65 years or over (15.6). Pneumonia was the most frequent clinical presentation (48% of cases) followed by septicaemia (29%) and meningitis (18%), meningitis being the most frequently reported among children aged below 1 year (42%).

Information on outcome was available only in 20.5% of such cases. Overall, 450 deaths have been reported to ECDC in 2010. Only 46,1% of cases had information on serotype. Looking at the serotype and age distribution, the pneumococcal conjugate vaccines could have potentially prevented 60% of cases occurring in children up to 1 year old, and more than 50% of cases in all age groups (except those aged 5-14 years). Concerning the specific situation in Portugal, no information is available for 2010 and 2011.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004758/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Declarações do Ministro das Finanças da Alemanha

Considerando que o Ministro das Finanças da Alemanha, *Wolfgang Schäuble*, considera que as condições do resgate financeiro a Chipre, para o qual irão contribuir acionistas, credores, mas também grandes depositantes dos principais bancos, deve servir como modelo para o futuro;

Pergunto à Comissão:

1. Como analisa estas declarações?

2. Assume a mesma posição no que respeita a constituir um eventual modelo para resgates futuros?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(7 de junho de 2013)

Chipre é um caso único devido à dimensão do seu setor bancário, conjugada com a respetiva estrutura, nível de assunção de riscos e supervisão insuficiente. As medidas adotadas são adaptadas à situação absolutamente excecional de Chipre, tendo em vista restabelecer a viabilidade do setor bancário e protegendo, ao mesmo tempo, todos os depósitos inferiores a 100 000 EUR, em conformidade com os princípios da UE.

Dada a natureza única do caso de Chipre, a abordagem seguida em Chipre não deve ser vista como um modelo para futuras intervenções. Embora possam ter algumas semelhanças entre si, cada programa é especificamente adaptado às necessidades do país envolvido.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004758/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Statements by Germany's Finance Minister

Germany's Finance Minister, Wolfgang Schäuble, believes that the terms set for the Cyprus bailout, to which shareholders, creditors will and major deposit-holders in the main Cypriot banks will contribute, should serve as a template for the future.

How does the Commission view this statement?

Does it share the opinion that future bailouts should be based on this example?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(7 June 2013)

Cyprus is a unique case because of the size of its banking sector combined with its structure, level of risk-taking and suboptimal supervision. Measures taken are tailor-made to the very exceptional situation in Cyprus in order to restore the viability of a smaller banking sector while, at the same time, protecting all deposits below EUR 100 000 in accordance with the EU principles.

Given the unique nature of the Cypriot case, the approach followed in Cyprus should not be seen as a blueprint for future interventions. While each programme may have its similarities, each is tailored to the needs of the country in question.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004759/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Direito Europeu das Sociedades Comerciais

Considerando que:

— A legislação da União Europeia sobre o direito das sociedades que aborda as contas anuais das empresas dá-lhes a opção de tornar ou não públicas determinadas informações relativas, designadamente, aos aspetos ambientais e sociais das suas atividades. Como resultado, menos de 10 % das maiores empresas europeias divulgam esse tipo de informação de forma regular;

— Na sequência do que já tinha avançado em 2011, a Comissão Europeia apresentou uma proposta de modificação daquela legislação europeia, com o objetivo de intensificar o nível da transparência das empresas com mais de 500 trabalhadores.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Nos termos desta proposta, as empresas ficarão obrigadas a divulgar que tipo de informação?

Resposta dada por Michel Barnier em nome da Comissão
(19 de junho de 2013)

Em 16 de abril, a Comissão Europeia adotou uma proposta de alteração das diretivas contabilísticas ([1]) que visa reforçar os atuais requisitos de prestação de informações não financeiras, com o objetivo principal de aumentar a transparência de certas grandes empresas relativamente aos aspetos sociais e ambientais.

De acordo com a proposta, as grandes empresas estabelecidas na UE ou cotadas num mercado da UE e que se enquadrem no seu âmbito de aplicação, passam a ter de incluir nos respetivos relatórios anuais informações substanciais sobre as suas políticas, os riscos assumidos e os resultados obtidos no que respeita às questões ambientais, sociais e de recursos humanos, ao respeito pelos direitos humanos, às questões ligadas ao combate contra a corrupção e o suborno e à diversidade nos respetivos conselhos de administração. Para este efeito, as empresas podem recorrer às orientações internacionais, da UE ou nacionais que considerarem adequadas. Quando as empresas não dispuserem de qualquer política num desses domínios, têm de apresentar uma justificação fundamentada sobre os motivos dessa situação.

Esta medida surge na sequência dos compromissos assumidos em abril de 2011 no âmbito do Ato para o Mercado Único I ([2]) e na Comunicação «Responsabilidade social das empresas: uma nova estratégia da UE para o período de 2011-2014» ([3]), publicada em outubro de 2011.

([1]) Quarta e Sétima Diretivas contabilísticas relativas às contas anuais e às contas consolidadas, 78/660/CEE e 83/349/CEE.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/smact/index_pt.htm
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0681:FIN:PT:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004759/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: European company law

European Union company law legislation for companies' annual accounts allows companies to choose whether or not to make public information regarding the environmental and social aspects of their activities. As a result, less than 10% of the largest European companies regularly publish this type of information.

Following on from its proposals in 2011, the Commission has presented a draft amendment to this European legislation, aimed at increasing the transparency of companies with over 500 workers.

Under this proposal, what type of information will companies be obliged to publish?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2013)

The European Commission adopted on 16 April a proposal for an amendment to the Accounting Directives ([1]) strengthening the existing requirements on non-financial reporting with the main objective of enhancing the transparency of certain large companies on social and environmental matters.

According to the proposal, large companies established within the EU or listed on an EU market and falling within the scope of application would be required to disclose in their Annual Reports material information on policies, risks and results as regards environmental matters, social and employee-related aspects, respect for human rights, anti-corruption and bribery issues, and diversity in their boards of directors. In doing so, companies may use international, EU-based or national guidelines that they consider appropriate. When companies do not pursue any policy in one of the given areas, they are required to provide a reasoned explanation as to why this is the case.

This measure follows up on commitments taken in the Single Market Act 1 ([2]) in April 2011 and in the communication 'A renewed strategy 2011-2014 for Corporate Social Responsibility' ([3]) issued in October 2011.

([1]) Fourth and Seventh Accounting Directives on Annual and Consolidated Accounts, 78/660/EEC and 83/349/EEC.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/smact/index_en.htm
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0681:FIN:EN:PDF

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004760/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Reforço dos direitos dos passageiros de transportes aéreos na UE

Considerando que a Comissão analisou as lacunas ainda existentes em matéria de direitos dos passageiros nos transportes aéreos e apresentou um novo pacote de medidas que visa melhorá-los.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Em que consistem as novas medidas apresentadas?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(6 de junho de 2013)

Em 13 de março de 2013, a Comissão adotou uma proposta de alteração do Regulamento (CE) n.° 261/2004 que estabelece regras comuns para a indemnização e a assistência aos passageiros dos transportes aéreos em caso de recusa de embarque e de cancelamento ou atraso considerável dos voos e do Regulamento (CE) n.° 2027/97 relativo à responsabilidade das transportadoras aéreas no que respeita ao transporte de passageiros e respetiva bagagem ([1]).

A proposta e a avaliação do impacto que a acompanha, bem como material de imprensa e informações adicionais podem ser consultados no sítio da Comissão ([2]).

([1]) COM(2013) 130 final.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/kallas/headlines/news/2013/03/passenger-rights-air-revision_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004760/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(26 April 2013)

Subject: Strengthening air passengers' rights in the EU

The Commission has analysed existing shortcomings regarding the rights of air passengers and has presented a new package of measures aimed at improving them.

What are these new measures the Commission is proposing?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2013)

The Commission adopted on 13 March 2013 a proposal for the amendment of Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 establishing common rules on compensation and assistance to passengers in the event of denied boarding and of cancellation or long delay of flights and of Regulation (EC) No 2027/97 on air carrier liability in respect of the carriage of passengers and their baggage by air ([1]).
The proposal and the accompanying impact assessment as well as press material and further information can be found on the Commission's website ([2]).

([1]) COM(2013) 130 final.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/kallas/headlines/news/2013/03/passenger-rights-air-revision_en.htm

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-004761/13
aan de Commissie
Emine Bozkurt (S&D)
(29 april 2013)

Betreft: De Pelješacbrug

Kan de Commissie bevestigen dat zij met de Kroatische regering is overeengekomen een strategie uit te stippelen voor een betere aansluiting van het zuidelijke grondgebied van Kroatië (de regio van Dubrovnik)?

Indien dit inderdaad het geval is, kan de Commissie dan een antwoord geven op de volgende vragen:

1. Wanneer wordt naar verwachting de laatste hand aan deze strategie gelegd?

2. Welke oplossingen worden er voorgesteld?

3. Zullen voor deze doeleinden EU-gelden worden gebruikt?

4. Is een van de oplossingen de bouw van de Pelješacbrug?

5. Wordt de brug, indien zij wordt gebouwd, gefinancierd of medegefinancierd door de EU?

De toekomstige brug tussen het Kroatische vasteland en het schiereiland Pelješac zou een stuk van de kust bij Neum omzeilen, waar Bosnië en Herzegovina toegang tot de Adriatische Zee heeft.

6. Het buurland Bosnië en Herzegovina beweert dat de brug zijn toegang tot de zee en de territoriale wateren zou beperken. Hoe gaat de Commissie met deze bezorgdheid om?

7. In hoeverre denkt de Commissie dat niet bijgelegde bilaterale grensgeschillen eenpotentiëlebelemmering vormen voor het toetredingsproces van Bosnië en Herzegovina?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(12 juni 2013)

De Commissie onderhoudt sinds 2010 trilaterale contacten met Kroatië en Bosnië en Herzegovina om grensbeheeraangelegenheden in verband met de komende toetreding van Kroatië aan te pakken. Een aantal kwesties worden momenteel besproken, waaronder een betere verbinding van de regio van Dubrovnik met het Kroatische vasteland. In 2012 is besloten dat Kroatië via het instrument voor pretoetredingssteun een voorbereidende haalbaarheidsstudie zou laten uitvoeren over de vervoersmogelijkheden om het Kroatische vasteland met de regio van Dubrovnik te verbinden. Het project is in maart 2013 van start gegaan en zal naar verwachting minstens tot het einde van deze zomer lopen. In de voorbereidende haalbaarheidsstudie worden verschillende mogelijkheden (waaronder de Pelješacbrug) beoordeeld aan de hand van dezelfde parameters en in het bijzonder vanuit het perspectief van de internationale en milieuwetgeving. Het doel van deze studie is om nadien met kennis van zaken een besluit te kunnen nemen.

Kroatië heeft aangegeven dat het voor de financiering van een geschikte oplossing gebruik wenst te maken van structuurfondsen. Een dergelijk project moet voldoen aan de bepalingen van de verordening inzake structuurfondsen, die onder meer naleving van de internationale wetgeving en de EU-milieuwetgeving voorschrijft.

De Commissie moedigt alle landen aan bilaterale aangelegenheden in een vroeg stadium van het toetredingsproces aan te pakken.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004761/13
to the Commission
Emine Bozkurt (S&D)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Pelješac bridge

Can the Commission confirm that it has agreed with the Croatian Government to draw up a strategy to improve connections with Croatia's southern territory (the Dubrovnik region)?

If this is indeed the case, will the Commission answer the following questions:

1. When is the strategy expected to be finalised?

2. What are the proposed solutions?

3. Will EU funding be used for these purposes?

4. Is one of the solutions the construction of the Pelješac bridge?

5. In the event that the bridge is to be built, will it be financed or co-financed by the EU?

The future bridge between Croatia's mainland and its Pelješac peninsula would bypass a stretch of the coast at Neum, where Bosnia and Herzegovina has access to the Adriatic Sea.

6. Neighbouring Bosnia and Herzegovina claims that the bridge would limit its access to the sea and territorial waters. How is the Commission dealing with these concerns?

7. To what extent does the Commission consider open bilateral border disputes to be a potential obstacle to Bosnia and Herzegovina's accession process?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2013)

Since 2010, the Commission is in trilateral contact with Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina in order to address border management issues related to the upcoming accession of Croatia. A number of issues are under discussion, including how to link the Dubrovnik region with mainland Croatia. It was decided in 2012, that Croatia would contract under the Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance a pre-feasibility study on possible transport options to connect mainland Croatia with the Dubrovnik region. The project started in March 2013 and is foreseen to continue to at least the end of this summer. The pre-feasibility study will assess different options (including the Pelješac Bridge), from the same parameters, and in particular from an international law and environmental law perspective. The purpose of the study is to allow an informed decision to be taken at a subsequent stage.

Croatia has indicated that they are interested in using structural funds for financing a suitable solution. Any such project would have to abide by the EU Structural Fund regulation which includes compliance with international and EU environmental law.

The Commission is encouraging all countries to address bilateral issues in an early stage of the accession process.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004762/13
an die Kommission
Richard Seeber (PPE)
(29. April 2013)

Betrifft: Sicherheit von Nahrungsergänzungsmitteln mit pflanzlichen Bestandteilen

In Artikel 2 der Richtlinie 2002/46/EG i.d.F. der VO 1161/2011 werden Nahrungsergänzungsmittel wie folgt definiert:

„Im Sinne dieser Richtlinie bezeichnet der Ausdruck a) ‚Nahrungsergänzungsmittel' Lebensmittel, die dazu bestimmt sind, die normale Ernährung zu ergänzen und die aus Einfach- oder Mehrfachkonzentraten von Nährstoffen oder sonstigen Stoffen mit ernährungsspezifischer oder physiologischer Wirkung bestehen und in dosierter Form in den Verkehr gebracht werden, …".

Dies gilt auch für Nahrungsergänzungsmittel mit pflanzlichen Inhaltstoffen.

Die von Italien und Frankreich veröffentlichten Listen von Pflanzen, die in Nahrungsergänzungsmitteln erlaubt sind (jeweils ca. 800-900 Pflanzen), enthalten überwiegend Pflanzen, deren Inhaltsstoffe nur teilweise bekannt sind und die traditionell nie als Lebensmittel verwendet wurden und werden.

Durch die Anreicherung der Extrakte besteht jedoch die Gefahr, dass auch gesundheitsgefährdende (Begleit-)Substanzen in einem Ausmaß angereichert werden, in dem sie eine schwerwiegende Gefährdung für die Gesundheit darstellen können. Zwar sieht die Richtlinie in Artikel 12 eine Schutzklausel vor, gemäß der die Mitgliedstaaten das Inverkehrbringen eines Nahrungsergänzungsmittels unterbinden können. Im Falle von Pflanzen ist die mögliche Anreicherung unerwünschter Substanzen jedoch nicht die Ausnahme sondern die Regel.

1. Wie wird ausgeschlossen, dass sich in den Pflanzenkonzentraten nicht Mengen an physiologisch/pharmakologisch wirksamen Stoffen mit unerwünschter Wirkung ansammeln, die nicht von vornherein Gegenstand der Beschränkung der Richtlinie über Nahrungsergänzungsmittel sind?

2. Berücksichtigen die Mitgliedstaaten den Aspekt der Möglichkeit der Anreicherung physiologisch/pharmakologisch wirksamer Stoffe mit unerwünschter Wirkung bei der Zusammenstellung von Listen mit erlaubten Pflanzen?

3. Wie wird sichergestellt, dass Nahrungsergänzungsmittel mit pflanzlichen Inhaltstoffen immer in gleichbleibender Qualität in Verkehr gebracht werden?

Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(25. Juni 2013)

In der EU werden Nahrungsergänzungsmittel durch die Richtlinie 2002/46/EG ([1]) geregelt, die die Zusammensetzung von Nahrungsergänzungsmitteln im Einzelnen zunächst nur für Vitamine und Mineralstoffe harmonisiert. Die Verwendung anderer Stoffe als Vitamine und Mineralstoffe in Nahrungsergänzungsmitteln, z. B. Pflanzen und ihre Zubereitungen, unterliegt nationalen Regeln und lässt die Bestimmungen des Vertrags unberührt.

Die Kommission möchte darauf hinweisen, dass Nahrungsergänzungsmittel, wie jedes Produkt, das unter die Definition „Lebensmittel" fällt, den Anforderungen der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 178/2002 über das allgemeine Lebensmittelrecht ([2]) unterliegt.

In Artikel 14 der genannten Verordnung wird als Kernprinzip angeführt, dass Lebensmittel, die nicht sicher sind, nicht in Verkehr gebracht werden dürfen. Nicht sichere Lebensmittel sind dort definiert als entweder gesundheitsschädlich oder für den Verzehr durch den Menschen ungeeignet.

Ferner sind nach Artikel 17 der genannten Verordnung die Lebensmittelunternehmer in den ihrer Kontrolle unterstehenden Unternehmen dafür verantwortlich, dass die Lebensmittel den entsprechenden Anforderungen des Lebensmittelrechts genügen.

Den Mitgliedstaaten obliegt es, das Lebensmittelrecht durchzusetzen und mithilfe eines Systems amtlicher Kontrollen zu überwachen und daraufhin zu prüfen, dass die einschlägigen Anforderungen von den Lebensmittelunternehmern eingehalten werden. Daher sind die Lebensmittelunternehmer verpflichtet sicherzustellen, dass im Handel befindliche Nahrungsergänzungsmittel keine nicht zugelassenen oder unsicheren Stoffe enthalten; dies wird von den nationalen zuständigen Behörden überwacht.

([1]) ABl. L 183 vom 12.7.2002.
([2]) ABl. L 31 vom 1.2.2002, S. 1; Verordnung (EG) Nr. 178/2002 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 28. Januar 2002 zur Festlegung der allgemeinen Grundsätze und Anforderungen des Lebensmittelrechts, zur Errichtung der Europäischen Behörde für Lebensmittelsicherheit und zur Festlegung von Verfahren zur Lebensmittelsicherheit.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004762/13
to the Commission
Richard Seeber (PPE)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Safety of food supplements with vegetable ingredients

Article 2 of Directive 2002/46/EC in the version published in Regulation (EU) No 1161/2011 defines food supplements as follows:

'For the purposes of this directive: (a) "food supplements" means foodstuffs the purpose of which is to supplement the normal diet and which are concentrated sources of nutrients or other substances with a nutritional or physiological effect, alone or in combination, marketed in dose form…'.

This also applies to food supplements with vegetable ingredients.

The lists of plants permitted in food supplements published by Italy and France (approx. 800 to 900 plants in each case) mainly contain plants with constituent components which are only partly known and which have never traditionally been used as foodstuffs.

The enrichment of extracts leads to a risk that harmful (secondary) substances will be enriched to the extent that they can represent a serious threat to health, however. Article 12 of the directive contains a safeguard clause according to which the Member States can prevent a food supplement from being placed on the market. In the case of plants, the possible enrichment of undesirable substances is the rule rather than the exception.

1. How is it possible to ensure that the vegetable concentrates do not accumulate quantities of physiologically/pharmacologically active ingredients with undesirable effects that are not directly covered by the restrictions contained in the directive on Food Supplements?

2. Do the Member States factor in the possibility of enriching physiologically/pharmacologically active ingredients with undesirable effects when compiling lists of permitted plants?

3. What steps are taken to ensure the consistent quality of food supplements with vegetable ingredients placed on the market?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(25 June 2013)

In the EU food supplements are regulated by Directive 2002/46/EC ([1]) which as a first step harmonises in detail the composition of food supplements only with respect to vitamins and minerals. The use of the substances other than vitamins and minerals in food supplements, e.g. plants and their preparations is governed by national rules and without prejudice to the provisions of the Treaty.

The Commission would like to point out that food supplements, as any product falling under the definition of 'food', are covered by the requirements of the General Food Law Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 ([2]).

Article 14 of that regulation states as a core principle, that food shall not be placed on the market if it is unsafe. Unsafe food is defined as either injurious to health or unfit for human consumption.

Furthermore, according to Article 17 of that regulation, food business operators are responsible for the compliance of food with the relevant requirements of food law within the business under their control.

Member States shall enforce food law, and monitor and verify that the relevant requirements thereof are fulfilled by food business operators, through a system of official controls. Therefore, it is food business operators' obligation to ensure that food supplements on the market do not contain unauthorised or unsafe substances, under the control of national competent authorities.

([1]) OJ L 183, 12.7.2002.
([2]) OJ L 31, 1.2.2002, p. 1; Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 January 2002 laying down the general principles and requirements of food law, establishing the European Food Safety Authority and laying down procedures in matters of food safety.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004764/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(29 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Crisi religiosa in Nigeria: sensibilizzare e affrontare una situazione di emergenza

Allo stato attuale, i cristiani del nord della Nigeria sono presi di mira ogni giorno a casa, sul posto di lavoro, sulla via di casa o nelle loro aziende a motivo della loro fede. Questa emergenza religiosa ha le sue radici in una agenda espansionistica islamica sistematica e completa per la nazione. Assalitori sono andati casa per casa per uccidere i cristiani che non abiurano la loro convinzione religiosa. Qualche mese fa ci fu l'uccisione coordinata silenziosa di otto persone a Potiskum, nello Stato di Yobe. Una persona è sopravissuta all'assalto, ma è morta dopo il trasferimento in ospedale. Un'altra vittima, che di recente ha partecipato a un incontro su questo tema al Parlamento europeo (lunedì, 22 aprile 2013), è miracolosamente sopravvissuta: un uomo armato ha tirato fuori una pistola e gli ha sparato in faccia. Il proiettile gli ha attraversato il corpo ed è uscito dall'altra parte. Sua moglie ebbe grande difficoltà a ottenere aiuto, ma infine è stato trasportato in ospedale e si è ripreso. Tutti i presenti alla riunione si sono commossi per questa storia sorprendente. L'incontro ha dato un contributo significativo per informare i deputati del Parlamento europeo sul lavoro di assistenza medica in corso, come quello svolto dalla Voce dei martiri cristiani. È cresciuta la sensibilizzazione e tutti ora si rendono conto che c'è ancora molto da fare per porre fine a questa decimazione di cristiani.

Tenuto conto che:

— I fattori alla base di gran parte dell'emergenza religiosa al Nord sono politici ed economici dato che i musulmani dipendono dagli aiuti del governo per la loro esistenza e, se perdessero il potere politico, il loro benessere economico rischierebbe di essere minacciato e la religione diventa uno strumento di contrattazione oltre che un mezzo di protesta;

— le persone che hanno perso i parenti in questi episodi di violenza improvvisa spesso non sono solo le donne con i bambini, ma anche i bambini che hanno perso entrambi i genitori e non sanno cosa fare, sono tutti bisognosi di aiuto costante e bisogna provvedere a soddisfare le loro esigenze di base;

può la Commissione far sapere:

1. che cosa intende fare per combattere la persecuzione dei cristiani in Nigeria e quando lo farà, visto che il problema ha conseguenze sia a livello nazionale che internazionale;

2. se sia possibile intraprendere eventuali nuovi progetti umanitari e di assistenza medica per aiutare i nigeriani a costruire un futuro migliore e pacifico.

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(20 giugno 2013)

1. L'Unione europea continuerà a collaborare con il governo e il popolo della Nigeria per porre fine all'attuale ciclo di violenza contro cristiani e musulmani. Rimane inoltre impegnata in continui dialoghi politici intesi a trovare soluzioni adeguate ai problemi, nonché in interventi di aiuto mirati. Durante il dialogo ministeriale tra l'UE e la Nigeria tenutosi il 16 maggio a Bruxelles, l'Unione europea ha evidenziato la necessità di affrontare gli attuali problemi di sicurezza con un approccio completo in materia di sicurezza e sviluppo, che comprenda riforme socioeconomiche a favore, indistintamente, di tutti i gruppi della popolazione. L'UE ha ribadito la propria determinazione a sostenere la Nigeria tramite il suo programma di cooperazione nel paese.

2. Attualmente l'UE fornisce aiuti per la salute materna, la vaccinazione e l'immunizzazione (tra cui l'eradicazione della poliomielite), l'approvvigionamento idrico e il sistema fognario in diversi Stati nigeriani, compresi quelli del nord. Per quanto riguarda i progetti di aiuti umanitari, l'Unione europea sostiene interventi per ridurre gli alti livelli di malnutrizione acuta nella Nigeria settentrionale e per fornire assistenza alle numerose vittime delle gravi inondazioni che hanno colpito di recente diverse regioni del paese.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004764/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Religious crisis in Nigeria: raising awareness and dealing with an emergency situation

At present, Christians in northern Nigeria are being targeted every day at home, at the workplace, on their way home or on their farms because of their faith. This religious crisis has its roots in a systematic and comprehensive Islamic expansionist agenda for the nation. Assailants have been going from house to house aiming to kill Christians if they do not reject their religious beliefs. A few months ago there was a coordinated, silent killing of eight people in Potiskum, Yobe State. One person survived the assault, but died after having been transferred to hospital. Another victim, who recently took part in a meeting on this topic at the European Parliament (Monday, 22 April 2013), had a miraculous survival. An armed man drew a gun and shot him in the face. The bullet passed through his body and came out the other side. His wife had great difficulty getting help, but he was finally taken to hospital and made a recovery. Everyone present at the meeting was moved by this striking story. The meeting made a significant contribution towards informing Members of the European Parliament on the medical work in progress such as that being done by the Voice of the Christian Martyrs. Awareness was raised and everyone now realises that much remains to be done in order to put an end to this decimation of Christians.

Taking into account that:

— the underlying factors for much of the religious crisis in the North are political and economic as Muslims depend on government patronage for their existence and, if their political power is lost, their economic well-being is likely to be threatened and religion becomes a bargaining tool, as well as a means of protest;

— people who lose their relatives in these episodes of sudden violence are often not only women with children, but also children who have lost both their parents and do not know what to do, are all in need of constant help and have basic needs to be fulfilled;

can the Commission state:

1. what it intends to do in order to combat the persecution of Christians in Nigeria and when it will do this, considering that this problem has consequences at a national and international level;

2. whether any new humanitarian and medical projects can be undertaken to help Nigerians build towards a better and peaceful future?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2013)

1. The EU will continue to work with the government and people of Nigeria to help bring an end to the current cycle of violence which is targeting Christians and Muslims. It remains engaged through continuous political dialogue on appropriate approaches to the problems, and through targeted aid interventions. At the EU-Nigeria Ministerial dialogue on 16 May in Brussels, the EU stressed the need to address the current security challenges with a comprehensive security / development approach, including socioeconomic reforms that equally benefit all groups of the population. The EU repeated its determination to support Nigeria through its cooperation programme in Nigeria.

2. The EU currently supports maternal health, vaccination and immunisation (including polio eradication) and water and sanitation in several Nigerian states, including in the North. With regard to humanitarian aid projects, the EU is supporting action to reduce the high levels of acute malnutrition in the Northern Nigeria and to assist the many victims of the recent severe flooding in many parts of the country.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-004766/13
til Kommissionen
Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(29. april 2013)

Om: Regler for internetsider om medicinsk udstyr

Medlemsstaterne har gennemført den gældende EU-lovgivning om medicinsk udstyr på forskellige måder, hvilket i nogle tilfælde har ført til stærkt afvigende regler og krav.

I lyset af dette bedes Kommissionen besvare følgende spørgsmål:

1. Hvad er medlemsstaternes regler vedrørende sprog og oversættelser af internetsider omhandlende medicinsk udstyr? Hvilke medlemsstater stiller krav om oversættelser og hvilke gør ikke?

2. Nogle medlemsstater tillader ikke internetsider, der på nogen som helst måde kan opfattes som reklamerende for medicinsk udstyr; hvilke lande har indført sådanne restriktioner? Hvilke medlemsstater tillader internetsider som omhandler og/eller promoverer medicinsk udstyr?

3. Visse medlemsstater har indført meget strikse regler vedrørende adgang til internetsider omhandlende medicinsk udstyr, såsom foranstaltninger der sikrer, at kun certificeret sundhedspersonale har adgang til internetsiderne. Kan Kommissionen fremlægge en liste over de forskellige krav, der gælder i hver enkelt medlemsstat?

4. Hvor mange sager har der været de sidste ti år om brud på reglerne for internetsider omhandlende medicinsk udstyr?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Tonio Borg
(25. juni 2013)

Den aktuelle lovgivning om medicinsk udstyr omfatter ikke websteder eller online markedsføring omhandlende medicinsk udstyr.

Derfor har Kommissionen ikke detaljerede oplysninger om medlemsstaternes bestemmelser om sprog, oversættelse og adgang til kommercielle websteder omhandlende medicinsk udstyr.

Her bør det bemærkes, at Kommissionen ifølge forslagene til en forordning om medicinsk udstyr ([1]) og til en forordning om medicinsk udstyr til in vitro-diagnostik ([2]), som Kommissionen vedtog i september 2012, skal udvikle og forvalte en europæisk database om medicinsk udstyr (Eudamed), der gør det muligt for borgerne at få tilstrækkelige oplysninger om de produkter, der findes på markedet, de tilsvarende attester, der udstedes af bemyndigede organer, de relevante erhvervsdrivende og om kliniske afprøvninger.

([1]) KOM(2012)0542 endelig.
([2]) KOM(2012)0541 endelig.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004766/13
to the Commission
Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Rules relating to websites for medical devices

Member States have implemented existing EU legislation governing medical devices in different ways, sometimes leading to very different rules and requirements.

In light of this, could the Commission answer the following:

1. What are the Member States' rules regarding languages and the translation of websites relating to medical devices? Which Member States require translations and which do not?

2. Some Member States do not allow websites that could be perceived as promoting medical devices in any way — which countries impose such restrictions? Also, which Member States allow websites about and/or promoting medical devices?

3. Some Member States have very strict rules in place regarding access to websites relating to medical devices, such as the implementation of measures which ensure that only licensed healthcare professionals can access the websites, for instance. Could the Commission provide a list of the different requirements in place in each Member State?

4. How many cases have there been in the last 10 years regarding breaches of the rules governing websites relating to medical devices?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(25 June 2013)

The current medical device legislation does not cover websites or online advertising relating to medical device.

For this reason, the Commission does not possess comprehensive information on the Member States' rules on languages, translation and access to commercial websites related to medical devices.

In this context, it is worth highlighting that the proposals for a regulation on medical devices ([1]) and for a regulation on *in vitro* diagnostic medical devices ([2]), adopted by the Commission in September 2012, foresee that the Commission develops and manages a European databank on medical devices (Eudamed) which will enable the public to be adequately informed on devices placed on the market, the corresponding certificates issued by notified bodies and the relevant economic operators, and about clinical investigations.

([1]) COM(2012) 542 final.
([2]) COM(2012) 541 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004768/13
to the Commission
Julie Girling (ECR)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Follow-up: Migratory pathways for European eel stocks

Following on from the Commission's answer to Written Question E-001422/2013, could the Commission confirm that all Member States have compiled an eel management plan?

Could the Commission tell me whether it is carrying out the audit of Member States in-house? If the answer is no, could the Commission tell me what organisation has been commissioned to carry out the work?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2013)

Nineteen of the twenty-seven Member States have submitted Eel Management Plans (EMPs): six Member States were exempted from this obligation in line with Article 3 of the Eel Regulation (EC) No 1100/2007 ([1]), as their territory was deemed not to constitute significant eel habitat, whereas two MS did not submit EMPs and are thus implementing a 50% obligatory reduction in eel fisheries as a compensation according to Article 4(2) of the Eel Regulation.

Concerning the evaluation of the implementation of the EMPs submitted by the Member States, given that the ICES Working Group on Eels assembles the highest level of eel expertise in Europe, and that they have carried out the technical analysis of the EMPs, the Commission has asked ICES to examine the progress reports and deliver their input by the end of June 2013. This input will then be forwarded to the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF), which will deliver its opinion by the end of July 2013.

On this basis, in line with the regulation, the Commission will report to the European Parliament and the Council by the end of the year.

([1]) OJ L 248, 22.9.2007.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004769/13
to the Commission
Arlene McCarthy (S&D)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Implementation of the 116000 hotline

Further to the Commission's response E-009268/2012 of 29 November 2012, could it provide a further update regarding the state of implementation of the 116000 hotline?

The deadline for implementation of the hotline was 25 May 2011. Will the Commission launch infringement proceedings against those Member States that have failed to provide the hotline?

Can the Commission outline what action it is taking to ensure that the hotline is made fully operational in Member States where the 116000 number has been reserved?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(28 June 2013)

Further to its reply to the Written Question E-009268/2012, the Commission would like to highlight that the number became operational in three more Member States ([1]). The number is not yet operational in Finland, Latvia, Lithuania or Sweden. Latvia, Lithuania and Sweden are however envisaging to launch the hotline in the near future.

The Commission would like to assure the Honourable Member that it is committed to ensuring that Member States fulfil their obligations to make the hotline operational.

In response to the European Commission's 2013 funding offer for missing children hotlines, EUR 4.4 million has now been allocated to organisations responsible for the hotlines in 17 Member States ([2]). Thanks to this funding three new hotlines are set to be launched in Lithuania, Latvia and Sweden, while funding for the other 14 organisations will be used to considerably improve the quality of service.

On 4 June 2013, the Commission organised its third conference on missing children, to take stock of progress and assess what remains to be done. The conference allowed for the exchange of the best practices related to the establishment of the hotline. The participants concluded that with most hotlines up and running, it is time to focus on quality and a more integrated approach to protecting children and their rights.

In April 2012, the Commission also launched a new 116 website to boost awareness of 116 000 and related services ([3]).

([1]) Bulgaria, the Czech Republic and Ireland.
([2]) Belgium, the Czech Republic, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Spain, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Sweden, Slovakia and the United Kingdom.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/activities/116/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004770/13
to the Commission
Peter Skinner (S&D)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Discrepancy between Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport and Directive 96/53/EC concerning maximum weight of vehicles

Council Directive 96/53/EC imposes a maximum total weight of 40 tonnes in international traffic for certain road vehicles. This restriction also applies to the type of vehicle commonly used for long-distance transportation of animals.

Council Regulation (CE) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport lays down the minimum space requirements for the transport of animals on board vehicles.

These two EC laws are in conflict with each other because, in the case of transport of pigs and cattle, even if the loading densities allowed under Regulation 1/2005 are respected, the maximum weight of 40 tonnes may still be exceeded. This results in reduced levels of road safety and in cases where a vehicle is at a halt (such as at a police checkpoint), it can endanger the welfare of the animals in transit. This may occur when a vehicle exceeding 40 tonnes is stopped by police, when it is usually highly unlikely to find an adequate facility for unloading the animals. As a result of this, considerable delays — lasting hours — with the animals on board can be incurred.

1. Does the Commission not consider that the loading densities allowed by Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 need to be reduced for them to be in line with the maximum weight requirements for vehicles, as set out in Directive 96/53/EC?

2. If not, why not?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(24 June 2013)

1 and 2. The set of rules concerning road legislation, including those of maximum total weight, and the rules on space allowance according to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport ([1]) complement each other. Hence, all pieces of legislation are to be respected when calculating the number of animals that may be transported on a truck.

Considering the variety of trucks available on the EU market it would not be feasible to take the weight of the truck into account when deciding on the rules on space allowances.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations; OJ L 3, 5.1.2005, p. 1.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004772/13
à la Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(29 avril 2013)

Objet: Volet énergétique de l'UPM: l'heure est venue de concrétiser les ambitions

L'Union pour la Méditerranée (UPM), projet ambitieux lancé en 2008 notamment à l'initiative de la France, a été remise à l'honneur récemment à travers les réunions de l'Assemblée parlementaire de l'UPM à Marseille et à Bruxelles.

Ces rendez-vous ont permis aux parlementaires de faire le point sur les initiatives phares de l'Union dans la région comme la dépollution de la Méditerranée, l'université euroméditerranéenne ou la construction d'autoroutes maritimes et terrestres. Ces projets présentent de réels atouts pour accompagner le développement, la stabilisation et la prospérité des pays riverains de la Méditerranée.

Dans leur déclaration finale, les parlementaires ont aussi indiqué les nombreux défis auxquels l'Union doit encore répondre, notamment sur le plan de l'énergie. En février dernier, dans sa réponse à ma question écrite sur le plan solaire méditerranéen, le commissaire Oettinger déclarait que la Commission considérait ce projet comme un élément essentiel de sa politique visant à assurer la sécurité énergétique de l'Union européenne et à lutter contre le changement climatique.

Cinq ans après le lancement de l'UPM, la Commission ne peut se contenter de déclarations d'intention, mais doit accéder aux demandes des parlementaires des deux rives de la Méditerranée, en présentant des actions concrètes.

La Commission peut-elle indiquer quelles sont ses principales propositions envisagées dans le cadre de sa contribution au schéma directeur du plan solaire méditerranéen qui sera présenté aux États de l'UPM fin 2013?

Réponse donnée par M. Oettinger au nom de la Commission
(24 juin 2013)

L'Union européenne soutient l'élaboration de projets relatifs aux énergies renouvelables dans les pays du sud de la Méditerranée, tant en ce qui concerne les aspects règlementaires (notamment au moyen de programmes d'appui budgétaire bilatéraux, d'assistance technique et d'activités de jumelage) que pour ce qui est des projets d'investissement concrets (principalement en faisant appel à la facilité d'investissement pour le voisinage et à la banque européenne d'investissement). Toutes ces activités contribuent à l'objectif consistant à mettre en place le plan solaire méditerranéen (PSM). Par ailleurs, la Commission européenne coopère étroitement avec le Secrétariat de l'Union pour la Méditerranée (UpM) afin de mettre la dernière main au plan directeur PSM en vue de la réunion ministérielle de l'UpM sur l'énergie, qui devrait avoir lieu le 11 décembre 2013, à Bruxelles. La Commission prépare actuellement cette réunion conjointement avec la Jordanie, coprésidente de l'UpM, et avec le secrétariat de l'UpM. À ce stade, il est prévu que le plan directeur PSM soit adopté lors de la réunion ministérielle, que des conclusions soient adoptées afin de renforcer les organisations régionales pour l'énergie, et qu'une discussion politique sur la possibilité de mettre en place une communauté européenne de l'énergie soit engagée. La Commission a récemment informé l'Assemblée parlementaire de l'UpM de ce processus et souhaite faire à nouveau de même lors d'une de ses prochaines réunions, si cela est jugé nécessaire.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004772/13
to the Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: UfM energy project: the time has come to put ambitions into action

The Union for the Mediterranean (UfM), an ambitious project launched in 2008 on the initiative of France in particular, recently renewed its reputation during the UfM Parliamentary Assembly meetings in Marseille and Brussels.

These meetings allowed politicians to highlight the Union's flagship initiatives in the region, such as the de-pollution of the Mediterranean, the Euro-Mediterranean University and the construction of maritime and land highways. These projects represent real assets to accompany the development, stabilisation and prosperity of the countries along the shores of the Mediterranean.

In their closing statement, the politicians also highlighted the many challenges to which the Union has yet to respond, particularly in terms of energy. Last February, in his reply to my written question on the Mediterranean solar plan, Commissioner Oettinger stated that the Commission considered this project a key element in its policy aimed at ensuring energy security in the EU and combating climate change.

Five years after the launch of the UfM, the Commission cannot content itself with declarations of intent. It must meet the demands of politicians from both sides of the Mediterranean by presenting concrete measures.

Can the Commission state what main proposals it has planned within the framework of its contribution to the master plan for the Mediterranean solar plan, which will be presented to the UfM States at the end of 2013?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(24 June 2013)

The European Union is supporting the development of renewable energy projects in the Southern Mediterranean countries both as regards regulatory aspects (for instance through bilateral budget support programs, technical assistance and twinning activities) and as regards concrete investment projects (mainly through the Neighborhood Investment Facility and the European Investment Bank). All these activities contribute to the objective of establishing the Mediterranean Solar Plan (MSP). In addition, the European Commission is closely cooperating with the UfM Secretariat in order to finalise the MSP Master Plan in view of the UfM Ministerial meeting on energy planned on 11 December 2013 in Brussels. The Commission is currently preparing this meeting jointly with the Jordan Co-Presidency of the UfM and the UfM Secretariat. At this stage, it is expected that the ministerial meeting endorses the MSP Master Plan, adopts conclusions to strengthen regional energy organisations and starts a political discussion on the perspective of creating a Mediterranean Energy Community. The Commission recently informed the UfM Parliamentary Assembly about this process and wishes to do so again at the occasion of any of its next meetings as considered appropriate.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004773/13
à la Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(29 avril 2013)

Objet: Mesures pour renforcer la confiance des consommateurs à l'égard des professionnels de la viande

La Commission européenne a rendu publics le 16 avril les résultats des tests sur la présence d'ADN de cheval dans les produits commercialisés comme contenant du bœuf. Ces résultats laissent apparaître un nombre significatif de fraudes puisque plus de 4,6 % des échantillons testés contenaient de l'ADN de cheval.

De tels résultats ne font, malheureusement, que confirmer les premiers cas de fraude détectés en début d'année, et risquent de mettre un peu plus à mal le marché des plats préparés en Europe. Or, comme l'a rappelé récemment le commissaire Tonio Borg, le secteur agroalimentaire est l'un des secteurs économiques les plus importants en Europe. Il est donc impératif de réviser les règles européennes afin de renforcer le contrôle des denrées alimentaires et l'information du consommateur.

La Commission s'est d'ores et déjà engagée à présenter un rapport à l'automne prochain sur les possibilités d'étendre l'étiquetage d'origine de la viande dans les plats préparés. Je m'étais engagée très tôt en faveur de cette mesure qui est devenue urgente. La Commission prévoit également d'intégrer des propositions en matière de contrôles et de sanctions dans le paquet «santé des animaux et des végétaux», actuellement en préparation.

Ces initiatives doivent permettre de renforcer la confiance des consommateurs européens dans les professionnels de la viande, y compris à l'égard des artisans bouchers, qui ne doivent pas être les victimes collatérales de cette crise. La Commission prévoit-elle de faire du renforcement de la confiance des consommateurs dans les professionnels de la viande l'un des axes prioritaires de ses futures actions?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(14 juin 2013)

La Commission s'emploie à résoudre les problèmes mis en lumière par le scandale de la viande de cheval et à renforcer le système européen afin de rétablir la confiance des consommateurs. Dans ce contexte, elle discute avec les États membres de mesures spécifiques visant à lutter contre la fraude alimentaire, à améliorer les programmes de tests, à modifier les règles relatives aux passeports pour les chevaux, à renforcer les contrôles officiels et à rendre plus efficaces les règles relatives à l'étiquetage de l'origine de la viande.

Le 6 mai 2013, la Commission a également adopté un ensemble de propositions législatives qui ont pour objectif de simplifier et moderniser les règles actuelles concernant la filière agroalimentaire. Cet ensemble comprend une proposition qui vise à réviser la législation existante ([1]) applicable aux contrôles officiels et à d'autres activités réalisées par les États membres pour garantir le respect de l'acquis européen concernant la filière agroalimentaire et à renforcer les instruments de contrôle officiels et les mécanismes d'assistance mutuelle entre les autorités compétentes des différents pays. La proposition prévoit également des régimes de sanctions plus stricts en cas de violation délibérée de la réglementation.

([1]) Règlement (CE) n° 882/2004 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 29 avril 2004 relatif aux contrôles officiels effectués pour s'assurer de la conformité avec la législation sur les aliments pour animaux et les denrées alimentaires et avec les dispositions relatives à la santé animale et au bien-être des animaux, JO L 165 du 30.4.2004, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004773/13
to the Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Measures to boost consumer confidence in meat industry professionals

On 16 April, the Commission published the results of tests for the presence of horse DNA in products marketed as containing beef. These results highlight a significant number of cases of fraud as more than 4.6% of the samples tested contained horse DNA.

Unfortunately, such results only serve to confirm the first cases of fraud detected at the beginning of the year, and risk having a further negative impact on the ready meals market in Europe. Yet, as Commissioner Tonio Borg recently recalled, the agri-food sector is one of the most important economic sectors in Europe. It is therefore essential that we revise the European rules so as to strengthen controls on food products and the information provided to consumers.

The Commission has already undertaken to present a report next autumn on the possibility of extending the labelling of the origin of meat in ready meals. From the outset, I have supported this measure, which is becoming urgent. The Commission also plans to integrate proposals on controls and sanctions in the 'animal and plant health' package which is currently being prepared.

These initiatives must enable us to boost European consumer confidence in meat industry professionals, including artisan butchers, who must not become collateral victims of this crisis. Does the Commission plan to make boosting consumer confidence in meat industry professionals one of the priority axes of its future actions?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(14 June 2013)

The Commission is working hard to tackle the problems which have been highlighted by the horsemeat scandal and to strengthen the EU system so as to restore consumer confidence. In this context, specific actions for fighting food fraud, improving testing programmes, modifying the rules on horse passports, strengthening official controls and improving the effectiveness of origin labelling rules are being discussed with the Member States.

On 6 May 2013 the Commission also adopted a package of legislative proposals which intend to simplify and modernise existing agri-food chain rules. The package includes a proposal to review current legislation ([1]) applicable to official controls and other activities carried out by the Member States to ensure the enforcement of the agri-food chain *acquis* and to strengthen official controls instruments and mechanisms for reciprocal assistance between competent authorities in different countries. The proposal also includes more severe rules on sanctions in cases of intentional violations of the rules.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules, OJ L 165, 30.4.2004, p. 1.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004774/13
à la Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(29 avril 2013)

Objet: Faire entrer les femmes dans le secteur des nouvelles technologies: une urgence pour la croissance

Cette semaine a eu lieu au Parlement européen un débat sur la place des femmes dans le secteur des nouvelles technologies de l'information et de la communication (TIC). Cela a été l'occasion de rappeler le potentiel économique immense que représentent tout à la fois les femmes et ce secteur pour la croissance et la compétitivité en Europe.

Malheureusement, ce potentiel reste largement inexploité: les femmes comptent pour près d'un Européen sur deux et pourtant à peine un emploi sur trois dans le secteur des TIC est pourvu par elles. C'est pourtant un secteur qui devrait les attirer particulièrement: le salaire y est généralement supérieur à celui qu'elles obtiennent ailleurs.

Alors d'où vient le problème? Les intervenants l'ont bien souligné: ce qu'il faut, c'est un profond changement de mentalités. C'était déjà le sens du message que nous avions envoyé en mars en votant un rapport sur l'élimination des stéréotypes liés au genre, qui invitait à encourager les filles à entreprendre des études dans ces domaines qui ne sont pourtant pas traditionnellement considérés comme féminins. Et Neelie Kroes a très justement rappelé qu'ouvrir ces métiers aux femmes, ce n'est pas un risque; bien au contraire, c'est la promesse d'une plus grande compétitivité.

Mais le temps presse: nous aurons en 2015 à pourvoir 900 000 emplois dans le secteur des TIC. C'est pourquoi je demande à la Commission de faire dès aujourd'hui des propositions pour encourager l'égalité entre les hommes et les femmes dans ce secteur, sans attendre juin, date à laquelle elle publiera les résultats d'une enquête sur la place des femmes dans le secteur des nouvelles TIC. Nous n'avons pas besoin de connaître les statistiques pour répandre les bonnes pratiques, et la Commission est à même de nous proposer plusieurs mesures qui permettraient des avancées rapides.

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Kroes au nom de la Commission
(14 juin 2013)

Encourager les jeunes filles à étudier les disciplines scientifiques (sciences, technologie, ingénierie et mathématiques) et à acquérir des compétences numériques constitue un effort permanent auquel tous les acteurs concernés doivent participer. Il est également essentiel d'attirer l'attention sur ce sujet et d'amener les décideurs politiques à s'engager à traiter la question.

Les évènements organisés dans le cadre de la «journée 2013 des femmes dans le secteur des TIC» à Bruxelles et à travers l'Europe sont de très bons exemples d'actions de sensibilisation. La Commission a aussi lancé une campagne intitulée «La science, c'est pour les filles!», afin d'encourager les jeunes filles à étudier les disciplines scientifiques et à faire carrière dans la recherche ([1]). Pour faire évoluer la situation, il est nécessaire de nouer un dialogue avec elles, aussi bien en ligne ([2]) que de vive voix ([3]), et d'obtenir la participation d'un large éventail de parties prenantes. La grande coalition en faveur de l'emploi dans le secteur du numérique est une autre initiative prise par la Commission pour lutter contre le déficit de qualifications dans les TIC, qui concerne aussi les jeunes femmes. Afin de combler ce déficit, les parties prenantes s'engagent à faire en sorte d'augmenter le nombre de personnes qualifiées dans les TIC en Europe, notamment en rendant le secteur plus attrayant pour les femmes.

L'enquête sur les «femmes actives dans le secteur des TIC» mentionnée par l'Honorable Parlementaire préconisera des mesures en faveur de l'investissement des parties prenantes à tous les niveaux, ainsi que d'actions telles que l'amélioration des échanges d'informations et la reconnaissance des bonnes pratiques. L'enquête visera à faire évoluer le code des meilleures pratiques en faveur des femmes dans le secteur des TIC, en y intégrant des politiques en matière d'égalité hommes-femmes ainsi que des campagnes de sensibilisation et de promotion.

([1]) http://science-girl-thing.eu/fr et https//www.facebook.com/sciencegirlthing
([2]) http://blogs.ec.europa.eu/neelie-kroes/international-womens-day-2013/ (en anglais).
([3]) https://www.facebook.com/girlsdigital (en anglais).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004774/13
to the Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Bringing women into the new technology sector: urgently needed for growth

This week a debate took place in Parliament on women's place in the new information and communication technology (ICT) sector. This served as a reminder of the massive economic potential represented by both women and this sector for growth and competitiveness in Europe.

Unfortunately, this potential is still largely untapped: women account for almost one in every two Europeans, yet they hold barely one in three jobs in the ICT sector. Nonetheless, it is a sector which should be particularly attractive to them: the salary is generally higher than what women earn elsewhere.

What is the problem then? The speakers highlighted it clearly: what is needed is a serious shift in mentality. That was the meaning behind the message that we had already sent in March when we voted for a report on eliminating gender stereotypes, which called for girls to be encouraged to undertake studies in areas which are not traditionally seen as 'feminine'. Neelie Kroes also recalled, and rightly so, that opening up these subjects to women is not a risk; quite the opposite, it is the promise of greater competitiveness.

However, time is marching on: in 2015 we will have to fill 900 000 vacancies in the ICT sector. That is why I am calling on the Commission to make proposals to encourage equality between men and women in this sector from today, rather than waiting until June when it will publish the results of a study on women's place in the new ICT sector. We do not need to know the statistics to develop good practices, and the Commission should be able to propose several measures that would allow for progress to be made quickly.

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(14 June 2013)

Encouraging girls to study STEM subjects (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) and to acquire digital skills is an ongoing effort to which all actors must contribute. It is also essential to bring attention to this issue and to get commitment from high-level policy-makers to address the issues.

The 'Girls in ICT' Day 2013 with its Brussels event and many other gatherings across Europe are very good examples of awareness raising. The Commission also launched the campaign 'Science it's a girl thing!' which encourages girls to study STEM subjects and to envisage a career in research ([1]). To effect change, we need to engage with girls through real-life interactions ([2]) and online ([3]), and to get commitment from a wide range of stakeholders. The Grand Coalition for Digital Jobs is another initiative taken by the Commission to address the ICT skills gap, addressing young women as well. Stakeholders pledge to make changes to increase the number of ICT-skilled persons in Europe to bridge the skills gap, of which some relate to attracting more women to the ICT sector.

The study on 'Women active in the ICT sector', which the Honourable Member mentions, will recommend measures for the involvement of stakeholders across all levels and on possible actions such as better exchange of information and recognition of best practice. It will assess an evolution path for the Code of Best Practices for Women and ICT, mainstreaming of gender policies in the ICT field as well as awareness-raising and advocacy.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/science-girl-thing and https//www.facebook.com/sciencegirlthing.
([2]) http://blogs.ec.europa.eu/neelie-kroes/international-womens-day-2013/.
([3]) https://www.facebook.com/girlsdigital.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004776/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(29 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Migliore qualità della vita per i giovani europei: quali prospettive?

I giovani svolgono un ruolo determinante all'interno di una società basata sulla conoscenza: la loro istruzione e formazione favoriscono l'emergenza di una popolazione altamente qualificata, adattabile e sana. Sebbene alcune recenti statistiche definiscano lo stato di salute dei giovani europei soddisfacente, settori quali attività fisica, salute mentale, livello di istruzione e situazione delle famiglie continuano a destare particolare preoccupazione. A livello europeo, l'Olanda e i Paesi scandinavi risultano ai primi posti per quanto riguarda il benessere infantile e adolescenziale, così come per il loro sistema scolastico. In Italia si conta che oltre un milione e 750mila bambini viva sotto la soglia di povertà. Altri dati negativi relativi all'Italia riguardano l'assiduità con cui viene praticato uno sport (solo una percentuale pari al 21,9 % dei giovani pratica sport con una certa continuità), l'esposizione ai livelli di inquinamento, una tra le più alte tra i Paesi industrializzati, e la disoccupazione giovanile (37,1 %). Fortunatamente l'Italia registra una percentuale tra le più basse d'Europa per i casi di bullismo (11 %).

Si tenga presente che esistono notevoli collegamenti tra la salute e il benessere dei giovani e il loro livello di inclusione sociale e istruzione. Per questo è necessario promuovere uno stile di vita sano e di qualità che migliori il tenore di vita dei bambini e degli adolescenti, offrendo loro sistemi scolastici efficienti e prospettive di lavoro concrete.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Quali misure intende adottare per garantire un quadro europeo omogeneo relativamente al benessere psicofisico di bambini e giovani?

2. Ritiene opportuno promuovere l'utilizzo degli strumenti dell'Unione già esistenti per progetti atti a migliorare la qualità della vita dei cittadini europei in cui venga sempre integrata la dimensione giovanile?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(25 giugno 2013)

La Commissione è ben decisa a contribuire a promuovere la salute e il benessere dei giovani e ad aumentarne il livello di istruzione e inclusione sociale. Del Pacchetto investimenti sociali della Commissione relativo del febbraio 2013 ([1]) fa parte la raccomandazione intitolata «Investire nell'infanzia per spezzare il circolo vizioso dello svantaggio sociale» ([2]). Esso definisce un quadro di orientamenti da seguire nella lotta contro la povertà infantile e l'esclusione sociale, rendendo altresì possibile la promozione del benessere dei minori mediante strategie multidimensionali che comprendano anche iniziative nel settore sanitario. A tal fine si propone di avvalersi appieno degli strumenti di cui dispone l'Unione europea, come ad esempio il programma per il cambiamento e l'innovazione sociale, il Fondo sociale europeo, Erasmus per tutti e Orizzonte 2020 e di sfruttare le occasioni offerte dai fondi strutturali a sostegno dei bambini e delle famiglie.

Da febbraio 2013 il programma dell'UE per la salute sta inoltre cofinanziando insieme a 24 Stati membri un'azione comune sulla salute e il benessere mentale, in cui rientra un pacchetto di lavoro incentrato sul tema «Scuole e salute mentale». Uno degli obiettivi del programma è far sì che gli Stati membri trovino un accordo per i prossimi tre anni su un quadro comune di iniziative in materia di salute e benessere mentale.

La relazione dell'UE sulla gioventù del 2012 mostra come gli Stati membri stiano attuando le raccomandazioni della strategia dell'UE per i giovani ([3]). In essa si richiede di sviluppare un approccio intersettoriale nei confronti di tali problemi. Tra gli ambiti d'iniziativa identificati vi è quello relativo alla salute e al benessere. Si incoraggiano inoltre i giovani ad adottare uno stile di vita sano attraverso l'istruzione e l'attività fisica e si forniscono gli strumenti per favorire la collaborazione tra scuole, animatori giovanili e organizzazioni sportive. La Commissione e gli Stati membri stanno collaborando nell'ambito del metodo aperto di coordinamento come quadro in cui scambiare le politiche comunitarie per i giovani.

([1]) Comunicazione della Commissione «Investire nel settore sociale a favore della crescita e della coesione, in particolare attuando il Fondo sociale europeo nel periodo 2014-2020», COM(2013)83 def. del 20.2.2013.
([2]) C(2013)778 def. del 20.2.2013.
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2009:0200:FIN:IT:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004776/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Better quality of life for young people in Europe: what are the prospects?

Young people play a crucial role in a knowledge-based society: educating and training young people promotes the emergence of a highly qualified, adaptable and healthy population. Although some recent statistics define the state of health of young Europeans as satisfactory, sectors such as physical activity, mental health, education levels and family situations continue to give rise to particular concern. Within Europe, the Netherlands and the Scandinavian countries are the leaders with regard to child and adolescent well-being, as well as in terms of their education systems. In Italy, it is estimated that over 1 750 000 children are living below the poverty line. Other negative data on Italy relate to playing sport regularly (only 21.9% of young people practise a sport with any regularity), exposure to pollution, where levels are some of the highest in industrialised countries, and youth unemployment (37.1%). Fortunately, Italy has one of the lowest rates of bullying in Europe (11%).

It should be borne in mind that there are significant links between young people's health and well-being and their levels of social inclusion and education. It is therefore necessary to promote a healthy, high-quality lifestyle that improves the standard of living of children and young people, offering them efficient education systems that give them concrete prospects of work.

1. What measures does the Commission intend to take to ensure that there is a homogenous European framework on the mental and physical well-being of children and young people?

2. Does it think it advisable to promote the use of EU instruments that already exist for projects designed to improve the quality of life of European citizens, within which the youth dimension should always be included?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(25 June 2013)

The Commission is keen to help promote the health and well-being of young people and help increase their level of social inclusion and education. The Commission's 'Social Investment Package' of February 2013 ([1]) includes a Commission Recommendation 'Investing in Children — breaking the Cycle of Disadvantage' ([2]). It set out a framework of guidelines for policies to address child poverty and social exclusion, and for promoting children's well-being through multi-dimensional strategies, including health sector action. It proposes to make full use of relevant EU-instruments, such as the Programme for Social Change and Innovation, the European Social Fund, Erasmus for All and Horizon 2020 for this purpose, and to exploit the opportunities provided by the Structural Funds to support children and families.

Since February 2013, the EU Health Programme is further co-funding a Joint Action on Mental Health and Well-being with 24 Member States, which includes a work package focused on 'Mental Health and Schools'. One of the objectives of this Joint Action is that Member States agree, over the next three years, on a common framework of action on mental health and well-being.

The 2012 EU Youth Report shows how Member States follow the recommendations of the EU Youth Strategy ([3]). It advocates a cross-sectoral approach to issues that concern young people. One of the identified action fields is health and well-being. It encourages healthy lifestyles for young people via education and physical activity and establishes means to support collaboration between schools, youth workers, and sporting organisations. The Commission and the Member States are working together under the Open Method of Coordination as a framework for EU youth policy exchange.

([1]) Commission Communication 'Towards Social Investment for Growth and Cohesion — including implementing the European Social Fund 2014-2020', COM(2013) 83 final of 20.2.2013.
([2]) C(2013) 778 final of 20.2.2013.
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2009:0200:FIN:EN:PDF.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004778/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(29 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Sicurezza sul posto di lavoro in Europa: cosa aspettarsi in futuro

La salute e la sicurezza sul posto di lavoro costituiscono altrettanti aspetti salienti della politica sociale dell'Unione e con la strategia di Lisbona per la crescita e l'occupazione l'Unione europea si prefigge di creare un maggior numero di posti di lavoro e di migliore qualità. In questo ambito l'azione comunitaria non si limita all'aspetto normativo: le istituzioni europee svolgono infatti numerose attività d'informazione, di orientamento e di promozione in favore di un ambiente di lavoro protetto e sano, in collaborazione con l'Agenzia europea per la sicurezza e la salute sul lavoro. In particolare, la Commissione richiama le esigenze da soddisfare per garantire un posto di lavoro sicuro e sano a tutti i cittadini europei: il consolidamento della cultura della prevenzione, una migliore applicazione del diritto esistente in materia e il benessere complessivo sul posto di lavoro. Ritiene inoltre necessario adeguare il quadro giuridico a una realtà sociale in continua evoluzione e incoraggiare l'elaborazione di pratiche migliori, il dialogo collettivo e la responsabilità sociale delle aziende. Questi importanti passi hanno contribuito, negli ultimi anni, a una diminuzione degli incidenti pari al 25,5 % in Italia e al 29,4 % in Europa. Tuttavia, si contano annualmente 20 milioni di lavoratori che affrontano problemi di salute causati dal loro posto di lavoro; inoltre il 40 % dei lavoratori europei svolge la propria funzione in ambienti non privi di pericoli.

Considerato che:

— l' Unione Europea presenta un panorama disomogeneo in materia di sicurezza sul posto di lavoro;

— la Strategia europea 2020 prevede un incremento di opportunità tramite posti di lavoro verdi, atti alla tutela dell'ambiente e del lavoratore e che prevedono un uso ragionato e produttivo delle nuove tecnologie;

può la Commissione precisare quali saranno i passi successivi in materia di sicurezza sul posto di lavoro per una completa armonizzazione del panorama europeo volto a tutelare i lavoratori?

Risposta di Laszlo Andor a nome della Commissione
(25 giugno 2013)

La Commissione ritiene che la legislazione unionale in tema di salute e sicurezza sul lavoro, unitamente alle strategie europee adottate in tale ambito nel 2002 e 2007, abbia efficacemente contribuito a migliorare la salute e sicurezza sul posto di lavoro nell'UE, in particolare definendo requisiti minimi comuni e un approccio strategico per raggiungere la convergenza tra le politiche degli Stati membri in questo ambito e la loro integrazione.

Il 31 maggio la Commissione ha presentato la valutazione della strategia sulla salute e sicurezza sul lavoro 2007-2012 ed ha avviato una consultazione pubblica sul futuro della politica unionale in tale ambito ([1]). La consultazione si prefigge di raccogliere i punti di vista e i contributi di tutti i cittadini e di tutte le organizzazioni che mostrino interesse per tale ambito, in modo da alimentare il dibattito su un nuovo quadro politico per la salute e la sicurezza professionali.

La Commissione attira l'attenzione dell'onorevole deputata sul fatto che, ai sensi dell'articolo 17 bis della direttiva quadro ([2]), entro la fine del 2015 la Commissione presenterà una relazione unitaria, basata su un ampio riesame delle 24 direttive unionali in materia di salute e sicurezza, per riferire della loro pertinenza, dello stato della ricerca e delle nuove conoscenze scientifiche nei molteplici ambiti legati alla legislazione in materia di salute e di sicurezza professionali. La Commissione informerà le altre istituzioni e gli organi dell'UE sui risultati del riesame. Quest'esercizio consentirà inoltre alla Commissione, se del caso, di presentare proposte per migliorare il quadro normativo al fine di proteggere più efficacemente i lavoratori di tutta l'UE.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=699&consultId=13&furtherConsult=yes
([2]) Direttiva 89/391/CEE del Consiglio, del 12 giugno 1989, concernente l'attuazione di misure volte a promuovere il miglioramento della sicurezza e della salute dei lavoratori durante il lavoro, GU L 183 del 29.6.1989.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004778/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Safety at work in Europe: what to expect in the future

Health and safety at work are both important aspects of the EU's social policy, and with the Lisbon strategy for Growth and Jobs the European Union is setting out to create a larger number of jobs and to ensure that they are of a higher quality. EU action within this area is not limited to legislation: the European institutions carry out several activities providing information and guidance and promoting a safe and healthy working environment in cooperation with the European Agency for Health and Safety at Work. Specifically, the Commission points to the requirements to be met to ensure that all European citizens have safe, healthy jobs: consolidating a culture of risk prevention, better application of existing law on the subject and overall well-being at work. It also believes that the legal framework needs to be adapted to a continually evolving society and that encouragement needs to given for the development of best practice, collective dialogue and corporate social responsibility. These significant steps have in recent years helped to reduce accidents by 25.5% in Italy and by 29.4% in Europe as a whole. However, every year approximately 20 million workers face health problems caused by their jobs; furthermore, 40% of European workers work in environments that are dangerous.

Given that:

— safety at work varies widely across the European Union;

— the Europe 2020 strategy provides for increased opportunities through green jobs, intended to protect both the environment and workers, providing for a rational and productive use of new technologies;

can the Commission say what further steps it will take on safety at work to ensure full harmonisation across Europe to protect workers?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(25 June 2013)

The Commission considers that the EU legislation on health and safety at work, together with the European Strategies adopted in this field in 2002 and 2007, have effectively contributed to improving workplace health and safety within the EU, in particular by laying down common minimum requirements and a strategic approach to achieving convergence between and the integration of the Member States' policies in this area.

On 31 May the Commission presented the evaluation of the strategy on Health and Safety at Work 2007-2012 and launched a public consultation on the future of the EU policy in this area ([1]). The consultation seeks to gather insights and contributions from all citizens and organisations with an interest in this area and will feed into the debate on a new policy framework for occupational safety and health.

The Commission would draw the Honourable Member's attention to the fact that, pursuant to Article 17a of the framework Directive ([2]), by the end of 2015 at the latest, the Commission will produce a single report based on a comprehensive review of the 24 EU health and safety Directives in terms of their relevance, of research and of new scientific knowledge in the various fields relating to occupational safety and health legislation. It will inform the other EU institutions and bodies of the results of that review. This exercise will also allow the Commission, where appropriate, to put forward proposals to improve the regulatory framework in order to protect workers across the EU more effectively.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=699&consultId=13&furtherConsult=yes
([2]) Council Directive 89/391/EEC of 12 June 1989 on the introduction of measures to encourage improvements in the safety and health of workers at work, OJ L 183, 29.6.1989.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004780/13
alla Commissione
Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D)
(29 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Ristrutturazione del debito obbligazionario subordinato della Bank of Ireland e conseguenze per i consumatori

La Bank of Ireland, prima della crisi finanziaria che ha portato alla sua nazionalizzazione, aveva emesso delle obbligazioni di tipo subordinato. La banca ha successivamente ristrutturato il suo debito obbligazionario subordinato offrendo ai risparmiatori uno scambio con titoli garantiti dallo Stato per tagli minimi di più di 50.000 euro o sterline. Quest'offerta di scambio non era utilizzabile dai residenti in Italia e USA.

Moltissimi risparmiatori italiani, non essendo stati informati della possibilità di scambio e non essendo essa possibile in Italia, sono stati penalizzati assai gravemente dalla ristrutturazione.

— Considerando che i titoli subordinati sono cancellabili in caso di fallimento della banca, ma la banca non è mai fallita anzi è stata nazionalizzata;

— considerando la sentenza dell'Alta Corte inglese del luglio 2012, che ha definito illegittime le modalità di ristrutturazione seguite dalla Bank of Ireland;

— considerando che l'Irlanda ha ricevuto aiuti dall'Unione europea per il salvataggio del suo sistema bancario,

può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se ritiene legittime le modalità di ristrutturazione utilizzate da Bank of Ireland;

2. in che modo ha vigilato per far sì che, a fronte degli aiuti concordati all'Irlanda, le operazioni di ristrutturazione del debito delle banche irlandesi non fossero eseguite a discapito dei risparmiatori europei;

3. quali azioni abbia adottato o intenda adottare per garantire che siano tutelati i diritti di tutti i risparmiatori europei, senza distinzioni per nazionalità, che avevano investito in obbligazioni di tipo subordinato emesse da Bank of Ireland?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(25 giugno 2013)

Nel giugno 2012 la Commissione ha adottato una proposta sulla risoluzione delle crisi bancarie, ancora in corso di negoziazione. La nuova direttiva chiarirà la gerarchia dei crediti soggetti allo strumento del *bail-in*. In attesa dell'entrata in vigore della legislazione dell'UE, gli Stati membri mantengono un margine di discrezionalità nell'adozione di misure volte alla risoluzione delle crisi bancarie, purché siano rispettati i principi generali del trattato e il diritto derivato in vigore.

Nell'ambito delle norme sugli aiuti di Stato, la Commissione ha valutato le misure di ristrutturazione della Bank of Ireland delineate nel piano di ristrutturazione presentatole. La Bank of Ireland non è stata nazionalizzata in quanto, nel dicembre 2012, la partecipazione dello Stato era pari al 15,13 %. La sentenza del tribunale del Regno Unito cui si fa riferimento sembra essere contraria all'IBRC ([1]), piuttosto che alla Bank of Ireland. L'IBRC è stata liquidata dal governo irlandese nel febbraio 2013.

Per quanto riguarda la Bank of Ireland, nella decisione C(2011)9755 del 20 dicembre 2011 la Commissione ha concluso che il piano:

— era necessario e sufficiente a garantire il ripristino della redditività a lungo termine della banca;

— garantiva che i costi di ristrutturazione fossero limitati al minimo necessario e che il beneficiario degli aiuti, i suoi azionisti e i detentori di titoli di debito fornissero un proprio significativo contributo ai costi di ristrutturazione, in linea con i requisiti di ripartizione degli oneri;

— infine, conteneva misure adeguate per limitare le distorsioni della concorrenza.

La Commissione non è a conoscenza della presunta discriminazione nei confronti dei detentori di titoli di debito subordinati di altre nazionalità. Il divieto di qualsiasi discriminazione sulla base della nazionalità è, nel campo di applicazione dei trattati, un principio sancito dall'articolo 18 del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea. Qualora tale denuncia sia presentata alla Commissione, essa valuterà la situazione con tutti gli elementi di fatto.

([1]) Irish Bank Resolution Corporation.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004780/13
to the Commission
Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Restructuring of the Bank of Ireland's subordinated bond debt and consequences for consumers

Prior to the financial crisis that led to its nationalisation, the Bank of Ireland had issued some subordinated bonds. The bank subsequently restructured its subordinated bond debt, offering to exchange savers' bonds for securities guaranteed by the State for minimum tranches of over EUR or GBP 50 000. This offer of an exchange could not be taken up by residents of Italy or the USA.

Many Italian savers were not informed of the possibility of an exchange, which was in any case not possible in Italy. They have therefore been penalised rather seriously by the restructuring.

Subordinated securities may be cancelled in the event of the bank's collapse; however, the bank never collapsed, but was instead nationalised.

In a judgment in July 2012 England's Supreme Court held that the restructuring methods adopted by the Bank of Ireland were illegal.

Ireland received aid from the European Union to rescue its banking system.

1. Does the Commission consider that the restructuring methods used by the Bank of Ireland are lawful?

2. How has it ensured that, in view of the aid granted to Ireland, the operations to restructure the debt of Irish banks were not carried out in a way that was detrimental to European savers?

3. What actions has it taken or does it intend to take to ensure that the rights of all European savers who invested in subordinated bonds issued by the Bank of Ireland are protected, without distinction based on nationality?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(25 June 2013)

In June 2012, the Commission adopted a proposal on bank resolution, still being negotiated. The new Directive will clarify the hierarchy of creditor claims to be subject to bail-in. Pending the entry into force of EU legislation, Member States retain discretion on bank resolution measures as long as they respect existing secondary legislation and the general principles of the Treaty.

The Commission assessed under state aid rules the restructuring measures for Bank of Ireland as submitted in its restructuring plan to the Commission. Bank of Ireland has not been nationalised, as the holding of the State in the bank stood at 15.13% at December 2012. The UK court ruling referred to appears to be against the IBRC [1], as opposed to Bank of Ireland. IBRC was liquidated by the Irish government in February 2013.

As to Bank of Ireland, the Commission concluded in its decision C(2011)9755 of 20 December 2011 that the plan:

— was necessary and sufficient to ensure the restoration of the long-term viability of the bank;

— ensured that the restructuring costs were limited to the minimum necessary and the aid beneficiary, its shareholders and its debt holders provided for a significant own contribution to the restructuring costs in line with the requirements on burden-sharing; and

— contained adequate measures limiting the distortion of competition.

The Commission has no knowledge of the alleged discrimination against subordinated bondholders on the ground of nationality. The prohibition of any discrimination on grounds of nationality within the scope of application of the Treaties is a principle enshrined in Article 18 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU. Should such a complaint be lodged with the Commission, it would assess the situation with all elements of fact.

[1] Irish Bank Resolution Corporation.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004781/13
alla Commissione
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(29 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Violenze nella Repubblica Centrafricana e traffico d'armi

È notizia delle ultime settimane che nella Repubblica Centrafricana si protraggono scontri armati molto violenti, i quali provocano un enorme flusso di profughi costretti a fuggire nei vicini Congo, Ciad o Camerun. L'UNHCR e altre organizzazioni internazionali si impegnano quotidianamente a portare loro soccorso nei campi profughi attraverso la distribuzione di pasti caldi e la somministrazione di cure mediche. Finché non cesseranno i conflitti e, soprattutto, il traffico delle armi dai paesi sviluppati ai campi di guerra; non c'è però speranza di porre fine alla carneficina.

— Considerando che *Amnesty International* ha diffuso, già nel 2012, un documento dal titolo «Dieci ragioni per controllare il commercio delle armi nel mondo» nel quale si evidenzia che una percentuale rilevante delle stesse viene prodotta anche da paesi dell'Unione europea, Germania, Regno Unito e Francia in testa;

— evidenziando altresì che lo scorso 2 aprile le Nazioni Unite hanno approvato a larga maggioranza il primo trattato sul commercio internazionale delle armi, il quale vede comunque un ambito di applicazione materiale piuttosto limitato, in quanto si applica soltanto alle armi convenzionali incluse nell'apposito registro delle Nazioni Unite e non alle munizioni ed entrerà in vigore solo dopo la ratifica di almeno 50 Stati;

— osservando infine che la Commissione europea ha presentato di recente una proposta volta a inasprire i controlli sulle armi che entrano ed escono dal territorio dell'Unione e a rendere più facilmente rintracciabili le rotte dei trafficanti entro i suoi stessi confini;

può la Commissione precisare quanto segue:

1. Quali sono i più recenti sviluppi dei lavori intrapresi al suo interno?

2. Quali azioni intende intraprendere, in tempi rapidi, per arginare il fenomeno del commercio delle armi dentro e fuori l'Unione europea?

Risposta dell'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(3 luglio 2013)

Le esportazioni di armi sono disciplinate, a livello UE, dalla posizione comune 2008/944/PESC ([1]) sul controllo dell'esportazione delle attrezzature di difesa. Ai sensi di tale posizione comune, le esportazioni di armi restano autorizzate o respinte a livello nazionale dopo un'attenta valutazione guidata dagli otto criteri della stessa posizione comune. Tali criteri riguardano in particolare il rischio di violazioni dei diritti umani e del diritto umanitario internazionale, il rischio di diversione e il possibile effetto destabilizzante dell'esportazione delle armi sulla situazione interna e regionale del paese destinatario.

Il Trattato sul commercio delle armi, adottato dall'Assemblea generale delle Nazioni Unite il 2 aprile 2013, si applica non solo alle armi convenzionali ma anche alle munizioni. L'UE ha ultimato il 27 maggio 2013 le sue procedure interne, consentendo agli Stati membri di firmare il Trattato, per quanto riguarda le materie rientranti nella competenza dell'UE, al momento dell'apertura alla firma, il 3 giugno 2013. La successiva autorizzazione della ratifica del Trattato da parte degli Stati membri è in corso di preparazione, in modo che questi possano rapidamente procedervi per quanto riguarda le materie di competenza dell'UE.

L'8 marzo 2012 il Consiglio ha adottato il regolamento 258/2012 ([2]), che allinea la legislazione dell'UE al Protocollo delle Nazioni Unite contro la fabbricazione e il traffico illeciti di armi da fuoco, loro parti e componenti e munizioni. Il 22 marzo 2013 la Commissione ha adottato una proposta di decisione del Consiglio sulla conclusione, a nome dell'Unione europea, del Protocollo sulle armi da fuoco.

La Commissione sta inoltre elaborando un approccio comune per contrastare la circolazione illegale di armi da fuoco dentro e verso l'UE, che intende annunciare per mezzo di una comunicazione nel corso del 2013.

([1]) Posizione comune 2008/944/PESC del Consiglio, dell'8 dicembre 2008, che definisce norme comuni per il controllo delle esportazioni di tecnologia e attrezzature militari, GU L 335 del 13.12.2008.

([2]) Regolamento (UE) n. 258/2012 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 14 marzo 2012, che attua l'articolo 10 del protocollo delle Nazioni Unite contro la fabbricazione e il traffico illeciti di armi da fuoco, loro parti e componenti e munizioni, addizionale alla convenzione delle Nazioni Unite contro la criminalità transnazionale organizzata (Protocollo delle Nazioni Unite sulle armi da fuoco), e dispone autorizzazioni all'esportazione, misure di importazione e transito per le armi da fuoco, loro parti e componenti e munizioni, GU L 94 del 30.3.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004781/13
to the Commission
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Violence in the Central African Republic and arms trafficking

There have been reports in recent weeks that very violent armed conflicts are continuing in the Central African Republic, prompting huge numbers of refugees to flee to neighbouring Congo, Chad and Cameroon. The UNHCR and other international organisations are working every day to provide aid to the refugee camps through the distribution of hot meals and the supply of medical services. Until there is an end to the conflicts and, above all, to the trafficking of arms by developed countries to war zones, there is no hope of putting an end to the carnage.

In 2012 Amnesty International published a document entitled 'Ten reasons for controlling the arms trade worldwide', pointing out that a high percentage of arms are produced by European Union countries, chief among them Germany, the United Kingdom and France.

On 2 April 2013 the United Nations adopted, by a large majority, the first treaty on the international arms trade, which, however, has a rather limited physical scope, since it applies only to conventional arms included in the relevant register of the United Nations and not to ammunition, and will enter into force only once it has been ratified by at least 50 States.

Finally, the European Commission recently submitted a proposal intended to step up controls on arms entering and leaving EU territory and to make it easier to trace trafficking routes within its borders.

1. What are the most recent developments in the work that the Commission is carrying out?

2. What actions does it intend to take, in the short term, to stem arms trading within and outside the European Union?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(3 July 2013)

Arms exports are regulated at the EU level by Common Position 2008/944/CFSP ([1]) on the control of export of defence equipment. Under this Common Position, arms exports remain authorised or denied at the national level after a thorough assessment guided by the eight criteria of the Common Position. Those criteria notably relate to the risk of human rights and international humanitarian law violations, the risk of diversion and the possible destabilising impact of the arms export on the internal and regional situation of the recipient country;

The Arms Trade Treaty, adopted by the UN General Assembly on 2 April 2013, applies not only to conventional arms but also to ammunition/munitions. The EU has completed on 27 May 2013 its internal procedures, enabling Member States to sign the Treaty on matters covered by EU competence as early as the Treaty was open for signature on 3 June 2013. Subsequent authorisation of the ratification by Member States is being actively prepared so that Member states can ratify the Treaty swiftly with regard to matters of EU competence.

On 8 March 2012, the Council adopted Regulation 258/2012 ([2]) that brings the EU legislation into line with the UN Firearms Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition. On 22 March 2013, the Commission adopted a proposal for a Council Decision on the conclusion, on behalf of the European Union, of the Firearms Protocol.

The Commission is also developing a common approach to tackling the illegal circulation of firearms inside and into the EU which it intends to announce by way of a communication later during 2013.

([1]) Council Common Position 2008/944/CFSP of 8 December 2008 defining common rules governing control of exports of military technology and equipment, OJ L 335, 13.12.2008.

([2]) Regulation (EU) No 258/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 March 2012 implementing Article 10 of the United Nations' Protocol against the illicit manufacturing of and trafficking in firearms, their parts and components and ammunition, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organised Crime (UN Firearms Protocol), and establishing export authorisation, and import and transit measures for firearms, their parts and components and ammunition, OJ L 94, 30.3.2012.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-004782/13
adresată Comisiei
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(29 aprilie 2013)

Subiect: Măsuri de protecție a cetaceelor în Marea Neagră

Regulamentul (CE) nr. 812/2004 stabilește măsurile menite să reducă capturile accidentale de cetacee de către navele de pescuit în anumite zone ale Uniunii.

Din păcate, însă actul legislativ nu acoperă și Marea Neagră, iar, în consecință, capturile accidentale de cetacee nu sunt reglementate în această zonă.

În ultimii ani, mai multe sute de delfini au eșuat pe litoralul Mării Negre, numărul lor scăzând dramatic.

Delfinii din Marea Neagră sunt de multe ori victimele practicilor de pescuit, prinzându-se accidental în plase. De asemenea, numărul lor este afectat și de pescuitul ilegal, dar și de poluare.

O soluție pentru a împiedica reducerea suplimentară a numărului delfinilor din Marea Neagră ar fi folosirea dispozitivelor acustice, la care se recurge deja în alte zone.

Care sunt măsurile pe care Comisia le ia în acest sens?

Intenționează Comisia să instituie un cadru legislativ cuprinzător pentru protecția cetaceelor? Dacă da, când ar urma să fie lansată această propunere?

Răspuns dat de dna Damanaki în numele Comisiei
(27 iunie 2013)

Integrarea preocupărilor legate de mediu în gestionarea pescuitului este un principiu fundamental al politicii comune în domeniul pescuitului (PCP) și al reformei PCP în curs de desfășurare. Într-adevăr, Regulamentul (CE) nr. 812/2004 nu acoperă Marea Neagră, însă statele membre au obligația, în temeiul Directivei „Habitate" ([1]), de a monitoriza captura și mortalitatea accidentală a tuturor cetaceelor, precum și de a se asigura că acest lucru nu are un impact semnificativ asupra populațiilor. Acest lucru este valabil și pentru Marea Neagră. În plus, Directiva-cadru „Strategia pentru mediul marin" ([2]) prevede ca toate statele membre UE să asigure o stare ecologică bună pentru apele lor până în 2020, inclusiv în ceea ce privește stadiul de conservare a cetaceelor.

Pe lângă sprijinul acordat în favoarea protejării cetaceelor din Marea Neagră, Comisia finanțează în prezent un studiu menit să evalueze impactul negativ al pescuitului asupra cetaceelor din Marea Neagră. Rezultatele acestui studiu vor fi disponibile în toamna anului 2014.

Problema capturilor secundare de cetacee în Marea Neagră a fost, de asemenea, abordată la nivel internațional de Comisia Generală pentru Pescuit în Marea Mediterană (CGPM), care, în urma unei propuneri a UE, a adoptat în 2012 un set de măsuri ([3]) pentru a reduce capturile secundare de cetacee în Marea Neagră. În plus, CGPM a adoptat recent alte măsuri ([4]) care vizează atenuarea impactului pescuitului cu setci de fund asupra cetaceelor din Marea Neagră, pe baza unei propuneri a UE.

În conformitate cu trecerea la un proces regionalizat de luare a deciziilor în cadrul reformei PCP, intenția Comisiei este de a integra eventual principalele elemente ale Regulamentului (CE) nr. 812/2004 (și anume, monitorizarea și atenuarea) în alte cadre de reglementare viitoare, cum ar fi măsurile tehnice sau noul cadru de colectare a datelor. Astfel, măsurile vor putea să vizeze zonele și speciile cele mai amenințate.

([1]) Directiva 92/43/CEE a Consiliului (JO L 206, 22.7.1992).
([2]) Directiva 2008/56/CE a Parlamentului European și a Consiliului din 17 iunie 2008 de instituire a unui cadru de acțiune comunitară în domeniul politicii privind mediul marin (JO L 164, 25.6.2008).
([3]) CGPM/36/2012/2.
([4]) CGPM/37/2013/2.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004782/13
to the Commission
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Measures to protect cetaceans in the Black Sea

Regulation (EC) No 812/2004 stipulates the measures intended to reduce incidental catches of cetaceans by fishing vessels in certain areas of the EU.

Unfortunately, however, this legislation does not cover the Black Sea, which means that incidental catches of cetaceans are not regulated in this area.

In recent years, several hundred dolphins have been stranded on the shores of the Black Sea, resulting in a sharp decline in their numbers.

Dolphins in the Black Sea are frequently victims of fishing practices where they accidentally get caught in nets. In addition, their numbers are affected not only by illegal fishing but also by pollution.

One solution for preventing a further decrease in the number of dolphins in the Black Sea would be to use acoustic devices, which are already being deployed in other areas.

What measures is the Commission going to take on this matter?

Does the Commission intend to introduce a comprehensive legal framework for protecting cetaceans? If so, when would this proposal be initiated?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2013)

The integration of environmental concerns into fisheries management is a fundamental principle of the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) and the ongoing CFP reform. Indeed Regulation (EC) No 812/2004 does not cover the Black Sea but Member States do have obligations under the Habitats Directive ([1]) to monitor the incidental capture and killing of all cetaceans and to ensure that this does not have a significant impact on the populations. This applies also to the Black Sea. Moreover, the Marine Strategy Framework Directive ([2]) requires all EU Member States to achieve good environmental status within their waters by 2020, including the conservation status of cetaceans.

Additionally to support the protection of cetaceans in the Black Sea, the Commission is currently funding a study assessing the adverse impacts of fisheries on cetaceans in the Black Sea. The results of this study will be available by autumn 2014.

The issue of cetacean by-catch in the Black Sea has also been addressed at international level by the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM) which, acting on an EU proposal, adopted in 2012 a set of measures ([3]) to mitigate cetacean by-catch in the Black Sea. Moreover, GFCM also recently adopted other measures ([4]) aimed at mitigating the impact of bottom-set gillnets on cetaceans in the Black Sea on the basis of an EU proposal.

In line with the move to regionalised decision-making under the reform of the CFP, the Commission's intention is to possibly incorporate the main elements of Regulation (EC) 812/2004 (i.e. monitoring and mitigation) into other future regulatory frameworks such as the Technical Measures or the new Data Collection Framework. This will allow that measures are targeted in the areas and for the species most under threat.

([1]) Council Directive 92/43/EEC (OJ L 206, 22.7.1992).
([2]) Directive 2008/56/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 of June 2008 establishing a framework for community action in the field of marine environmental policy (OJ L 164, 25.6.2008).
([3]) GFCM/36/2012/2.
([4]) GFCM/37/2013/2.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-004783/13
adresată Comisiei
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(29 aprilie 2013)

Subiect: Finalizarea negocierilor privind Acordul de Asociere UE-Republica Moldova

În ultimii ani, Republica Moldova a înregistrat progrese însemnate în dialogul cu Uniunea, apropiindu-se de finalizarea negocierilor privind Acordul de Asociere.

Totuși, instabilitatea politică de la Chișinău din ultima perioadă riscă să pună în pericol toate reformele adoptate de Guvernul Filat și, implicit, parcursul european al țării. După demiterea guvernului, Curtea Constituțională a hotărât că decretul Președintelui Nicolae Timofti de desemnare a lui Vlad Filat pentru funcția de prim-ministru este neconstituțional. Această decizie, la care se adaugă demiterea președintelui Parlamentului, precum și existența în prezent a unui guvern interimar, accentuează instabilitatea politică, întrucât două instituții fundamentale ale statului nu sunt pe deplin funcționale.

Comisia a menționat că se intenționează finalizarea negocierilor privind Acordul de Asociere UE-Moldova, inclusiv Acordul privind Zona de Liber Schimb Aprofundat și Cuprinzător, până la Summit-ul Parteneriatului Estic de la Vilnius, din noiembrie 2013.

În ce măsură actuala criză politică de la Chișinău poate pune în pericol finalizarea negocierilor dintre UE și Moldova privind Acordul de Asociere până la Summit-ul de la Vilnius?

Răspuns dat de dl Füle în numele Comisiei
(26 iunie 2013)

Recenta criză politică de la Chișinău nu a afectat ritmul și amploarea cooperării dintre UE și Republica Moldova, nici ale negocierilor privind acordul de asociere/acordul de liber schimb aprofundat și cuprinzător. Încheierea acestor negocieri înaintea summitului Parteneriatului estic de la Vilnius ar fi putut fi pusă în pericol de o schimbare a priorităților politice în Republica Moldova sau întârziată în cazul în care Parlamentul sau Guvernul Republicii Moldova ar fi luat măsuri sau decizii incompatibile cu valorile europene.

UE este optimistă cu privire la faptul că noul guvern al prim-ministrului Leanca va depune toate eforturile necesare pentru a înainta rapid în procesul de asociere politică și integrare economică cu UE, garantând, în același timp, reforme aprofundate și integritatea instituțiilor de stat ale Moldovei.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004783/13
to the Commission
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Concluding the negotiations on the EU-Republic of Moldova Association Agreement

In recent years, the Republic of Moldova has made significant progress in its dialogue with the EU, as it approaches the point of concluding the Association Agreement negotiations.

However, the political instability observed recently in Chișinău is likely to jeopardise all the reforms adopted by the Filat government and, by extension, the country's progress towards EU accession. After the government was dismissed, the Constitutional Court ruled that the decree issued by President Nicolae Timofti appointing Vlad Filat as prime minister was unconstitutional. This decision, with the dismissal of the president of the Moldovan Parliament on top of this, along with the presence of an interim government at the moment are exacerbating the political instability as two of the state's fundamental institutions are not fully functioning.

The Commission stated that it intends to conclude the negotiations on the EU-Moldova Association Agreement, including the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area Agreement, by the Eastern Partnership summit to be held in Vilnius in November 2013.

To what extent might the current political crisis in Chișinău jeopardise the conclusion of the Association Agreement negotiations between the EU and Moldova by the Vilnius summit?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(26 June 2013)

The recent political crisis in Chisinau did not affect the pace and depth of EU-Moldova cooperation, including the Association Agreement/DCFTA negotiations. The conclusion of these negotiations before the Vilnius Eastern Partnership Summit could have been jeopardised by a change of policy priorities in the Republic of Moldova, or delayed in case steps or decisions incompatible with the European values would have been taken by the Moldovan Parliament or Government.

The EU is optimistic that the new government of Prime Minister Leanca will make all efforts to work at full speed towards the political association and economic integration with the EU, while safeguarding deep reforms and the integrity of Moldova's state institutions.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-004784/13
adresată Comisiei
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(29 aprilie 2013)

Subiect: Performanța economică în agricultură

Agricultura este un sector strategic al Uniunii Europene, întrucât asigură securitatea alimentară, echilibrul pieței, păstrează liniștea socială, protejează viața și mediul înconjurător. Agricultura asigură hrana pentru populațiile statelor membre, precum și importante surplusuri pentru export. Peste 40% din bugetul comunitar se alocă acestui sector, având în vedere că populația ocupată în agricultură, împreună cu familiile, asigură stabilitatea zonelor rurale și conservarea peisajelor naturale. Noile state membre și cele candidate au o populație agricolă numeroasă, cu pondere ridicată în totalul populației ocupate. În aceste țări ponderea agriculturii în produsul intern brut (PIB) este mai redusă decât ponderea populației agricole în populația ocupată, ceea ce reflectă o utilizare ineficientă a resurselor umane specifică agriculturii de subzistență. Decalajul structural este semnificativ în noile state membre și mai ales în România și Bulgaria. Această situație exprimă utilizarea ineficientă a resurselor naturale și umane și competitivitatea redusă la export. Decalajele structurale dintre România și UE 15, dar și față de unele dintre noile state membre, sunt semnificative. Aceste decalaje reflectă o performanță economică redusă la nivel național, dar mai ales în agricultură.

În acest context, ce măsuri are în vedere Comisia pentru a reduce aceste decalaje la nivel european și pentru a promova utilizarea la nivel maxim și eficient a resurselor amintite anterior?

Răspuns dat de dl Cioloş în numele Comisiei
(25 iunie 2013)

Propunerile privind reformarea PAC pentru următoarea perioadă de programare 2014-2020 conțin o serie de elemente noi, cu obiectivul de a îmbunătăți competitivitatea agricultorilor, de a mobiliza și dezvolta potențialul economic, social și de mediu al agriculturii și al lanțurilor de aprovizionare cu alimente. Comisia a propus o convergență progresivă a plăților directe, atât între statele membre, cât și între agricultorii din aceeași regiune. Comisia a propus, de asemenea, măsuri care, pe lângă faptul că sunt eficiente pentru realizarea obiectivelor politice deja stabilite, vor ține seama și de diferitele situații cu care se confruntă agricultorii de pe întreg teritoriul UE.

Având în vedere rolul esențial pe care îl joacă exploatațiile agricole de mici dimensiuni în zonele rurale, Comisia a propus introducerea unei scheme specifice pentru micii agricultori, sub forma unei sume forfetare. Schema este menită să îmbunătățească situația economică a exploatațiilor agricole de mici dimensiuni (se estimează că aproximativ 30 % din agricultorii europeni ar fi eligibili).

Pe lângă aceasta, politicile de dezvoltare rurală vor oferi posibilități suplimentare pentru sprijinirea piețelor locale și dezvoltarea lanțurilor scurte de aprovizionare. În ceea ce privește măsurile specifice, măsura de „cooperare" propusă prezintă un interes special în acest sens; în mod mai general, abordarea Leader va fi menținută și ameliorată. Mai mult, va fi posibilă crearea unor subprograme consacrate, de exemplu, micilor agricultori sau lanțurilor scurte de aprovizionare.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004784/13
to the Commission
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Economic performance in agriculture

Agriculture is a strategic sector for the European Union as it ensures food security and market balance, maintains social harmony, and protects life and the environment. Agriculture provides food for Member States' populations and substantial surpluses for export. More than 40% of the EU budget is allocated to this sector, given that the farming population, along with their families, provides stability in rural areas and conservation of natural landscapes. The new Member States and candidate countries have a large farming population, accounting for a high proportion of the total working population. In these countries the proportion contributed by agriculture to GDP is lower than the proportion of the farming population among the working population, reflecting the inefficient use of human resources, which is specific to subsistence farming. There is a considerable structural disparity in the new Member States, especially in Romania and Bulgaria. This situation is reflected in the inefficient use of natural and human resources and in the low level of export competitiveness. The structural disparities between Romania and the EU-15, as well as in relation to some of the new Member States are significant. These disparities reflect a low level of domestic economic performance, especially in agriculture.

In light of this, what measures is the Commission considering with the aim of narrowing these disparities at EU level and of promoting the maximum and most efficient use of the resources mentioned above?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(25 June 2013)

The CAP reform proposals for the next programming period 2014-2020 contains several new elements with the objective to improve farmers competitiveness, mobilise and develop the economic, social and environmental potential of agriculture and food supply chains. The Commission proposed a gradual convergence of direct payments, both between Member States and between farmers in a same region. The Commission also proposed measures which, while effective at achieving the already set policy objectives, will take into account different situations of farmers across the EU.

In recognition of the key role that small farms play in rural areas, the Commission proposed to introduce a specific scheme for small farmers in the form of a lump sum. The scheme should improve the economic position of small farms (with around 30% of EU farmers expected to be eligible).

Complementing this, rural development policies will offer additional possibilities to support local markets and short supply chains development. In terms of specific measures, the proposed 'cooperation' measure should be of particular interest in this respect; more generally, the Leader approach will be retained and improved. Furthermore, it will be possible to create sub-programmes dedicated to, for example, small farmers or short supply chains.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-004785/13
till kommissionen
Alf Svensson (PPE)
(29 april 2013)

Angående: Immunisering och vaccin inom ramen för DCI-budgeten

Immunisering och vaccin är några av de mest kostnadseffektiva biståndssatsningarna på hälsoområdet, eftersom de inte enbart bidrar till minskad dödlighet i vanliga sjukdomar, utan också hjälper utvecklingsländerna att minska kostnaderna för sjukvården. Många utvecklingsländer har nu vaccineringsprogram som del av sina nationella hälsostrategier, vilket ligger i linje med EU:s egna prioriteringar. Sedan 2003 har dock kommissionen endast avsatt mycket begränsade biståndsmedel för immuniseringsinsatser i utvecklingsländer.

Europaparlamentet föreslår att DCI-förordningen för perioden 2013–2020 (Annex V, kapitel A, "Human Development", punkt 9) explicit skall påbjuda stöd från budgeten till såväl förebyggande hälsovård som immunisering i utvecklingsländerna.

Hur planerar kommissionen att agera utifrån detta? Kommer särskilda medel från biståndsbudgeten öronmärkas specifikt för immunisering, som Europaparlamentet begär? Kommer EU:s bidrag till GAVI Alliance att öka jämfört med föregående budgetperiod?

Svar från Andris Piebalgs på kommissionens vägnar
(20 juni 2013)

Förutom sitt stöd till länder för utarbetande och genomförande av en sund, evidensbaserad nationell hälso- och sjukvårdspolitik, stöder kommissionen globala hälsoinitiativ som också stärker hälsosystem, inbegripet rutinmässig immunisering.

Trots kommissionens tidigare stöd till GAVI (Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunisation) är det i dagsläget för tidigt att fastställa storleken på framtida bidrag. EU:s bidrag kommer att avgöras av å ena sidan resultaten av GAVI:s utvärdering efter halva tiden och å andra sidan de program- och finansieringsfaser som kommer att avslutas under 2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004785/13
to the Commission
Alf Svensson (PPE)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Immunisation and vaccines within the framework of the DCI budget

Immunisation and vaccines are some of the most cost-effective aid investments in the area of health, as they not only help to reduce mortality from common diseases, but also help developing countries to reduce the costs of healthcare. Many developing countries now have vaccination programmes as part of their national health strategies, which is in line with the EU's own priorities. Since 2003, however, the Commission has allocated only very limited aid resources to immunisation efforts in developing countries.

Parliament proposes that the Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI) Regulation for the period 2013-2020 (Annex V, Chapter A 'Human development', paragraph 9) should explicitly impose support from the budget for both preventive healthcare and immunisation in developing countries.

What action does the Commission plan to take on the basis of this? Will special funds from the aid budget be earmarked specifically for immunisation, as requested by Parliament? Will the EU's contribution to the GAVI Alliance increase compared with the previous budget period?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2013)

In addition to its support to countries for the development and implementation of sound and evidence-based national health policies, the Commission supports global health initiatives which also strengthen health systems including routine immunisation.

Notwithstanding past Commission support to the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunisation (GAVI), it is now too early to determine the level of future contributions. On the one hand, the EU contribution will depend on the results of the GAVI Mid-Term Evaluation and on the other hand, on the programming and financing phases to be completed in 2014.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-004786/13
a la Comisión
Andrés Perelló Rodríguez (S&D)
(29 de abril de 2013)

Asunto: Vertedero de Jumilla (Murcia, España)

A finales de febrero, la prensa española se hizo eco del supuesto expediente sancionador abierto por la Comisión Europea al vertedero de la localidad murciana de Jumilla, por las graves deficiencias medioambientales que registraban sus instalaciones. Dicha información, obtenida a través de declaraciones del alcalde del municipio (ver en anexo), incluía la fecha del 25 de marzo como fecha límite para solucionar los mencionados problemas y evitar así la sanción comunitaria.

¿Podría indicar la Comisión si dicho expediente de infracción está efectivamente en curso?

¿Podría informar la Comisión sobre el contenido del mismo y confirmar si, en el supuesto plazo del 25 del marzo, se ha presentado una solución satisfactoria y conforme a la legislación comunitaria?

¿Podría informar la Comisión de si las gestiones que ha realizado y las informaciones que ha recibido relativas a este expediente son de carácter público y, si es el caso, podría indicar dónde pueden ser consultadas por otras partes interesadas?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(31 de mayo de 2013)

El vertedero a que se refiere Su Señoría forma parte de una evaluación más amplia que la Comisión está llevando a cabo sobre el cumplimiento por parte de España de sus obligaciones derivadas del artículo 14 de la Directiva 1999/31/CE del Consejo, de 26 de abril de 1999, relativa al vertido de residuos.

En el marco de dicha evaluación, el 25 de enero de 2013, la Comisión notificó a España un dictamen motivado que constituye la última etapa de la fase precontenciosa, en virtud del artículo 258 del Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión Europea. Los servicios de la Comisión están procediendo actualmente a la evaluación interna de la respuesta de España.

De acuerdo con lo dispuesto en el Reglamento (CE) n° 1049/2001 ([1]), la Comisión no facilita información sobre los procedimientos de infracción en curso, con el fin de no obstaculizar el diálogo con el Estado miembro ni el objetivo de resolver el litigio antes de recurrir al Tribunal de Justicia.

([1]) Reglamento (CE) n° 1049/2001 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 30 de mayo de 2001, relativo al acceso del público a los documentos del Parlamento Europeo, del Consejo y de la Comisión. DO L 145 de 31.5.2001.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004786/13
to the Commission
Andrés Perelló Rodríguez (S&D)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Landfill in Jumilla (Murcia, Spain)

There were reports in the Spanish press at the end of February that the Commission had begun proceedings against the landfill in the Murcian town of Jumilla on account of serious environmental failings recorded on the site. This information, obtained from statements by the town's mayor (see attached), gave the date of 25 March 2013 as the deadline for a solution to be found to the aforesaid problems in order to avoid being penalised by the European Union.

Could the Commission say whether these infringement proceedings are indeed ongoing?

Could the Commission provide information on the subject-matter of these infringement proceedings and confirm whether a satisfactory solution that complies with EU legislation was submitted by 25 March 2013?

Could the Commission confirm whether the steps it took and the information it has received in regard to these proceedings are in the public domain and if so, where can other interested parties find this?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(31 May 2013)

The landfill referred to by the Honourable Member is part of a wider assessment the Commission is undertaking on the compliance by Spain of their obligations under Article 14 of the Council Directive 1999/31/EC of 26 April 1999 on the landfill of waste.

In the framework of this assessment, on 25 January 2013, the Commission notified to Spain a Reasoned opinion, the last phase of the pre-litigation stage under Article 258 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. The Spanish reply is currently undergoing internal evaluation by Commission services.

In accordance with Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 ([1]), the Commission does not disclose further details of an ongoing infringement procedure in order not to undermine the dialogue with the Member State and the objective of settling the dispute before the case is brought to the Court of Justice.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 May 2001 regarding public access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents.
OJ L 145, 31.5.2001.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-004787/13
aan de Commissie
Frank Vanhecke (EFD)
(29 april 2013)

Betreft: Kwik in spaarlampen

In de context van de aanwezigheid van kwik in spaarlampen wordt de uitstoot van kwik door electriciteitscentrales zwaar overschat. Op de website van de Commissie ([1]) staat dat die emissie 0,016 mg/kWh bedraagt. Op grond van deze overdreven emissiewaarde van centrales kon in het rapport van VITO en de Commissie worden verklaard dat het kwikgehalte van spaarlampen meer dan gecompenseerd wordt door de daling van de kwikuitstoot door kolencentrales, omdat spaarlampen minder stroom verbruiken en een langere levensduur hebben dan gloeilampen. De kwikuitstoot van kolencentrales ligt in werkelijkheid echter veel lager en dit betekent dat het gebruik van spaarlampen niet kon gerechtvaardigd worden bij de publicatie van het VITO-rapport.

Tot wanneer, tot welk jaar moet men teruggaan om de door de Commissie vermelde waarde terug te vinden?

Was het gerechtvaardigd om de rechtvaardiging van spaarlampen te laten steunen op een oude waarde?

UNEP heeft in de Minamata Conventie de maatregel opgenomen om bepaalde spaarlampen tegen 2020 te verbieden. Is het niet wenselijk om in de EU alle spaarlampen die kwik bevatten, te verbieden?

Antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie
(28 mei 2013)

Het verbod dat in Verordening (EG) nr. 244/2009 is vastgesteld, was gebaseerd op de meest recente gegevens die op dat ogenblik beschikbaar waren. De gegevens zijn afkomstig uit het Europees referentiesysteem voor levenscyclusgegevens ([2]) (*European Reference Life Cycle Database* — ELCD), dat is ontwikkeld door het Gemeenschappelijk Centrum voor onderzoek in samenwerking met andere diensten van de Commissie. De levenscyclusgegevens, die een van de uitgangspunten waren voor het besluit dat in 2009 is genomen, waren geldig voor de periode 2002-2010 en zijn nog steeds de officiële gegevens die op EU-niveau beschikbaar zijn. Naar verwachting worden in 2013 nieuwe energiegegevens bekendgemaakt in het ELCD.

De verordening moet uiterlijk in 2014 worden herzien. Op dat moment moet worden bepaald hoe het EU-kader voor energiebesparende verlichtingssystemen verder moet worden ontwikkeld. In afwachting hiervan wil de Commissie de aandacht van het geachte Parlementslid vestigen op het feit dat, krachtens Richtlijn 2011/65 ([3]), het toegestane kwikgehalte van compacte fluorescerende lampen (CFL's) in de EU vanaf januari 2013 is gehalveerd tot 2,5 mg, tegenover 50 mg voor celbatterijen en 500 mg voor tandheelkundige amalgaamvullingen.

In verschillende landen buiten de EU bestaan geen regelingen voor het kwikgehalte van compacte fluorescerende lampen, of ligt het maximaal toegestane gehalte gevoelig hoger. De Minamata-conventie heeft niet tot doel alle compacte fluorescerende lampen te verbieden, maar wel om een wereldwijd verbod te bewerkstelligen op bepaalde soorten CFL's, die in de EU uit hoofde van de bovengenoemde wetgeving reeds verboden zijn.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific_committees/opinions_layman/mercury-in-cfl/en/mercury-cfl/l-2/3-emissions-risk-environment.htm
([2]) http://elcd.jrc.ec.europa.eu/.
([3]) Richtlijn 2011/65/EU van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 8 juni 2011 betreffende beperking van het gebruik van bepaalde gevaarlijke stoffen in elektrische en elektronische apparatuur, Publicatieblad L 174,1, blz. 88-110.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004787/13
to the Commission
Frank Vanhecke (EFD)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Mercury in energy-saving light bulbs

In connection with mercury in energy-saving light bulbs, mercury emissions from power stations are being greatly overestimated, the Commission website ([1]) indicating a level of 0.016 mg/kWh. On the basis of this inflated figure, the report by VITO and the Commission concluded that the mercury content of energy-saving light bulbs, with their lower power consumption and longer duration, was more than offset by the reduction in mercury emissions from coal-fired power stations. However, mercury emissions from power stations are in fact much lower, which means that the use of energy-saving light bulbs cannot be justified on the basis of the VITO report.

How many years is it necessary to go back to arrive at the emission levels quoted by the Commission?

Was it justified to defend the use of energy-saving light bulbs on the basis of outdated values?

At the Minimata Convention, the UNEP took steps to have certain types of energy-saving light bulb banned by 2020. Should the EU not follow suit by banning all energy-saving light bulbs containing mercury?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(28 May 2013)

The ban laid down in Regulation (EC) No 244/2009 was based on the most up to date data available at the time. These were drawn from the 'European Reference Life Cycle Database' ([2]) (ELCD) developed by the Joint Research Centre, together with other Commission services. The life cycle data used as one input to the decision (taken in 2009) were valid for the period 2002-2010 and they still constitute the official EU-level information available. A publication of new energy data in the ELCD is foreseen for 2013.

The regulation is to be reviewed by 2014. That will be the time to consider how the EU framework for energy-saving lighting should be further developed. In the meantime, the Commission would draw the Honourable Member's attention to the fact that, under Directive 2011/65 ([3]), the mercury content of Compact Fluorescent Lamps (CFL) in the EU was halved as from January 2013 to a maximum of 2.5 mg (compared to 50 milligrams in cell batteries and 500 milligrams in amalgam dental fillings).

In many countries outside the EU, the mercury content of compact fluorescent lamps is unregulated or allowed to be considerably higher. The Minimata convention does not aim to ban all compact fluorescent lamps but to establish a worldwide ban of certain types of CFL — types which are already banned in the EU under the legislation mentioned above.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific_committees/opinions_layman/mercury-in-cfl/en/mercury-cfl/l-2/3-emissions-risk-environment.htm
([2]) http://elcd.jrc.ec.europa.eu/
([3]) Directive 2011/65/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 8 June 2011 on the restriction of the use of certain hazardous substances in electrical and electronic equipment, OJ L 174,1 pp. 0088-0110.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004789/13
an die Kommission
Karl-Heinz Florenz (PPE)
(29. April 2013)

Betrifft: Quarantäneschaderreger (QSE) und Aktualisierung der europäischen Liste der QSE sowie Maßnahmen zur Bekämpfung (Richtlinie 2000/29/EG)

Die Richtlinie 2000/29/EG beinhaltet in ihren Anhängen eine Liste sogenannter Quarantäneschaderreger (QSE), deren Auftreten gemeldet werden muss und die amtlichen Überwachungs- und Bekämpfungsmaßnahmen unterliegen. Unter diesen QSE sind auch die Apfel-Triebsucht (Apple proliferation, Candidatus phytoplasma mali) und der Birnenverfall (Pear decline, Candidatus phytoplasma pyri). Diese beiden Phytoplasmen haben sich in den letzten Jahren erheblich verbreitet. Sowohl die EFSA als auch das deutsche Julius-Kühn-Institut kommen aufgrund neuer Studien zu dem Schluss, dass die Liste der QSE deshalb angepasst werden muss und u. a. die beiden genannten Schädiger aus der Liste zu streichen seien. Dies soll u. a. verhindern, dass betroffene Unternehmen unnötig durch Verbringungsverbote und Betriebsschließungen belastet werden. Eine Bekämpfung der Schadenerreger wäre nach wie vor vorzunehmen — evtl. jedoch über zusätzliche Maßnahmen.

Kann die Kommission in diesem Zusammenhang folgende Fragen beantworten:

1. Wie bewertet die Kommission die aktuellen Studien im Hinblick auf die QSE-Liste?

2. Bereitet die Kommission eine Anpassung/Aktualisierung der QSE-Liste vor? Wenn ja, in welchem Zeithorizont? Welche Generaldirektionen/ Ausschüsse etc. werden beteiligt sein?

3. Welche Informationen liegen der Kommission in Bezug auf die derzeit verfügbaren Maßnahmen zur Bekämpfung derartiger QSE vor? Hat die Kommission die Mitgliedstaaten hierzu aktuell befragt? Sieht die Kommission Probleme aufgrund geltender europäischer Pestizid-Regelungen? Sieht die Kommission Bedarf, die Maßnahmen anzupassen/zu erweitern?

4. Im Fall von Apfel-Triebsucht und Birnenverfall sind wohl eher natürliche Faktoren für eine Ausbreitung verantwortlich, in anderen Fällen ist jedoch von Versäumnissen bei der Durchsetzung der geltenden Vorsichtsmaßnahmen/Quarantäneregelungen zu hören. Welche Informationen liegen der Kommission hierzu vor? Wie will die Kommission die Durchsetzung verbessern? Wie werden die Kontrollen durch die Mitgliedstaaten und durch das Lebensmittel- und Veterinäramt (Food and Veterinary Office-FVO) koordiniert? Welche Konsequenzen zieht die Kommission aus den Kontrollergebnissen? Ist vorgesehen, dass die Kontrollen — sowohl durch die Mitgliedstaaten als auch durch das FVO — intensiviert werden?

Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(20. Juni 2013)

Die kürzlich von der Europäischen Behörde für Lebensmittelsicherheit (European Food Safety Authority, EFSA) veröffentlichten Schädlingsrisikoanalysen zu „Apple Proliferation Mycoplasma" (Apfeltriebsucht-Mykoplasmen) und „Pear Decline Mycoplasma" (Birnenverfall-Mykoplasmen) wurden auf Antrag der Kommission erstellt, um den bestehenden Rechtsstatus dieser beiden Organismen gemäß der Richtlinie 2000/29/EG ([1]) des Rates beurteilen zu können. Diese Beurteilung wird im zweiten Halbjahr 2013 in Angriff genommen und wahrscheinlich im Laufe des Jahres 2014 die Grundlage für die Entscheidung liefern, ob der Rechtsstatus dieser beiden Schädlinge durch eine Durchführungsrichtlinie der Kommission geändert werden soll. Diese Maßnahme wird in Konsultation mit allen relevanten Referaten und Dienststellen der Kommission vorbereitet. Vor der Annahme durch die Kommission würde die Durchführungsrichtlinie zur Änderung der Anhänge der Richtlinie 2000/29/EG dem zuständigen Ständigen Ausschuss zur Stellungnahme vorgelegt.

Die Kommission besitzt keine Informationen von den Mitgliedstaaten über die Umsetzung der bestehenden Rechtsvorschriften über diese beiden Organismen, da die Richtlinie 2000/29/EG keine entsprechende Berichtspflicht enthält. Der Kommission ist nicht bekannt, dass die bestehenden Pestizid-Rechtsvorschriften eine negative Auswirkung auf die Ausbreitung dieser beiden Organismen in der EU gehabt haben könnten.

([1]) ABl. L 169 vom 10.7.2000, S. 1.

Das Lebensmittel- und Veterinäramt der Kommission überwacht die Durchführung der EU-Rechtsvorschriften über Pflanzengesundheit durch die Mitgliedstaaten ([2]). Regelmäßig sind Probleme mit der wirksamen Bekämpfung bestimmter Schadorganismen aufgetreten. Der kürzlich veröffentlichte Vorschlag der Kommission für eine neue Pflanzenschutzregelung ([3]) setzt sich mit diesen Problemen auseinander, aber auch schon im Rahmen der bestehenden Regelung wird die Umsetzung durch eine Kombination von finanzieller Unterstützung und Mechanismen bei Verstößen gefördert.

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/index_en.cfm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/health_consumer/pressroom/animal-plant-health_en.htm (KOM(2013)267 vom 6. Mai 2013).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004789/13
to the Commission
Karl-Heinz Florenz (PPE)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Harmful organisms and the updating of the European list of harmful organisms and measures to combat them (Directive 2000/29/EC)

The annexes to Directive 2000/29/EC contain a list of so-called harmful organisms, the occurrence of which must be reported and which are subject to official monitoring and control measures. These harmful organisms include apple proliferation (Candidatus phytoplasma mali) and pear decline (Candidatus phytoplasma pyri). These two phytoplasms have spread significantly in recent years. Based on new studies, both the EFSA and the Julius Kühn Institute in Germany have reached the conclusion that the list of harmful organisms needs to be modified and that these two harmful organisms were among those that should be removed from the list. Among other things, this should avoid placing an unnecessary burden on affected enterprises through the imposition of movement bans and business closures. It would still be necessary to combat harmful organisms, but this could be achieved through additional measures.

In this context, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. How does the Commission assess the current studies in respect of the list of harmful organisms?

2. Is the Commission preparing to modify/update the list of harmful organisms? If so, what is the timeframe involved? Which Directorates General/Committees will be involved?

3. What information is available to the Commission in relation to the measures currently available to combat harmful organisms of this kind? Has the Commission surveyed the Member States about this recently? Does the Commission believe that problems have arisen in connection with the current European pesticide regulations? Does the Commission believe it is necessary to modify/extend the measures?

4. In the case of apple proliferation and pear decline, natural factors are responsible for the spread of disease, however in other cases problems arise due to negligence in implementing the relevant precautions/quarantine provisions. What information is available to the Commission on this? How does the Commission intend to improve implementation? How are the controls coordinated by the Member States and by the Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)? What conclusions does the Commission draw from the control results? Are there plans to intensify controls both by the Member States and by the FVO?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2013)

The pest risk analyses on apple proliferation mycoplasma and pear decline mycoplasma recently published by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) were prepared at the request of the Commission so as to be able to evaluate the existing legal status of these two organisms under Council Directive 2000/29/EC ([1]). This evaluation will start in the second semester of 2013 and will allow deciding, probably in the course of 2014, whether to amend the legal status of these two pests by way of a Commission Implementing Directive. This measure is prepared in consultation with all relevant Commission departments and services. Before adoption by the Commission the Implementing Directive amending the annexes of Directive 2000/29/EC, would be submitted for opinion to the responsible Standing Committee.

The Commission does not possess information from the Member States on the implementation of the existing legislation on these two organisms, since there is no pertinent reporting obligation in Directive 2000/29/EC. The Commission is not aware that existing pesticide legislation could have had a negative impact on the spread of these two organisms in the EU.

The Food and Veterinary Office of the Commission monitors the implementation of the EU plant health legislation by the Member States ([2]). Problems with the effective control of certain harmful organisms have been found regularly. The recently published Commission proposal for a new plant health regime ([3]) addresses these problems, but already under the existing regime is implementation encouraged by a combination of financial support and infringement mechanisms.

([1]) OJ L 169, 10.7.2000, p.1.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/index_en.cfm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/health_consumer/pressroom/animal-plant-health_en.htm (COM(2013) 267 of 6 May 2013).

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004790/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(29 de abril de 2013)

Asunto: Cancelación de las reuniones sobre organismos modificados genéticamente (OMG) del Comité Permanente

En junio de 2012, la Comisión admitió que acostumbra a incumplir los plazos legales en cuanto a las autorizaciones de OMG (respuesta a la pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004184/2012).

1. ¿Cómo explica la Comisión, a la vista de lo anterior, la cancelación frecuente de reuniones del Comité Permanente en las que se podría haber votado sobre productos modificados genéticamente?

2. ¿Velará la Comisión por que se celebren en el futuro las reuniones del Comité Permanente siempre que haya productos modificados genéticamente pendientes de autorización que cuenten con una evaluación positiva de la Autoridad Europea de Seguridad Alimentaria (EFSA)? ¿Velará también la Comisión por que se vote en un plazo de tres meses desde la presentación de la solicitud de autorización, tal como exige la ley?

Respuesta del Sr. Borg en nombre de la Comisión
(26 de junio de 2013)

1. Las reuniones del Comité Permanente de la Cadena Alimentaria y de Sanidad Animal (CCASA), Sección «Alimentos y Piensos Modificados Genéticamente y Riesgos Medioambientales», se programan de modo provisional y únicamente se anulan cuando no hay decisiones de autorización que votar por parte de los Estados miembros, tal como se explica a continuación en el punto 2.

2. La Comisión despliega todos los recursos logísticos necesarios para que se puedan celebrar las reuniones del CCASA y para que se puedan votar los proyectos de decisión en los tres meses siguientes a la adopción de un dictamen positivo por parte de la EFSA.

Las reuniones del CCASA se programan con un año de antelación y con una periodicidad de una reunión al mes para poder reservar las salas de reunión y garantizar la interpretación de tal modo que los Estados miembros puedan votar los proyectos de decisión de autorización. Sin embargo, no puede preverse con un año de antelación cuántos OMG serán objeto de un dictamen positivo de la EFSA ni cuándo exactamente.

Por otra parte, la Comisión remite a Su Señoría a la respuesta a su pregunta escrita E-004184/2012 ([1]) en lo referente a lo rígido del procedimiento que hay que respetar antes de enviar un proyecto de decisión de autorización para su votación por parte de los Estados miembros.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/es/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004790/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Cancellation of Standing Committee meetings on genetically modified organisms (GMOs)

In June 2012, the Commission admitted that it regularly fails to comply with legal timelines when it comes to GMO authorisations (answer to Written Question E-004184/2012).

1. With this in mind, how does the Commission explain the frequent cancellation of Standing Committee meetings where voting on GM products could have been held?

2. Will the Commission ensure that Standing Committee meetings are held in the future, whenever GM products with a positive European Food and Safety Authority (EFSA) assessment are pending authorisation? Will the Commission also ensure that voting is held within three months of these authorisation applications being made, as legally required?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(26 June 2013)

1. Provisionally scheduled meetings of the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health (SCOFCAH) — Section Genetically Modified Food and Feed and Environmental Risk — are cancelled only when there are no authorising decisions ready to be voted by the Member States, as explained in point 2 below.

2. Necessary logistical means are deployed by the Commission to allow SCOFCAH meetings to be held and draft decisions to be voted within three months after the adoption of a positive opinion by EFSA.

Meetings of the SCOFCAH are planned one year in advance, with a one meeting per month periodicity, so that meeting rooms and interpretation can be ensured to allow Member States to vote on draft authorisation decisions. However, it cannot be foreseen one year in advance how many GMOs will get positive EFSA opinions and when exactly.

Furthermore, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the answer to his Written Question E-004184/2012 ([1]) as regards the stringent procedural steps to comply with prior to sending a draft authorisation decision for vote by Member States.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004791/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Greek bailout

With the recent announcement that Greece is moving towards another bailout payment, could the Commission clarify what is currently being done to ensure that further bailouts are not required?

With over EUR 720 billion in bailout loans since 2010, and Greek debt at 160% of the country's GDP, it is essential that a resolution be quickly sought.

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(14 June 2013)

The Commission has recently published, in liaison with the ECB, a report which provides an assessment of the progress made by Greece with respect to its 2nd economic adjustment programme. The report states that Greece continues to make progress in the context of the programme and that public finances are steadily improving. With regard to debt dynamics, the assessment is broadly unchanged compared to December 2012. The debt-to-GDP ratio is forecast to resume a declining path in 2014 and should become lower than 120% by 2021, assuming that the economic adjustment programme continues to be fully implemented. More information can be found in the report ([1]).

([1]) The Second Economic Adjustment Programme for Greece — Second Review May 2013, http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2013/op148_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004793/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Diane Dodds (NI)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Political deadlock in Bosnia and Herzegovina

On numerous occasions, High Representative Ashton has highlighted the urgent need for the political leadership in Bosnia and Herzegovina to break the ethnic and political deadlock that has gripped the country.

What more can the EEAS do to ensure that a peaceful, stable and multi-ethnic Bosnia and Herzegovina can progress?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(3 July 2013)

The March Council Conclusions 2011 put in place an EU policy to assist Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) in moving ahead on its EU path. It also reinforced presence and strengthened EU engagement with BiH.

Despite difficulties, the priority remains unchanged. Bosnia and Herzegovina must implement the ruling of the European Court of Human Rights in the Sedjic/Finci case. Over the last couple of months, the EU has facilitated a dialogue among BiH political leaders in order to find a compromise on the implementation of the ruling. That would enable the entry into force of the Stabilisation and Association Agreement (SAA) and would give BiH an opportunity to submit a credible EU membership application. However, BiH political leaders have not delivered yet.

The EU continues to call upon all political forces to act responsibly. All BiH political leaders and officials need to support the necessary reforms that are designed to advance BiH on the road towards its EU accession. The EU's commitment towards BiH remains at a high level, but the ultimate responsibility for progress is in the hands of BiH.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004794/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Diane Dodds (NI)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — EU training mission in Mali

Since the beginning of the violence which erupted in January 2013 and the subsequent French military intervention in Mali, a considerable amount of funding and resources has been directed at training and development in the country.

1. Could the European External Action Service (EEAS) indicate how long the EU training mission in Mali will last?

2. How is the deployment being funded, and which Member States are contributing to the 450 staff being used to train the Malian armed forces?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2013)

The mission will last 15 months from the launch of the mission on 18 February.

The common costs of the Mission are approximately EUR 25 million. The contributors are listed in attached Annex.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004795/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Diane Dodds (NI)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Earthquake in Iran

In light of the recent major earthquake in south-east Iran, resulting in at least 40 deaths, could the EEAS state what emergency procedures are enacted on behalf on the EU following major natural disasters?

Answer given by Ms Georgieva on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2013)

The Commission is able to trigger a civil protection and/or humanitarian assistance response when a disaster strikes.

The EU Civil Protection Mechanism facilitates cooperation in disaster response among 32 European Participating States (EU-27, Croatia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Norway). The states pool resources that can be made available to disaster-stricken countries worldwide. When activated, the Mechanism coordinates the provision of assistance inside and outside the European Union. The Commission manages the Mechanism through the Monitoring and Information Centre (MIC/ ERC). Since its launch in 2001, the Mechanism has received more than 170 requests for assistance.

The Commission also has a worldwide network of humanitarian field experts who provide an updated analysis of existing and forecasted needs in response to a crisis. In the immediate aftermath of a disaster, the experts can be sent to the crisis for needs assessments and to monitor the implementation of EU-funded humanitarian projects.

The recent earthquake in Iran triggered alerts through the early warning and alert systems on 9 April 2013. The alert was received at the MIC who informed all Participating States (PS) to the EU Civil Protection Mechanism through its internal communication system. Updated information on the situation was continuously shared with the PS. However, as there was no request for international assistance from the Iranian authorities, the Mechanism was not activated and no EU humanitarian funding was required.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004796/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: EU-Egypt taskforce

The EU-Egypt taskforce aims to ensure investment, tourism, job creation and cooperation to improve conditions for SMEs.

1. How successful has this taskforce been to date, and have there been any notable achievements?

2. What have the costs to this task force been to date?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(8 July 2013)

This high-level meeting between the EU and the new Egyptian government took place 13-14 November 2012, co-organised by the HR/VP and Egyptian FM Kamel Amr. The outcome of the Task Force, as specified in the Co-Chair Conclusions, encompasses the EU's continued political, financial and technical support to the democratic reform process. The meeting agreed on increased cooperation in trade and industry, agriculture, energy, higher education, science, technology and innovation, information society, culture and mobility and migration. Steps have also been taken to facilitate the return of misappropriated funds to the Egyptian authorities.

Unfortunately, the political turmoil in Egypt immediately following the Task Force has partly impacted the implementation of the Co-Chairs Conclusions. In addition, the violence between political and religious groups has intensified, the overall security situation worsened and the economy is facing severe challenges in the absence of macroeconomic stability, foreign investment and tourism, in combination with a growing energy crisis and increasing inflation. The European Union Special Representative for the Southern Mediterranean Region has been travelling frequently to Cairo to stress for the need for a political and economic consensus in order to continue the process of democratic transition.

In addition, on 28 February 2013, the formal dialogue under the Association Agreement between the EU and Egypt was resumed and during 2013 technical subcommittees will be organised in order to drive the commitments under the EU-Egypt Action Plan further, including the commitments taken under the Task Force.

The contract for the preparation of the Task Force amounted to EUR 134,158.00.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004797/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: EUPOL in Afghanistan

With the EUPOL Mission in Afghanistan scheduled to end in May 2013, could the Commission state in what areas the mission in Afghanistan has been successful?

1. How successful has EUPOL been in developing anti-corruption capacities?

2. Are there plans to extend the mission after May 2013?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(26 June 2013)

EUPOL Afghanistan supports the reform process towards a trusted and efficient civilian police service, which works in accordance with international standards, within the framework of the rule of law and respect for human rights. With regard to anti-corruption, EUPOL Afghanistan supports the Ministry of Interior / Afghan National Police and Attorney General's Office (AGO) in the consistent application of the anti-corruption related law; in increasing the performance of Police investigators and prosecutors to guarantee a proper follow-up of cases investigated by the Afghan National Police (ANP); and in developing institutional organisational structures.

EUPOL Afghanistan provides assistance through mentoring, advising and training Afghan police, prosecutors and other related officials. As a result of the work of EUPOL and other international organisations, a growing professionalism can be seen within the units dealing with anti-corruption issues. This has led to, *inter alia*, increased legal understanding of the criminal law and improved quality of investigations resulting in a higher number of cases in court. EUPOL is especially focusing on sustainability of its activities, and has developed train-the-trainer courses, with the aim to create a pool of national trainers in the existing Ministry of the Interior (MoI) and AGO structures.

On 27 May 2013, The Council extended EUPOL Afghanistan until 31 December 2014. It also allocated a budget of EUR 108 million for the period from 1 June 2013 until the end of 2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004799/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Fuel poverty

The issue of fuel poverty is something which affects many families throughout the EU. According to the EU Fuel Poverty Network, the inability to afford adequate heating is particularly pronounced across eastern and southern Europe, with over 30% of households in Portugal, Bulgaria and Cyprus declaring this inability. In the United Kingdom, fuel poverty is also a problem, with up to 9.9% of households being affected by fuel poverty.

1. What is the Commission doing to address the imbalance of fuel poverty?

2. Are there any schemes available for those families who have difficulty heating their homes?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(21 June 2013)

1. The EU requires ([1]) Member States to take action with regard to energy poverty, including the obligation to define the concept of vulnerable customers, to address energy poverty where identified, to provide for support for energy efficiency improvements, etc. In addition, the Commission encourages Member States to support vulnerable customers, for example by identifying and disseminating best practices. Furthermore, the Commission puts the issues of vulnerable consumers and energy poverty high on the agenda of the Citizens' Energy Forum ([2]) meetings. Examples of good practice in various Member States include no winter disconnection, the installation of prepayment meters to avoid disconnection, etc. In addition, there is some focus on energy efficiency measures to move customers out of poverty by, for example, improving (social) housing stock.

2. Some Member States include a heating allowance in a package of social benefits; this is a decision to be taken at Member State level. Further information on national social protection systems can be obtained at http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=815

([1]) Particularly Articles 3(7) and 3(8) of Directive 2009/72/EC; Articles 3(3) and 3(4) of Directive 2009/73/EC; Article 7(7)(a) of Directive 2012/27/EU.

([2]) Action Plan annexed to the Commission Communication 'Making the Internal Energy Market Work', http://ec.europa.eu/energy/gas_electricity/forum_citizen_energy_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004800/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Forced sterilisation in India

The controversial practice of forced sterilisation in India is one which must be addressed. The practice, which can lead to miscarriages and even deaths, has been mired in controversy for years. It is claimed that the purpose is to sterilise the poor in an attempt to curb India's growing population.

1. Is the Commission aware of this practice?

2. If so, what can the EU do to encourage the Indian Government to put an end to it?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2013)

As per the Government of India's policy today and confirmation from the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, there are neither coercive family planning schemes nor targets for sterilisation.

Some schemes focus on recommending and implementing sterilisation after the birth of a third child, yet the basis for sterilisation is always voluntary and in line with the policy for population stabilisation.

Family planning methods, such as delaying the first birth, spacing, or sterilisation are taking place on the basis of counselling and voluntary and informed decision making processes.

Additionally, EU-funded non-governmental organisations (NGOs) working on health issues in India have not reported any cases of forced sterilisation in the last few years.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004801/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Diane Dodds (NI)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Lifting of Burmese sanctions

With the recent announcement that the EU is to lift its trade, economic and individual sanctions against Burma following political reforms in the country, could the High Representative answer the following:

1. Is this lifting of sanctions subject to a review or is it permanent?

2. Is this not a rushed decision, when one considers the violent clashes between Buddhists and Muslims in recent weeks, in addition to long-standing human rights abuses carried out by the Burmese authorities?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2013)

1. The EU decided to lift sanctions against Myanmar/Burma, except the arms embargo and the embargo on equipment for internal repression which remain fully in force. Sanctions are an instrument of the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP). A decision to impose sanctions can be taken by the Council on the basis of Article 29 of the Treaty on European Union, requiring unanimity among Member States, within the framework of the CFSP. The EU's sanctions must be consistent with CFSP objectives, as set out in Article 21 of the TEU. A reintroduction of the sanctions remains an instrument at the EU's disposal if and when developments in Myanmar, which the EU follows very closely, require a reassessment of its policy.

2. The decision to lift the sanctions was taken after thorough assessment of developments in Myanmar/Burma and represents a careful balance struck between recognition of important progress achieved and persisting concerns, notably in the field of human rights. The expectation is that the reform process — while still facing manifold challenges — will continue. The EU will continue to monitor closely the situation and progress towards democratisation, peace, national reconciliation and protection of human rights.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004802/13
to the Commission
Diane Dodds (NI)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Europeans fighting in Syria

Gilles de Kerchove, the EU anti-terror chief, estimates that 500 Europeans are fighting with rebel forces in Syria. De Kerchove claims that the UK, the Republic of Ireland and France have the highest numbers of fighters in Syria.

1. Could the Commission explain what action is being taken in regard to this?

2. What measures can be put in place to dissuade EU citizens from becoming armed combatants in Syria?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(12 July 2013)

The Commission is deeply concerned by the possible threat to EU security of EU citizens travelling to Syria as foreign fighters and returning to Europe.

Given the important implication this issue may have for the fight against terrorism, different initiatives have been intiated by the Commission with the support of the Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). Working groups of the RAN have been involved in supporting action aiming at preventing and discouraging people departing from Europe to Syria as foreign fighters, and offering assistance to Member States on the possible threat posed by returnees. Specific actions identified include reaching out to the communities at risk including to diasporas, construct counter messages and rehabilitation actions involving local actors, communities and families; appropriate training to frontline police, and increasing awareness of the health sectors.

Member States should also make use of existing instruments to better monitor the movements of foreign fighters, such as the Second Generation of the Schengen Information System in place since 9 April 2013.

The issue was discussed at the Council (JHA) on 7 June 2013, based on a paper prepared by the EU Counter Terrorism Coordinator, outlining possible actions by the EU and Member States in the fields of monitoring, legislation, diplomacy, work with local communities and communication. The Commission has agreed to present, by the end of the year, a risk analysis exercise to identify the major security risks for the EU from foreign fighters and possible mitigation measures.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004803/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Phil Bennion (ALDE)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Somalia armed forces capacity building

Considering the EU's leading role in security and military capacity building of the Somalian armed forces, under the EU's Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) and the EU's three missions to contribute to security challenges through the European Union Training Mission (EUTM) in Somalia, the EU Naval Force (NAVFOR) and Regional Maritime Capacity Building for the Horn of Africa and the Western Indian Ocean (EUCAP NESTOR) could the VP/HR answer the following questions:

1. While the security situation in Somalia currently remains highly volatile, does the VP/HR know of any eventual plan being considered with regard to a timetable for the gradual withdrawal of EU troops from Somalia? Does the VP/HR know whether this possibility has been raised at all in discussions with other international forces operating in Somalia?

2. With EUR 325 million being disbursed under the African Union Peace-enabling Mission to Somalia (Amisom) for the period 2007-2012, is there a recent figure available for 2013? Is that figure likely to be reduced in the foreseeable future as the Somalian forces build themselves up?

3. Similarly, is there an update available on how the EU Military Mission (EUTM) training Somalian forces in Uganda is coping and on whether the target envisaged by the European External Action Service of 3 000 Somali soldiers and officers being fully trained by the end of 2012 was met?

4. Does part of the remit of EUCAP NESTOR or EU NAVFOR include the tackling and handling of illegal nuclear waste dumping, which I understand has allegedly been carried out not only by pirates but possibly also by European and Asian shipping companies?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(28 June 2013)

1. In line with all CSDP missions, the EU Training Mission (EUTM) Somalia has a firm end date for the mandate, currently set at March 2015. Any decision to extend the mandate, and hence for a continued presence in Mogadishu, would be a decision for Member States to take in due course. Such a decision would be based on assessment of the success of EUTM's current mandate and requirements of the Somalia armed forces at that time. These discussions would take place alongside assessment of the contribution and role of other international forces operating in Somalia.

2. The EU has committed almost EUR 480 million between March 2007 and May 2013 for Amisom, with around EUR 82 million committed so far during 2013, up to 31 May 2013. Funding Amisom remains an EU priority. The EU is also actively encouraging other international donors to contribute (more) to funding to share the financial burden. Whilst there are no immediate plans for Amisom to down-size, as the Somali forces increase in capacity, they will be able to increasingly take on responsibility for their own security.

3. The EUTM's training activities in Uganda have been viewed as a significant success. The mission fully met its target of training 3 000 Somali soldiers by the end of 2012.

4. Neither EUCAP Nestor nor EUNAVFOR have tackling nuclear waste dumping as part of their mandate. The Commission is furthermore not aware of any indication that nuclear waste is dumped in the Western Indian Ocean. There are more sustained reports of 'toxic' (not necessarily nuclear) waste dumping that has happened during the late 1990s. Despite the frequently occurring allegations to the contrary, there is no conclusive evidence or even any confirmed indication that the dumping of toxic waste is still happening in Somali waters.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004804/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Diane Dodds (NI)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — EEAS reorganisation

The EEAS has received much criticism in recent weeks due to its current structure being too top-heavy and marked by too many decision-making layers.

1. How can the EEAS ensure that it becomes more transparent and that it accepts greater accountability?

2. One recommendation made by Parliament's Foreign Affairs Committee was for the EEAS to better brief MEPs on foreign policy issues. How can this best be achieved?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(26 June 2013)

1. The top management structure of the EEAS reflects the heavy managerial challenges of setting up a new organisation, as well as the significant external representation responsibilities of the service. The Corporate Board, Managing Directors and other senior figures present a good cross-section of the component parts of the service (Member States diplomats, Commission and Council Secretariat) as well as a mix of nationalities and profiles. The organisation chart is consitent with the main elements required by the EEAS decision. As the service evolves and settles there may be changes to internal structures and reporting lines, in response to political priorities, demands on the organisation and the wider difficult budgetary context.

2. The EEAS is committed to inform fully and brief MEPs on issues falling under its responsibility and in full compliance with the Treaty and the relevant interinstitutional agreements .To this end, the EEAS implements the relevant provisions of the 'Declaration by the High Representative on political accountability' agreed with the European Parliament, where it is clearly stated that Heads of Delegation, EUSRs, Heads of CSDP Missions, and senior EEAS officials appear in parliamentary committees and sub-committees to provide regular briefings. In addition, EEAS officials are always ready to meet and brief MEPs also beyond in formal meetings. The EEAS Division for Relations with the European Parliament is always at the disposal of MEPs I order to assist them in advising and channelling such requests within the EEAS

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004805/13
alla Commissione
Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE)
(29 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Riconoscimento dei titoli di studio stranieri e accesso alla professione di avvocato in Spagna

Il nuovo sistema di accesso alla professione di avvocato in Spagna è regolato dalla Legge 34/2006 (e sue successive modifiche) che richiede requisiti formativi e processi di valutazione ulteriori rispetto a quelli conseguiti con il solo ottenimento della Laurea spagnola in giurisprudenza.

La suddetta legge, tuttavia, prevede al suo interno casi di non applicazione del nuovo sistema di accesso alla professione, per cui chi rientra in tali specifiche ipotesi può iscriversi all'ordine degli avvocati con il solo completamento degli studi universitari in diritto e, dunque, con il solo conseguimento della Laurea.

Come disposizione addizionale — introdotta a seguito di una modifica del 2012 — compare anche quella riguardante il riconoscimento del titolo di studio straniero in base alla quale i titoli professionali previsti nella Legge 34/2006 non saranno richiesti a chi, al momento della sua entrata in vigore (31 ottobre 2011), abbia già richiesto l'omologazione del proprio titolo di studi straniero a quello di «Licenciado en derecho».

Alla luce di tali disposizioni, tuttavia, sembra porsi in essere una disparità di trattamento tra chi possiede il titolo spagnolo di «Licenciado en derecho» o un titolo straniero per il quale sia stato chiesto il riconoscimento al titolo spagnolo entro il 30 ottobre 2011 — a cui sarebbe consentito di accedere direttamente al mercato del lavoro — e chi possiede un titolo straniero per il quale sia stato richiesto il riconoscimento al titolo spagnolo dopo il 30 ottobre 2011, che non si vedrebbe invece riconosciuto il proprio titolo come valido per l'accesso diretto alla professione di avvocato.

Alla luce di quanto sopra esposto, può la Commissione:

1. verificare se le disposizioni e l'applicazione della legge spagnola 34/2006 sopra citate costituiscono una violazione da parte della Spagna della normativa e degli accordi sottoscritti con l'Unione europea in materia di libera circolazione dei lavoratori e di riconoscimento accademico dei diplomi?

2. indicare quali azioni intende, se del caso, intraprendere al fine di veder assicurato a tutti i cittadini dell'Unione europea il diritto ad una mobilità accademica e professionale senza alcuna disparità di trattamento?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(2 luglio 2013)

La Commissione ha esaminato le disposizioni della legge spagnola n. 34/2006, comprese le ulteriori disposizioni inserite nel 2012, come richiesto dall'onorevole parlamentare.

La legge n. 34/2006 introduce nuovi requisiti di qualifica per l'acquisizione del titolo professionale di «avvocato», che si basa su competenze in diritto spagnolo. La legge tratta allo stesso modo tutte le persone, a prescindere dalla nazionalità, che prima dell'entrata in vigore dei nuovi requisiti in materia di qualifiche si sono mosse per soddisfare i precedenti requisiti, iniziando lo studio del diritto spagnolo o chiedendo alle autorità spagnole il riconoscimento di un diploma straniero di laurea in giurisprudenza.

Di conseguenza, coloro che hanno un titolo di studio spagnolo possono derogare ai nuovi requisiti in materia di qualifiche, se hanno iniziato i loro studi giuridici prima dell'entrata in vigore della legge, anche se hanno conseguito il diploma successivamente. Per beneficiare della deroga, i titolari di diplomi stranieri devono aver concluso i loro studi, aver conseguito il titolo rispettivo e aver richiesto il riconoscimento in Spagna prima dell'entrata in vigore della legge.

Le nuove disposizioni spagnole sembrano assicurare parità di trattamento a situazioni simili, vale a dire alle persone che al momento dell'entrata in vigore delle nuove disposizioni avevano dimostrato un desiderio di far parte del mondo forense spagnolo iniziando studi di diritto spagnolo, o compiendo le misure necessarie alla registrazione in qualità di avvocato spagnolo, pur avendo studiato un diritto di un altro Stato.

In considerazione di quanto precede, la risposta alle questioni sollevate dall'onorevole parlamentare è che le disposizioni della legge spagnola citata non costituiscono una violazione del diritto dell'UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004805/13
to the Commission
Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Recognition of foreign qualifications and access to the profession of lawyer in Spain

The new system for access to the profession of lawyer in Spain is governed by Law 34/2006 (and subsequent amendments thereto) which requires training and evaluation processes in addition to those obtained solely with a Spanish law degree.

However, the abovementioned law specifies cases where the new system for access to the profession does not apply, and thus persons who fall within these specific circumstances may register on the roll of lawyers solely by completing university law studies and, thus, solely by obtaining a law degree.

An additional provision, added following an amendment in 2012, concerns the recognition of foreign qualifications, and on the basis of this provision the professional qualifications referred to in Law 34/2006 will not be required of persons who, at the time of the law's entry into force (on 31 October 2011), had already requested approval of their own foreign qualification as being equivalent to the 'Licenciado en derecho' (Spanish law qualification).

In view of these provisions, however, a disparity in treatment seems to arise between persons possessing the Spanish 'Licenciado en derecho' qualification or a foreign qualification for which a request had already been made before 30 October 2011 that it be recognised as equivalent to the Spanish qualification, who are allowed direct access to the employment market, and persons possessing a foreign qualification for which a request was made for recognition as equivalent to the Spanish qualification after 30 October 2011. The qualifications of the latter would not be recognised as valid for direct access to the profession of lawyer.

1. Can the Commission check whether the provisions and application of Spanish Law 34/2006 cited above constitute an infringement by Spain of the legislation and agreements entered into with the European Union regarding the free movement of workers and academic recognition of qualifications?

2. What actions, if any, does it intend to take in order to ensure that all EU citizens have the right to academic and professional mobility without any differences in treatment?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(2 July 2013)

The Commission has examined the provisions of the Spanish Law 34/2006, including the additional provisions inserted in 2012, as requested by the Honourable Member.

Law 34/2006 introduces new qualification requirements for the acquisition of the Spanish professional title of 'lawyer', which is underpinned by competence in Spanish law. The law treats equally everybody, regardless of nationality, who before the entry into force of the new qualification requirements took steps towards fulfilling the old requirements either by undertaking studies in Spanish law or by seeking the recognition of a foreign law degree by the Spanish authorities.

Thus, holders of a Spanish degree can benefit from an exemption from the new qualification requirements, if they started their legal studies before the entry into force of the Law, even if their degree has been awarded after the entry into force. To benefit from the exemption, holders of foreign diplomas must have concluded their studies, been awarded their degrees and requested recognition in Spain before the entry into force of the Law.

The new Spanish provisions seem to ensure equal treatment of similar situations, namely persons who at the time of entry into force of these new provisions have demonstrated a wish to become members of the Spanish legal profession, either by engaging in studies of Spanish law or by taking the necessary steps towards registration as a Spanish lawyer despite having studied foreign law.

In view of the above, the answer to the Honourable Member's questions is that the provisions of the Spanish Law cited above do not constitute infringement of EC law.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004806/13
alla Commissione
Francesco Enrico Speroni (EFD)
(29 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Capi di abbigliamento acquistati in paesi terzi per missioni dell'Unione europea

Ai componenti la recente missione del'Unione europea di osservazione elettorale in Paraguay sono stati forniti, per le loro attività, capi di abbigliamento prodotti in paesi asiatici.

Perché, anche in considerazione delle difficoltà che attraversa il settore tessile, non ci si è approvvigionati da produttori dell'Unione o, quantomeno, del Paraguay?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(12 agosto 2013)

Le missioni di osservazione elettorale (MOE) dell'UE sono realizzate attraverso un contratto quadro stipulato tra la Commissione e un fornitore di servizi sulla base di una gara d'appalto.

Per ogni missione la Commissione seleziona, mediante un'ulteriore procedura di gara, il fornitore di servizi responsabile dell'attuazione degli aspetti logistici della missione con cui essa conclude un contratto specifico.

Secondo il capitolato d'oneri del contratto specifico firmato con la Commissione, una delle obbligazioni del prestatore di servizi è fornire gli elementi di visibilità dell'UE ai membri della MOE dell'UE secondo i tempi e il bilancio stabiliti.

La Commissione incoraggia acquisti sul mercato locale nonché la produzione di prodotti locali, ogniqualvolta ciò sia possibile.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004806/13
to the Commission
Francesco Enrico Speroni (EFD)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Items of clothing acquired in non-EU countries for European Union missions

Items of clothing produced in Asian countries were supplied to the members of the recent European Union electoral observation mission in Paraguay, for their activities.

In view of the difficulties faced by the textiles sector, why were supplies not procured from EU producers, or, at least, producers in Paraguay?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(12 August 2013)

The EU Election Observation Missions (EU EOMs) are implemented through a framework contract concluded between the Commission and a Service Provider following a competitive procedure.

For each mission, the Commission selects, by means of a further competitive procedure, the Service Provider responsible for the implementation of the logistical aspects of the mission with which it concludes a specific contract.

In accordance with the Terms of Reference of the specific contract signed with the Commission, one of the Service Provider's obligations is to provide the items of EU visibility to the members of the EU EOM within the agreed timeframe and budget.

The Commission encourages local purchases and local production of items whenever this is possible.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004807/13
an die Kommission
Arkadiusz Tomasz Bratkowski (PPE), Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE), Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE), Axel Voss (PPE) und Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE)
(29. April 2013)

Betrifft: Kooperationsabkommen zwischen Eurojust und Kroatien, Island, der Schweiz, Norwegen, den USA und der ehemaligen jugoslawischen Republik Mazedonien zur Bekämpfung von schwerer Kriminalität

Eurojust hat mit den folgenden Ländern Kooperationsabkommen zur Bekämpfung von schwerer Kriminalität abgeschlossen: Kroatien, Island, Schweiz, Norwegen, Vereinigte Staaten von Amerika und die ehemalige jugoslawische Republik Mazedonien. Gemäß diesen Abkommen werden die betroffenen Länder Informationen, darunter auch personenbezogene Daten, austauschen. Diese oben genannten Abkommen sind jedoch auf der Website von Eurojust nur in der englischen Fassung verfügbar. Hinzu kommt, dass sie im Amtsblatt der Europäischen Union nur schwer zu finden sind.

Ist die Kommission demnach der Auffassung, dass die EU-Bürger es nicht nötig haben, sich mit den Bestimmungen der betreffenden Abkommen in ihrer eigenen Landessprache vertraut zu machen, obwohl sie von großer Relevanz für ihre Grundrechte sind?

Welche Maßnahmen gedenkt die Kommission zu ergreifen, um das oben genannte Problem zu beheben, da dieser Umstand gegen Verordnung Nr. 1 zur Regelung der Sprachenfrage für die Europäische Wirtschaftsgemeinschaft (ABl. Nr. 17 vom 6.10.1958, S. 385, geändert durch Verordnung (EG) Nr. 920/2005 des Rates vom 13. Juni 2005 und Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1791/2006 des Rates vom 20. November 2006) verstößt?

Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission
(2. Juli 2013)

Die Verordnung Nr. 1 des Rates vom 15. April 1958 ist nicht direkt auf Eurojust anwendbar, da Eurojust kein Organ der Union ist.

Der Beschluss 2002/187/JI des Rates ([1]), auf dessen Grundlage Eurojust Abkommen mit Drittländern schließen und die praktischen Vorkehrungen für diese Abkommen — wie etwa die Sprachenregelung und die Veröffentlichung im Amtsblatt — treffen kann, verpflichtet Eurojust nicht dazu, die Abkommen in allen Amtssprachen der Union im Amtsblatt zu veröffentlichen.

Die Kommission teilt die Auffassung der Damen und Herren Abgeordneten, dass der Zugang zu Informationen auf der Website von Eurojust äußerst wichtig für die Bürgerinnen und Bürger ist. Aus Gründen der Kosteneffizienz kann es vorkommen, dass Unterlagen, die aufgrund ihres sehr spezifischen Inhalts nur an eine relativ begrenzte Zielgruppe gerichtet sind, nicht in allen Amtssprachen der Union zur Verfügung stehen.

([1]) Beschluss 2002/187/JI des Rates vom 28. Februar 2002 über die Errichtung von Eurojust zur Verstärkung der Bekämpfung der schweren Kriminalität, geändert durch den Beschluss 2003/659/JI des Rates vom 18. Juni 2003 und durch den Beschluss 2009/426/JI des Rates vom 16. Dezember 2008 zur Stärkung von Eurojust.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004807/13
à la Commission
Arkadiusz Tomasz Bratkowski (PPE), Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE), Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE), Axel Voss (PPE) et Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE)
(29 avril 2013)

Objet: Accords sur la coopération en matière de lutte contre les formes graves de criminalité entre Eurojust et la Croatie, l'Islande, la Suisse, la Norvège, les États-Unis et l'ancienne République yougoslave de Macédoine

Eurojust a conclu des accords sur la coopération en matière de lutte contre les formes graves de criminalité avec les pays suivants: la Croatie, l'Islande, la Suisse, la Norvège, les États-Unis et l'ancienne République yougoslave de Macédoine. En vertu de ces accords, les pays concernés vont échanger des informations, y compris des données personnelles. Les accords internationaux précités peuvent être consultés sur le site internet d'Eurojust, uniquement en langue anglaise. En outre, il est difficile de les trouver dans le Journal officiel de l'Union européenne.

Par conséquent, la Commission est-elle d'avis que les citoyens de l'Union européenne devraient être privés de la possibilité de s'informer sur les dispositions des accords concernés dans leur langue maternelle, étant donné que ces accords auront des incidences importantes sur leurs droits fondamentaux?

Quel type de mesures la Commission entend-elle adopter afin de remédier au problème soulevé ci-dessus, qui constitue une violation du règlement n° 1 portant fixation du régime linguistique de la Communauté économique européenne (JO L 17 du 6.10.1958, p. 385, tel que modifié par le règlement (CE) n° 920/2005 du Conseil du 13 juin 2005 et le règlement (CE) n° 1791/2006 du Conseil du 20 novembre 2006)?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Reding au nom de la Commission
(2 juillet 2013)

Le règlement n° 1 du 15 avril 1958 ne s'applique pas directement à Eurojust, puisque celle-ci ne constitue pas une institution de l'Union.

La décision 2002/187/JAI ([1]) du Conseil prévoyant qu'Eurojust peut conclure des accords avec des États tiers et établissant les modalités pratiques concernant ces accords, comme le régime linguistique et la publication au Journal officiel de l'Union européenne, n'oblige pas Eurojust à publier ces accords au Journal Officiel dans toutes les langues officielles de l'Union.

La Commission convient avec les Honorables Parlementaires qu'il est primordial d'assurer l'accès des particuliers aux informations publiées sur le site web d'Eurojust. Toutefois, pour des raisons de rapport coût-efficacité, il se peut que des documents très spécialisés et, par leur nature, destinés à un public relativement restreint ne soient pas disponibles dans toutes les langues officielles de l'Union.

([1]) Décision 2002/187/JAI du Conseil du 28 février 2002 instituant Eurojust afin de renforcer la lutte contre les formes graves de criminalité, modifiée par la décision 2003/659/JAI du Conseil et par la décision 2009/426/JAI du Conseil du 16 décembre 2008 sur le renforcement d'Eurojust.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-004807/13
do Komisji
Arkadiusz Tomasz Bratkowski (PPE), Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE), Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE), Axel Voss (PPE) oraz Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE)
(29 kwietnia 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Umowy o współpracy w zakresie walki z poważną przestępczością między Eurojustem a Chorwacją, Islandią, Szwajcarią, Norwegią, USA i byłą jugosłowiańską republiką Macedonii

Eurojust zawarł umowy o współpracy w zakresie walki z poważną przestępczością z następującymi państwami: Chorwacja, Islandia, Szwajcaria, Norwegia, Stany Zjednoczone Ameryki Północnej i była jugosłowiańska republika Macedonii. Na mocy tych umów państwa te będą wymieniać między sobą informacje, w tym dane osobowe. Wspomniane powyżej umowy międzynarodowe są dostępne na stronie internetowej Eurojustu wyłącznie w języku angielskim. Poza tym trudno jest je znaleźć w Dzienniku Urzędowym Unii Europejskiej.

W związku z tym, czy Komisja uważa, że powinno się pozbawiać obywateli UE możliwości zapoznania się z postanowieniami powyższych umów w ich własnym języku, zwłaszcza że postanowienia te mają wielkie znaczenie dla ich praw podstawowych?

Jakie działania zamierza podjąć Komisja, aby zaradzić temu problemowi, który narusza rozporządzenie nr 1 w sprawie określenia systemu językowego Europejskiej Wspólnoty Gospodarczej (Dz.U. 17 z 6.10.1958 s. 385, zmienione rozporządzeniem Rady (WE) nr 920/2005 z dn. 13 czerwca 2005 r. i rozporządzeniem Rady (WE) nr 1791/2006 z dn. 20 listopada 2006 r.)?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Viviane Reding w imieniu Komisji
(2 lipca 2013 r.)

Rozporządzenie nr 1 z dnia 15 kwietnia 1958 r. nie jest bezpośrednio stosowane wobec Eurojustu, ponieważ nie jest on instytucją unijną.

Decyzja Rady 2002/187/WSiSW ([1]) przewidująca zawieranie przez Eurojust umów z państwami trzecimi oraz przyjmowanie praktycznych ustaleń dotyczących tych umów, takich jak system językowy oraz publikacje w Dzienniku Urzędowym, nie wymaga od Eurojustu publikowania porozumień we wszystkich językach urzędowych Unii w Dzienniku Urzędowym.

Komisja zgadza się z Szanownymi Posłami, że dostęp do informacji zawartych na stronie internetowej Eurojustu jest kwestią istotną dla obywateli. Z przyczyn związanych z opłacalnością, wysoko wyspecjalizowane dokumenty skierowane do względnie wąskiej grupy, ze względu na naturę ich treści, mogą być niedostępne we wszystkich oficjalnych językach Unii.

([1]) Decyzja Rady z dnia 28 lutego 2002 r. ustanawiająca Eurojust w celu zintensyfikowania walki z poważną przestępczością zmieniona decyzją Rady 2003/659/WSiSW oraz decyzją Rady 2009/426/WSiSW z dnia 16 grudnia 2008 r. w sprawie wzmocnienia Eurojustu.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-004807/13
adresată Comisiei
Arkadiusz Tomasz Bratkowski (PPE), Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE), Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE), Axel Voss (PPE) şi Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE)
(29 aprilie 2013)

Subiect: Acordurile privind cooperarea în lupta împotriva formelor grave de criminalitate între Eurojust și Croația, Islanda, Elveția, Norvegia, SUA și Fosta Republică Iugoslavă a Macedoniei

Eurojust a încheiat acorduri privind cooperarea în lupta împotriva formelor grave de criminalitate cu următoarele țări: Croația, Islanda, Elveția, Norvegia, Statele Unite ale Americii și Fosta Republică Iugoslavă a Macedoniei. Conform acestor acorduri, țările în cauză vor face schimb de informații, inclusiv de date cu caracter personal. Acordurile internaționale menționate mai sus pot fi consultate pe site-ul internet la Eurojust doar în limba engleză. În plus, ele sunt dificil de găsit în Jurnalul Oficial al Uniunii Europene.

Având în vedere aceste aspecte, consideră Comisia că cetățenii UE ar trebui să fie lipsiți de posibilitatea de a se familiariza cu prevederile acordurilor în cauză în limba lor națională, ținând seama de faptul că acestea au o relevanță majoră pentru drepturile lor fundamentale?

Ce măsuri intenționează Comisia să ia pentru a remedia problema de mai sus, care este în contradicție cu Regulamentul nr. 1 de stabilire a regimului lingvistic al Comunității Economice Europene (JO 17, 6.10.1958, p. 385, modificat prin Regulamentul (CE) nr. 920/2005 din 13 iunie 2005 și prin Regulamentul (CE) nr. 1791/2006 al Consiliului din 20 noiembrie 2006)?

Răspuns dat de dna Reding în numele Comisiei
(2 iulie 2013)

Regulamentul nr.1 din 15 aprilie 1958 nu este direct aplicabil unității Eurojust, deoarece aceasta nu este o instituție a Uniunii.

Decizia Consiliului 2002/187/JAI ([1]), care prevede că Eurojust poate încheia acorduri cu țări terțe și poate adopta modalități practice în legătură cu acordurile respective (cum ar fi regimul lingvistic și publicarea în Jurnalul Oficial), nu supune Eurojust obligației de a publica acordurile respective în toate limbile oficiale ale Uniunii, în Jurnalul Oficial.

Comisia este de acord cu opinia distinșilor deputați, conform căreia accesul la informațiile publicate pe site-ul Eurojust are o importanță crucială pentru cetățeni. Din motive legate de eficiența costurilor, documentele foarte specializate care, prin conținutul lor, se adresează unui număr relativ limitat de persoane, pot să nu fie disponibile în toate limbile oficiale ale Uniunii.

([1]) Decizia Consiliului din 28 februarie 2002 de instituire a Eurojust în scopul consolidării luptei împotriva formelor grave de criminalitate și modificată prin Decizia 2003/659/JAI a Consiliului și Decizia 2009/426/JAI a Consiliului din 16 decembrie 2008 privind consolidarea Eurojust.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004807/13
to the Commission
Arkadiusz Tomasz Bratkowski (PPE), Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE), Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE), Axel Voss (PPE) and Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Agreements on cooperation in the fight against serious crime between Eurojust and Croatia, Iceland, Switzerland, Norway, the USA and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Eurojust has concluded agreements on cooperation in the fight against serious crime with the following countries: Croatia, Iceland, Switzerland, Norway, the United States of America and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Under the agreements, the countries concerned will exchange information, including personal data. The abovementioned international agreements are available on the Eurojust website in English only. In addition, it is difficult to find them in the *Official Journal of the European Union*.

In light of this, is the Commission of the opinion that EU citizens should be deprived of the opportunity to familiarise themselves with the provisions of the agreements in question in their own national language, considering that they bear great relevance to their fundamental rights?

What kind of measures does the Commission intend to take in order to remedy the above-mentioned problem, which contradicts Regulation No 1 on determining the languages to be used by the European Economic Community (OJ 17, 6.10.1958, p. 385, as amended by Council Regulation (EC) No 920/2005 of 13 June 2005 and Council Regulation (EC) No 1791/2006 of 20 November 2006)?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(2 July 2013)

Regulation No 1 of 15 April 1958 is not directly applicable to Eurojust, as Eurojust does not constitute an institution of the Union.

Council Decision 2002/187/JHA [1] providing for Eurojust to conclude agreements with third countries and the practical arrangements concerning those agreements, such as the linguistic regime and the publication in the Official Journal, does not oblige Eurojust to publish the agreements in all the official languages of the Union in the Official Journal.

The Commission agrees with the Honourable Members that access to information contained on the Eurojust website is crucial for the citizens. For reasons of cost-effectiveness highly specialised documents addressing a relatively limited target group because of the nature of their content may not be available in all the official languages of the Union.

[1] Council Decision of 28 February 2002 setting up Eurojust with a view to reinforcing the fight against serious crime and amended by Council Decision 2003/659/JHA and by Council Decision 2009/426/JHA of 16 December 2008 on the strengthening of Eurojust.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004808/13
to the Council
Paul Murphy (GUE/NGL)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Addition of the LTTE to the EU 'terrorist list'

With reference to the answer to the parliamentary question on the addition of the LTTE to the EU 'terrorist list' (P-009345/2012), could the Council outline what documents are available in the Council register of public documents or elsewhere that outline the decisions taken, and process followed, that resulted in the LTTE being listed as a terrorist organisation? Could the Council further outline what 'relevant information' formed the basis for the LTTE being added to the list of terrorist organisations?

Reply
(11 September 2013)

The following documents concerning the listing of the LTTE are listed in the Council Register of public documents and are publicly available (http://register.consilium.europa.eu/):

12669/1/05 REV 1

55101/06 REV 1

9962/06

9974/06

9599/06

9482/06 ADD 1 REV 1

9486/06 ADD 1 REV 1

Furthermore, the following documents concerning the listing of the LTTE were fully or partially declassified. These declassified documents, or declassified parts of the documents, are also available to the public:

CFSP/1174/06 (partially)

CFSP/1185/06

The Council also holds classified documents, prepared during deliberations within the Council, which are not publicly available.

As regards the procedure followed, the LTTE was listed as terrorist organisation pursuant to Common Position 931/2001/CFSP, as was pointed out in the Council's reply to Written Question P/009345&2012. The information on which the listing was based is contained in the abovementioned documents. Listing decisions by the Council are taken on the basis of a decision by a competent authority in respect of, and based on information concerning, terrorist activity by a person, entity or group pursuant to Article 1(2), (3) and (4) of Common Position 931/2001CFSP.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004810/13
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(29 de abril de 2013)

Asunto: Seis millones de parados en España

El 25 de abril de 2013 se hizo pública la Encuesta de Población Activa (EPA) del mercado laboral español para 2013, así como los datos del Instituto Nacional de Estadística (INE). La EPA indica que el desempleo aumentó en 237 400 personas, superando los seis millones de parados en el primer trimestre y situándose la tasa de paro en el 27,16 %.

Los datos del INE reflejan que la ocupación sigue bajando, ya que 322 300 personas, unas 3 500 al día, se quedaron sin empleo en el primer trimestre de 2013, lo que redujo la ocupación a 16 634 700 personas, su nivel más bajo desde 2003. De la misma forma, el desempleo entre las personas de 16 a 24 años aumenta hasta el 57,2 %. En suma, durante el último año el empleo se ha reducido en 708 500 personas, incrementándose el número de parados en 563 200 personas.

En el documento de trabajo de la Comisión Europea SWD(2013) 116 final, de 10 de abril de 2013, se habla de la flexibilidad del mercado laboral español y se indica que «*las indemnizaciones por despido improcedente siguen siendo elevadas en comparación con otros países, y la diferencia entre las indemnizaciones correspondientes a los contratos temporales y a los de duración indeterminada favorece el empleo de duración limitada*». Es decir, que aboga claramente porque se continúe flexibilizando y precarizando el mercado laboral español, hecho que está comprobado solo hace que aumente el desempleo.

¿Continúa considerando que se debe flexibilizar aún más el mercado laboral español? ¿Cuál es la justificación técnica y no ideológica que existe detrás del posicionamiento de la Comisión en el documento de trabajo mencionado? ¿No cree que la reforma laboral ya ha demostrado que esa no es la buena dirección para crear empleo? ¿No cree indispensable la consolidación del Estado del bienestar del Estado español en este momento tan crítico y, por tanto, el fin de las políticas de austeridad? ¿Otorgará prioridad a las recomendaciones de creación de empleo de calidad, mayor protección social y lucha contra la pobreza?

Respuesta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión
(24 de junio de 2013)

La reforma del mercado laboral, aprobada en julio de 2012, adopta medidas decisivas para modificar el despido individual y colectivo y la estructura de las negociaciones salariales. Las medidas adoptadas consisten en la introducción de diferentes márgenes de ajuste, al establecimiento de condiciones para reducir la inercia salarial nominal, la mayor flexibilidad de los salarios y una distribución más equilibrada de los insumos de trabajo entre horas trabajadas y efectivos. La Comisión ha recomendado ([1]) que España concluya la evaluación de la reforma en julio de 2013 y presente enmiendas en caso necesario antes de septiembre de 2013. La evaluación deberá cubrir toda la gama de objetivos y medidas, incluidas las dirigidas a hacer frente a la dualidad o segmentación del mercado laboral.

Para los Estados miembros de la UE afectados por la crisis de la deuda, el saneamiento presupuestario, la estabilidad financiera, y las reformas estructurales del mercado de productos y del mercado laboral son condiciones necesarias para restablecer la confianza, recuperar la solvencia fiscal y favorecer el dinamismo económico a medio plazo. No acometer estos esfuerzos llevaría a una crisis presupuestaria aun más aguda y de efectos más desastrosos tanto en la redistribución de la renta por parte de los gobiernos como en la prestación de servicios públicos básicos, lo que vendría a añadirse a una situación económica aún más penosa y a una mayor pérdida de empleo.

([1]) COM(2013) 359 final (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2013:0359:FIN:ES:PDF).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004810/13
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Six million unemployed in Spain

On 25 April 2013, the Labour Force Survey (EPA) on the Spanish labour market for 2013 and data from the Spanish National Statistics Institute (INE) were published. The EPA shows that unemployment increased by 237 400 people, surpassing the 6 million mark in the first quarter and placing the unemployment rate at 27.16%.

The INE data show that employment levels are still falling, as 322 300 people — some 3 500 per day — became unemployed in the first quarter of 2013, which reduced the number of people in employment to 16 634 700, the lowest it has been since 2003. Similarly, unemployment among 16 to 24 year olds rose to 57.2%. In summary, in the last year the number of people in employment has fallen by 708 500, the number of unemployed people having increased by 563 200.

The Commission's Working Document SWD(2013) 116 final, of 10 April 2013, speaks of the flexibility of the Spanish labour market and states that 'severance pay for unfair dismissals remains elevated in international comparison, while the gap between severance pay for temporary and permanent contract is biased in favour of employment of limited duration'. In other words, it clearly calls for Spain to continue to make its labour market more flexible and more precarious, something which been shown to lead only to increased unemployment.

Does the Commission continue to believe that the Spanish labour market should be made even more flexible? What is the technical rather than ideological explanation behind the Commission's position in the abovementioned working document? Does it not believe that labour reform has already shown that it is not the right way to create employment? Does it not consider it essential to consolidate the Spanish welfare system at this critical time and, therefore, to put an end to austerity policies? Will it give priority to recommendations for creating quality jobs, better social protection and combating poverty?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(24 June 2013)

The labour market reform passed in July 2012 takes decisive steps to modify the rules for individual and collective dismissals and the wage bargaining structure. Measures taken involve different adjustment margins, setting the conditions for reducing nominal wage inertia, more flexible wages and a more balanced distribution of the adjustment of the labour input between hours worked and headcounts. The Commission has recommended ([1]) that Spain finalise the evaluation of the reform by July 2013 and present amendments if necessary, by September 2013. The evaluation should cover the full range of objectives and measures, including those aimed at addressing the duality or segmentation in the labour market

For the EU Member States hit by the debt crisis, fiscal consolidation, financial stability and structural reforms in product and labour markets are necessary conditions to restore confidence, re-establish fiscal solvency and foster economic dynamism over the medium term. Failing to undertake these efforts would lead to a more acute fiscal crisis and much more disastrous effects on the income redistribution carried out by governments and on the provision of basic public services above and on the top of a more distressful economic situation and the subsequent toll on employment.

([1]) COM(2013) 359 final (http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/nd/csr2013_spain_en.pdf).

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004812/13
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(29 de abril de 2013)

Asunto: Plan de choque contra el desempleo juvenil

El 25 de abril de 2013 se publicaron la Encuesta de Población Activa (EPA) correspondiente a 2013 y los datos del Instituto Nacional de Estadística (INE). La EPA indica que el desempleo juvenil se sitúa ya en el 57,2 %, lo que supone alrededor de un millón de parados y representa una situación dramática, ya que implica un aumento de más del doble del número de desempleados desde 2008 (24,6 %).

En reiteradas ocasiones, tanto el Presidente de la Comisión como el del Consejo han mostrado su preocupación con respecto al desempleo juvenil en el sur de Europa y en España en particular. Recientemente, el Consejo ha dado luz verde a la «Garantía de la Juventud», un instrumento de financiación dotado con sólo seis millones de euros para los 28 Estados miembros durante un periodo de siete años cuyo objetivo es reducir el desempleo juvenil. Este instrumento estará cofinanciado por los Estados miembros, lo que no podrá realizarse sin una flexibilización del calendario para el cumplimiento de los objetivos en materia de déficit y de deuda pública, tal y como ha indicado el propio Comisario L. Andor.

Sin embargo, y con el beneplácito de las instituciones europeas, se han profundizado las medidas de austeridad injustas que dificultan la emancipación juvenil (recortes en la salud, en la educación, en las ayudas a la vivienda, etc.) y se ha optado por una reforma del mercado laboral que precariza aún más a los trabajadores y a las trabajadoras.

¿Qué opinión merecen a la Comisión las políticas de juventud y empleo juvenil adoptadas por el Gobierno español? ¿Qué recomendaciones concretas hará la Comisión en relación con la situación en materia de desempleo juvenil en España de cara al próximo semestre europeo? ¿Tiene la Comisión intención de proponer que se posponga un año el cumplimiento de los objetivos en materia de déficit y de deuda a cambio de un plan de choque contra el desempleo juvenil de un año de duración que implique la creación de medio millón de puestos de trabajo destinados a los jóvenes?

Respuesta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión
(27 de junio de 2013)

La Comisión observa con gran inquietud las tasas de desempleo juvenil en España, que son extremadamente altas. La Estrategia nacional de Emprendimiento y Empleo Joven 2013-2016, que se presentó en marzo de 2013, es un paso en la buena dirección, ya que integra un conjunto global de medidas. No obstante, la Comisión desea apoyar al Gobierno español en la aplicación de las medidas que puedan tener un efecto rápido y confía en que vele por la aplicación del sistema de «Garantía Juvenil» según las recomendaciones del Consejo ([1]). El 29 de mayo se publicaron las recomendaciones de la Comisión por país para 2013, junto con una nueva trayectoria de corrección en el marco del procedimiento de déficit excesivo ([2]) (por la que se amplía el plazo en dos años hasta 2016).

Las medidas incluidas en el Programa Nacional de Reformas, que deben fomentar una colaboración más estrecha entre los servicios públicos de empleo nacionales y regionales, y entre los servicios públicos de empleo y las agencias de colocación privadas, aún no están plenamente operativas. Se ha retrasado asimismo la aplicación de las medidas de reforma en el ámbito de las políticas activas del mercado de trabajo y siguen pendientes actuaciones para modernizar y reforzar el propio servicio público de empleo.

([1]) http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/es/13/st07/st07123.es13.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/index_es.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004812/13
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Emergency plan for youth unemployment

On 25 April 2013, the Labour Force Survey (EPA) for 2013 and data from the Spanish National Statistics Institute (INE) were published. The EPA shows that youth unemployment is now at 57.2%, which accounts for around one million unemployed people and represents a dramatic situation, as it implies that the number of unemployed people has more than doubled since 2008 (24.6%).

On numerous occasions, both the President of the Commission and the President of the Council have shown their concern with regard to youth unemployment in southern Europe and in Spain in particular. Recently, the Council has given the green light for the 'Youth Guarantee', a financing instrument with a budget of just EUR 6 million for the 28 Member States for a period of seven years, with the objective of reducing youth unemployment. This instrument will be co-financed by the Member States, which can only happen if there is greater flexibility in the time frame for meeting deficit and public debt targets, as Commissioner Andor has said himself.

However, with the consent of the European institutions, unfair austerity measures which make it difficult for young people to gain independence (cuts to health, education, housing benefits, etc.) have been deepened, and a reform of the labour market has been opted for that puts workers in an even more vulnerable position.

What is the Commission's opinion of the youth and youth employment policies adopted by the Spanish Government? What concrete recommendations will the Commission make with regard to the youth unemployment situation in Spain for the next European semester? Does the Commission intend to propose postponing by one year the deadline for meeting the deficit and debt targets in exchange for a one-year emergency plan for youth unemployment that will create half a million jobs for young people?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2013)

The Commission follows with great concern the very high rates of youth unemployment in Spain. The national Youth Employment and Entrepreneurship Strategy 2013-2016, presented in March 2013, is a step in the right direction as it integrates a comprehensive set of measures. However the Commission wishes to support the Spanish Government in the implementation of measures that can have a quick effect and expects that it will ensure the application of a youth guarantee scheme as recommended by the Council ([1]). The Commission's recommendations for the 2013 country-specific recommendations and a new EDP correction path (extending the deadline by 2 years to 2016) have been published on 29 May ([2]).

The measures included in the NRP should foster closer cooperation between national and regional public employment services and between public employment services and private placement agencies, but remain to be made fully operational. Implementation of reform measures in the field of active labour market policies has lagged behind and actions to modernise and reinforce the Public Employment Service itself are still needed.

([1]) http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/13/st07/st07123.en13.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004814/13
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(29 de abril de 2013)

Asunto: Protección del mar Mediterráneo

El Gobierno de España otorgó a dos empresas varios permisos de investigación para examinar la existencia de hidrocarburos en el mar Mediterráneo, en la costa de Valencia (denominados «Alta Mar 1», «Alta Mar 2», «Albufera», «Benifayó» y «Gandía», que se aprobaron mediante Reales Decretos de 23 de diciembre de 2010). Algunos ayuntamientos, así como la administración regional impugnaron estos acuerdos mediante recursos que recientemente han sido desestimados por el Tribunal Supremo (sentencias de 15, 21 y 27 de marzo de 2013).

Ante el inicio de las tareas de investigación, me interesa conocer la opinión de la Comisión Europea sobre los siguientes aspectos:

1. ¿Ha comunicado el Gobierno de España a la Comisión estas autorizaciones de conformidad con las previsiones contenidas en la Directiva 2008/56/CE, de 17 de julio, que establece el marco de acción comunitaria para la política del medio marino?

2. ¿Considera la Comisión que dichas actividades son conformes con los acuerdos suscritos mediante el Protocolo para la protección del mar Mediterráneo contra la contaminación resultante de la exploración y explotación de la plataforma continental, del fondo del mar y de su subsuelo, publicado en el Diario Oficial el pasado 9 de enero de 2013? ¿Qué disposiciones se están adoptando para garantizar que las anteriores autorizaciones se ajusten a estas previsiones como impone el artículo 29 de ese Protocolo?

3. ¿Qué otras actuaciones sobre el preciso cumplimiento de dicha normativa relativa a la estrategia marina sigue realizando la Comisión tras la publicación del informe COM(2012)0662, sobre la ejecución de las obligaciones, los compromisos y las iniciativas que tienen los Estados miembros o la Unión a nivel de la UE o a nivel internacional en el ámbito de la protección medioambiental de las aguas marinas?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(21 de junio de 2013)

1. De conformidad con el artículo 8, apartado 1, letra b), de la Directiva marco sobre la estrategia marina ([1]), España informó en 2012 a la Comisión de que las autoridades habían expedido permisos de exploración para Lubina 1 y Lubina 2 (Real Decreto 184/2002), Altamar 1, Altamar 2 (Real Decreto 1774/2010), Albufera, Benifayó y Gandía (Real Decreto 1775/2010). Sin embargo, la citada Directiva no prevé la notificación oficial de tales autorizaciones.

2. La Comisión no ha recibido por parte de España información suficientemente detallada sobre estas actividades para evaluar una posible vulneración del Derecho de la UE o del Protocolo del Convenio de Barcelona. La Comisión va a preguntar a las autoridades españolas de qué forma garantizan que los efectos medioambientales queden reducidos al mínimo, de conformidad con la normativa aplicable de la UE, incluido el Protocolo.

3. La Directiva 2008/56/CE antes citada no regula actividades específicas. La Comisión ha presentado una propuesta de Reglamento sobre seguridad de las actividades de prospección, exploración y producción de petróleo y gas en alta mar. Sobre la base de esta propuesta, en la sesión plenaria del Parlamento Europeo de 21 de mayo de 2013, se adoptó una Directiva destinada a reducir, en la medida de lo posible, la frecuencia de los accidentes graves causados por las actividades relacionadas con el petróleo y el gas mar adentro, limitar sus consecuencias y aumentar, de este modo, la protección del medio marino y de las economías costeras frente a la contaminación. Sin embargo, estas nuevas disposiciones no han entrado aún en vigor, por lo que no son aplicables en este caso.

([1]) Directiva 2008/56/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 17 de junio de 2008, por la que se establece un marco de acción comunitaria para la política del medio marino (DO L 164 de 25.6.2008, p. 19).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004814/13
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Protecting the Mediterranean Sea

The Spanish Government granted two companies various exploration permits to examine the existence of hydrocarbons in the Mediterranean Sea off the coast of Valencia (known as 'Alta Mar 1', 'Alta Mar 2', 'Albufera', 'Benifayó' and 'Gandía', which were approved by Royal Decrees dated 23 December 2010). Some local councils, as well as the regional government, contested these agreements by appeals, which were recently rejected by the Supreme Court (judgments of 15, 21 and 27 March 2013).

Before exploration work begins, I would like know the Commission's opinion on the following aspects:

1. Has the Spanish Government notified the Commission of these authorisations in accordance with the provisions laid down in Directive 2008/56/EC of 17 July establishing the framework for Community action in the field of marine environmental policy?

2. Does the Commission consider that these activities comply with the agreements entered into under the Protocol for the protection of the Mediterranean Sea against pollution resulting from exploration and exploitation of the continental shelf and the seabed and its subsoil, published in the Official Journal on 9 January 2013? What provisions are being adopted to ensure that the previous authorisations are made to comply with these provisions, as stipulated in Article 29 of this Protocol?

3. What other measures is the Commission continuing to take regarding exact compliance with this legislation on marine strategy, following publication of report COM(2012)0662 on the implementation of existing obligations, commitments and initiatives of Member States and the Union, at EU or international level, in the sphere of environmental protection in marine waters?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(21 June 2013)

In accordance with Article (8)(1)(b) of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) Spain informed the Commission in 2012 that the authorities had issued exploration permits for Lubina 1 and Lubina 2 (Real Decreto 184/2002), Altamar 1, Altamar 2 (Real Decreto 1774/2010), Albufera, Benifayó y Gandía (Real Decreto 1775/2010). However, a formal notification of such authorisations is not foreseen under the MSFD.

The Commission has not received sufficiently detailed information on these activities from Spain to assess a possible violation of EC law or of the Barcelona Convention Protocol. The Commission intends to ask the Spanish authorities how they ensure that the environmental impacts are minimised, in conformity with applicable EU legislation, including the Protocol.

The abovementioned Directive 2008/56/EC does not regulate specific activities. The Commission proposed a regulation on safety of offshore oil and gas prospection, exploration and production activities. On the basis of this proposal, a directive aiming to reduce as far as possible the occurrence of major accidents relating to offshore oil and gas operations and to limit their consequences, thus increasing the protection of the marine environment and coastal economies against pollution, has been adopted in Plenary by the EP on 21 May 2013. The provisions of this new legislation have, however, not entered into effect and are therefore not applicable in this case.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004815/13
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(29 de abril de 2013)

Asunto: Introducción de productos fitosanitarios prohibidos en la Unión Europea

Diversos informes han destacado la adecuada incorporación entre los agricultores españoles de la vigente normativa europea relativa al uso de plaguicidas. De manera especial, el Reglamento (CE) n° 1107/2009, de 21 de octubre, relativo a la comercialización de productos fitosanitarios, y la Directiva 2009/128/CE, de la misma fecha, por la que se establece el marco de la actuación comunitaria para conseguir un uso sostenible de los plaguicidas. Sin embargo, muchos profesionales advierten que subsisten problemas de residuos que provienen de frutas y hortalizas cultivadas en terceros países que todavía continúan utilizando productos fitosanitarios prohibidos en la Unión Europea.

Ante los riesgos que dichos residuos pueden originar en la cadena alimentaria, ¿está estudiando la Comisión Europea alguna medida para reducir tales riesgos?

¿No consideraría la posibilidad de incrementar la publicidad de los productos europeos que sí cumplen con dichas previsiones?

Respuesta del Sr. Borg en nombre de la Comisión
(17 de junio de 2013)

Puede haber varias razones por las que sustancias activas de productos fitosanitarios ([1]) no estén autorizadas para su uso en la EU, por ejemplo, motivos de preocupación relacionados con la salud de los consumidores, pero también con la salud en el trabajo o el medio ambiente o incluso la falta de interés económico en conseguir la autorización. Por lo tanto, la falta de autorización no implica necesariamente un riesgo para la cadena alimentaria.

Para combatir los riesgos debidos a residuos de plaguicidas en alimentos se establecen límites máximos de residuos (LMR). El Reglamento (CE) n° 396/2005 ([2]) contiene disposiciones que rigen las tolerancias en las importaciones, es decir, los LMR de los productos importados, pero dichas disposiciones se limitan a los casos en que el uso de una sustancia activa no está autorizado en la EU por motivos que no sean de salud pública. Las tolerancias en las importaciones están sujetas a la misma evaluación estricta del riesgo para los consumidores que los LMR, sobre la base de los usos en la EU, para garantizar que todos los alimentos comercializados son seguros, independientemente de su origen.

En el Reglamento (CE) n° 669/2009 de la Comisión ([3]) se establece una intensificación de los controles oficiales de las importaciones de determinados piensos y alimentos para poder hacer frente de forma más eficaz a riesgos conocidos o de nueva aparición (por ejemplo, la posible presencia de residuos de plaguicidas). Esto se traduce en controles sistemáticos de la documentación, así como controles de identidad y físicos, incluidos análisis de laboratorio, con una frecuencia establecida en función del riesgo detectado. El despacho a libre práctica está supeditado a que estos controles den resultados favorables.

La Directiva 2009/128/CE ([4]), sobre el uso sostenible de los plaguicidas, fomenta la gestión de plagas mediante un bajo consumo de plaguicidas, incluida la gestión integrada de plagas y la agricultura biológica, para la que el Reglamento (CE) n° 834/2007 del Consejo ([5]) establece disposiciones de etiquetado. Además, la Comisión tiene conocimiento de las correspondientes etiquetas utilizadas a iniciativa de las partes interesadas.

([1]) Véase el Reglamento (CE) n° 1107/2009, DO L 309 de 24.11.2009.
([2]) DO L 70 de 16.3.2005.
([3]) DO L 194 de 25.7.2009.
([4]) DO L 309 de 24.11.2009.
([5]) DO L 189 de 20.7.2007.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004815/13
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Introduction of banned plant health products into the European Union

Various reports have highlighted the appropriate transposition among Spanish farmers of the current European legislation on the use of pesticides, in particular Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 of 21 October concerning the placing of plant protection products on the market and Directive 2009/128/EC of the same date establishing a framework for Community action to achieve the sustainable use of pesticides. However, many professionals are warning that there are still problems with residues coming from fruit and vegetables grown in third countries which still continue to use plant health products that are banned in the EU.

Given the risks that these residues could represent for the food chain, is the Commission looking into any measures to reduce these risks?

Would it not consider the possibility of increasing the advertising of European products that do comply with these provisions?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2013)

Active substances of plant protection products may not be approved for use in the EU ([1]) due to various possible reasons, such as concerns regarding consumer health, but also workplace health, the environment, or lack of economic interest to pursue an approval. The absence of an approval does hence not necessarily imply a risk for the food chain.

Risks due to pesticide residues in or on food are addressed by establishing safe maximum residue levels (MRLs). Regulation (EC) No 396/2005 ([2]) contains provisions for setting import tolerances, i.e. MRLs for imported products, which are however restricted to cases where the use of an active substance is not authorised in the EU based on reasons other than public health. Import tolerances are subject to the same stringent consumer risk assessment as MRLs based on uses in the EU, to ensure that all food placed on the market is safe, regardless of its origin.

Commission Regulation (EC) No 669/2009 ([3]) foresees increased levels of official controls on imports of certain feed and food to allow known or emerging risks (e.g. the possible presence of pesticide residues) to be countered more effectively. This comprises systematic documentary checks, as well as identity and physical checks including laboratory analysis at a frequency related to the risk identified. Release for free circulation is subject to favourable results of the controls.

Low pesticide-input pest management is promoted in the EU through the Sustainable Use Directive 2009/128/EC ([4]) including integrated pest management as well as organic farming, for which labelling provisions are laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 ([5]). Furthermore, the Commission is aware of pertinent labels initiated by stakeholders.

([1]) cf. Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009, OJ L 309, 24.11.2009.
([2]) OJ L 70, 16.3.2005.
([3]) OJ L 194, 25.7.2009.
([4]) OJ L 309, 24.11.2009.
([5]) OJ L 189, 20.7.2007.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004816/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(29 Απριλίου 2013)

Θέμα: Αυξημένες ανάγκες χρηματοδότησης στην Κύπρο

Με την απόφαση του Eurogroup στις 25 Μαρτίου 2013, το πακέτο διάσωσης της κυπριακής οικονομίας υπολογιζόταν στα 17 δισ. ευρώ, από τα οποία 9 δισ. ευρώ θα δινόντουσαν από τον Ευρωπαϊκό Μηχανισμό Σταθερότητας, 1 δισ. ευρώ από το Διεθνές Νομισματικό Ταμείο και 7 δισ. ευρώ από την Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία, συμπεριλαμβανομένου και του κουρέματος των καταθέσεων.

Σύμφωνα με δημοσιογραφικές πληροφορίες (Assosiated Press), το πακέτο διάσωσης της κυπριακής οικονομίας, εν όψει του Eurogroup στις 12 Απριλίου, υπολογίζεται πλέον στα 23 δισ. ευρώ, από τα οποία 9 δισ. ευρώ θα δοθούν από τον Ευρωπαϊκό Μηχανισμό Σταθερότητας, 1 δισ. ευρώ από το Διεθνές Νομισματικό Ταμείο και 13 δισ. ευρώ από την Κύπρο.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Ποιοι είναι οι λόγοι αυτής της, τρομακτικής για τα οικονομικά δεδομένα της Κύπρου, αύξησης του πακέτου διάσωσης, το οποίο μάλιστα καλείται να επωμιστεί η ίδια;

2. Τι μέτρα έχει προτείνει στην Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία για να βρει τα επιπρόσθετα 6 δισ. ευρώ της συμβολής της στο πακέτο διάσωσης;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(17 Ιουνίου 2013)

Στη δήλωσή του της 25ης Μαρτίου 2013, το Eurogroup δήλωσε ότι — καταρχήν — η χρηματοπιστωτική βοήθεια παρέχεται για τη διασφάλιση της χρηματοπιστωτικής σταθερότητας στην Κύπρο και στην ευρωζώνη γενικότερα, μέσω της χορήγησης οικονομικής βοήθειας ύψους μέχρι 10 δισ. ευρώ.

Κατόπιν απόφασης του Διοικητικού Συμβουλίου του Ευρωπαϊκού Μηχανισμού Σταθερότητας της 24ης Απριλίου 2013 για την καταρχήν παροχή στήριξης σταθερότητας στην Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία, το Διοικητικό Συμβούλιο του ΕΜΣ ενέκρινε τη συμφωνία διευκόλυνσης οικονομικής ενίσχυσης (FFA) στις 8 Μαΐου 2013. 9 δισ. ευρώ θα δοθούν από τον ΕΜΣ και 1 δισ. ευρώ από το ΔΝΤ. Σύμφωνα με την FFA, η πρώτη δόση θα καταβληθεί με δύο εκταμιεύσεις: 2 δισ. ευρώ (μεταφορά στις 13 Μαΐου 2013) και περίπου 1 δισ. ευρώ (προγραμματίζεται για τις 30 Ιουνίου 2013).

Όλα τα σχετικά με το πρόγραμμα έγγραφα έχουν δημοσιευτεί και είναι διαθέσιμα στην ακόλουθη ιστοσελίδα: (http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2013/op149_en.htm).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004816/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Increased need for financing in Cyprus

In the Euro Group decision of 25 March 2013, the rescue package for the Cypriot economy was estimated at EUR 17 billion, of which EUR 9 billion would be contributed by the European Stability Mechanism, EUR 1 billion by the IMF and EUR 7 billion by the Republic of Cyprus, including the savings 'haircut'.

According to press reports (Associated Press), following the Euro Group meeting of 12 April, the Cypriot rescue package is now estimated at EUR 23 billion, of which EUR 9 billion will be contributed by the European Stability Mechanism, EUR 1 billion by the IMF and EUR 13 billion by Cyprus.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. What are the reasons for this increase in the rescue package, which is terrible for Cyprus's economic situation, and which Cyprus is also required to shoulder alone?

2. What measures has it proposed to the Republic of Cyprus for finding the additional EUR 6 billion of its contribution to the rescue package?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2013)

In its statement of 25 March 2013, the Eurogroup stated that — in principal — financial assistance is warranted to safeguard financial stability in Cyprus and the euro area as a whole by providing financial assistance for an amount up to EUR 10 billion.

Following decision by the ESM Board of Governors of 24 April 2013 to grant in principle Stability support to the Republic of Cyprus, the ESM Board of Directors approved the financial assistance facility agreement (FFA) on 8 May 2013.The ESM will provide EUR 9 billion, while the IMF EUR 1 billion. According to the FFA, the first tranche will be provided in two disbursements: EUR 2 billion (transferred on 13 May 2013) and around EUR 1 billion (scheduled for 30 June 2013).

All relevant programme documents have been published and can be accessed at:
(http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2013/op149_en.htm).

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004817/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(29 Απριλίου 2013)

Θέμα: Αμοιβές μελών Ανεξάρτητων Αρχών

Σύμφωνα με τον ελληνικό νόμο 4051/12 (άρθρο 9), οι αμοιβές και οι αποζημιώσεις των μελών του Γενικού Συμβουλίου (ΓΣ) και της Εκτελεστικής Επιτροπής (ΕΕ) του Ελληνικού Ταμείου Χρηματοπιστωτικής Σταθερότητας (ΤΧΣ), «καθορίζονται με απόφαση του Υπουργού Οικονομικών» μετά από «διαβούλευση με το Euro Working Group», ενώ απαγορεύεται η μείωσή τους, αφού στο ίδιο άρθρο προβλέπεται ότι οι συγκεκριμένες απολαβές «δεν δύνανται να τύχουν μειώσεως κατά τη διάρκεια της θητείας των μελών του Γενικού Συμβουλίου και της Εκτελεστικής Επιτροπής».

Εφαρμόζοντας τον συγκεκριμένο νόμο, ο έλληνας Υπουργός Οικονομικών, με απόφασή του (Αρ. 3710/Β.204/ΦΕΚ αρ. 35/30 Ιανουαρίου 2013), όρισε τα μέλη και τις απολαβές των μελών του Ελληνικού ΤΧΣ, με τους μισθούς του Προέδρου του ΓΣ, του Διευθύνοντος Συμβούλου και του Αναπληρωτή Διευθύνοντος Συμβούλου, να καθορίζονται στα 100 000, 215 000 και 185 000 ευρώ, αντιστοίχως.

Με δεδομένο ότι το ύψος των προαναφερθέντων μισθών αποτελεί πρόκληση για τους έλληνες πολίτες που πλήττονται καθημερινά από την οικονομική κρίση, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Μπορεί να με ενημερώσει για το ύψος των αμοιβών των μελών αντίστοιχων θεσμών με το ελληνικό ΤΧΣ στα άλλα κράτη μέλη, όπως το National Asset Management Agency (NAMA) στην Ιρλανδία και το Fund for Orderly Bank Restructuring (FROB) στην Ισπανία; Ποιο είναι το μέσο ύψος των αποδοχών των μελών των ανεξάρτητων αρχών στα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ και της Ελλάδας;

2. Πού βασίζεται νομικά η ρήτρα απαγόρευσης μείωσης των μισθών των μελών του ελληνικού ΤΧΣ; Υπάρχει ανάλογη ρήτρα στα στελέχη που εργάζονται στην Επιτροπή, την Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα ή τις άλλες εθνικές Κεντρικές Τράπεζες της Ευρωζώνης;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(19 Ιουνίου 2013)

1. Η Επιτροπή δεν μπορεί να σχολιάσει «το ύψος των αμοιβών των μελών αντίστοιχων θεσμικών οργάνων». Ωστόσο, η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή μπορεί να ενημερώσει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος σχετικά με τις νομικές ιδιαιτερότητες που διέπουν την αμοιβή των μελών του Γενικού Συμβουλίου και της Εκτελεστικής Επιτροπής του Ελληνικού Ταμείου Χρηματοπιστωτικής Σταθερότητας (ΕΤΧΣ). Το άρθρο 4 παράγραφος 12 του νόμου 3864/2010 με τίτλο «Περί ιδρύσεως Ταμείου Χρηματοπιστωτικής Σταθερότητας», όπως ισχύει σήμερα, ορίζει ότι οι αμοιβές και αποζημιώσεις των μελών του Γενικού Συμβουλίου και της Εκτελεστικής Επιτροπής καθορίζονται με απόφαση του Υπουργού Οικονομικών, ότι οι αμοιβές και αποζημιώσεις των μελών του Γενικού Συμβουλίου και της Εκτελεστικής Επιτροπής ορίζονται με τρόπο ώστε να καθίσταται δυνατή η πρόσληψη και διατήρηση στις θέσεις τους, προσώπων με εξειδικευμένα προσόντα και επαγγελματική πείρα, και ότι οι αμοιβές και αποζημιώσεις δεν αποτελούν συνάρτηση των κερδών ή εσόδων του Ταμείου.

2. Ο νόμος 4051/12 (άρθρο 9), με τον οποίο τροποποιήθηκε ο νόμος 3864/2010 όσον αφορά τα διοικητικά όργανα, υποκατέστησε το άρθρο 4 του αρχικού νόμου 3864/2010 και εισήγαγε ρήτρα σχετικά με την αμοιβή των μελών του νέου Γενικού Συμβουλίου και της νέας Εκτελεστικής Επιτροπής, σύμφωνα με την οποία οι εν λόγω αμοιβές και αποζημιώσεις «γ) δεν δύνανται να τύχουν μειώσεως κατά τη διάρκεια της θητείας των μελών του Γενικού Συμβουλίου και της Εκτελεστικής Επιτροπής» (άρθρο 4 παράγραφος 12 στοιχείο γ) του νόμου 3864/2010, όπως τροποποιήθηκε με το άρθρο 9 του νόμου 4051/12). Ωστόσο, η διάταξη αυτή διεγράφη από τον νόμο 3864/2012 με το άρθρο 6 παράγραφος 3 τελευταίο εδάφιο του νόμου 4092/2012 (ΦΕΚ 220/8-11-2012). Η σχετική τροποποίηση δημοσιεύεται στην ηλεκτρονική διεύθυνση: http://www.hfsf.gr/files/legal/13.L4092_am10.pdf

Μπορείτε να ανατρέξετε σε όλες τις τροποποιήσεις του νόμου 3864/2010, δηλαδή του νόμου για το ΕΤΧΣ, στον δικτυακό τόπο του ΕΤΧΣ: http://www.hfsf.gr/files/legal

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004817/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Remuneration of independent authority members

Under Greek law 4051/12 (Article 9), the emoluments and allowances of members of the General Council (GC) and of the Executive Committee (EC) of the Greek Financial Stability Fund (FSF) 'are determined by decision of the Finance Minister' after 'consulting with the Euro working group', whilst any reduction of the same is prohibited, since this Article also provides that the payments in question 'cannot be reduced for the duration of service of GC and EC members'.

In applying the law, the Greek Finance Minister, under Decision No 3710/B.204/FEC No 35/30 of January 2013, appointed the members of the Greek FSF and set their remuneration, with the salaries of the president, managing director and deputy managing director of the GC set at EUR 100 000, EUR 215 000 and EUR 185 000 respectively.

Given that the level of the above salaries is provoking anger among Greek citizens, who are suffering the consequences of the economic crisis daily, will the Commission say:

1. Can it inform me of the remuneration levels of members of equivalent institutions with the Greek FSF in other Member States, such as the National Asset Management Agency in Ireland or the Fund for Orderly Bank Restructuring in Spain? What is the average level of earnings at independent authorities in EU member states and in Greece?

2. What is the legal basis for explicitly prohibiting a reduction in the salaries of Greek FSF members? Is there an equivalent clause for executives who work at the Commission, the European Central Bank or other national central banks in the euro area?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2013)

1. The Commission cannot comment on the 'remuneration levels of members of equivalent institutions'. The European Commission however can inform the Honourable Member on the legal specificities related to the remuneration of the members of the General Council and the Executive Board of the Hellenic Financial Stability Fund (the 'HFSF'). Article 4(12) of the Law 3864/2010 titled 'Establishment of a Hellenic Financial Stability Fund' as currently in effect, states that the remuneration and compensation of members of the General Council and the Executive Board shall be determined by decision of the Minister of Finance, that the remuneration or compensation received by members of the General Council and Executive Board shall be such that qualified and expert persons can be recruited and retained and that no remuneration or compensation shall be based on the Fund's profits or any of its revenues.

2. The Law 4051/12 (Article 9), which amended the law 3864/2010 as regards the governing bodies, subrogated Article 4 of the initial Law 3864/2010 and introduced a clause about the remuneration of the members of the new General Council and the new Executive Board under which '(c) such remuneration and compensation shall not be diminished during the terms of office for which these General Council and Executive Board members have been appointed' (Article 4 paragraph 12(c) of the Law 3864/2010 as amended by Article 9 of the Law 4051/12). However, this provision was removed from the Law 3864/2012 by Article 6 paragraph 3 last subparagraph of the law 4092/2012 (FEK 220/8-11-2012). The amendment can be found on:
http://www.hfsf.gr/files/legal/13.L4092_am10.pdf

For reference to all the amendments of the Law 3864/2010, which is the HFSF Law, can be found on the HFSF site:
http://www.hfsf.gr/files/legal

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004818/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(29 Απριλίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ανταλλαγή Πληροφοριών Τραπεζικών Καταθέσεων στην ΕΕ

Απαντώντας η Επιτροπή (E-006872/2012), σε ερώτησή μου σχετικά με την ανταλλαγή τραπεζικών πληροφοριών σε φορολογικές αρχές των κρατών μελών σε περίπτωση δειγματοληπτικών ελέγχων, αναφέρει συγκεκριμένα ότι: «Η οδηγία 2011/16/ΕΕ της 15ης Φεβρουαρίου 2011 σχετικά με τη διοικητική συνεργασία στον τομέα της φορολογίας, η οποία πρόκειται να τεθεί σε ισχύ την 1η Ιανουαρίου 2013, προβλέπει ρητά ότι κράτος μέλος στο οποίο απευθύνθηκε σχετικό αίτημα δεν μπορεί να αρνηθεί την παροχή πληροφοριών αποκλειστικά και μόνον επειδή κάτοχος των εν λόγω πληροφοριών είναι τράπεζα, άλλο χρηματοπιστωτικό ίδρυμα, εξουσιοδοτημένος αντιπρόσωπος ή πρόσωπο που ενεργεί υπό την ιδιότητα του πράκτορα ή του διαχειριστή ή επειδή οι πληροφορίες αφορούν ιδιοκτησιακά συμφέροντα προσώπου».

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Υπάρχουν χώρες που δεν έχουν ακόμα ενσωματώσει στο εθνικό τους δίκαιο την οδηγία 2011/16/ΕΕ; Η Ελλάδα την έχει ενσωματώσει;

2. Με βάση την οδηγία 2011/16/ΕΕ, είναι υποχρεωμένες οι φορολογικές αρχές του Λουξεμβούργου και της Αυστρίας να παράσχουν στις ελληνικές αρχές, τα ονόματα, τα υπόλοιπα και τις κινήσεις των λογαριασμών των ελληνικών επιχειρήσεων και των ελλήνων καταθετών, που βρίσκονται στις τράπεζες των εν λόγω κρατών μελών, εφόσον τους ζητηθεί από την Ελλάδα, στα πλαίσια δειγματοληπτικών ελέγχων; Εάν ναι, γνωρίζει εάν υπάρχει σχετικό αίτημα από την ελληνική πλευρά;

Απάντηση του κ. Šemeta εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(19 Ιουνίου 2013)

Η οδηγία 2011/16/ΕΕ του Συμβουλίου σχετικά με τη διοικητική συνεργασία στον τομέα της φορολογίας έπρεπε να έχει μεταφερθεί στις εθνικές νομοθεσίες το αργότερο την 1η Ιανουαρίου 2013. Ωστόσο, δεν έχει ακόμη μεταφερθεί από όλα τα κράτη μέλη. Ειδικότερα, η Ελλάδα δεν έχει ακόμη κοινοποιήσει στην Επιτροπή την μεταφορά της οδηγίας.

Η οδηγία σχετικά με τη διοικητική συνεργασία ορίζει σαφώς, στο άρθρο 18 παράγραφος 2, ότι σε καμία περίπτωση το άρθρο 17 παράγραφοι 2 και 4 δεν θεωρείται ότι επιτρέπει στη λαμβάνουσα αρχή ενός κράτους μέλους να αρνείται την παροχή πληροφοριών αποκλειστικά και μόνον επειδή κάτοχος των πληροφοριών αυτών είναι τράπεζα, άλλο χρηματοπιστωτικό ίδρυμα, εξουσιοδοτημένος αντιπρόσωπος ή πρόσωπο που ενεργεί υπό την ιδιότητα του πράκτορα ή του διαχειριστή, ή επειδή οι πληροφορίες αφορούν ιδιοκτησιακά συμφέροντα προσώπου. Η μόνη εξαίρεση η οποία προβλέπεται στο άρθρο 18 παράγραφος 3 αφορά τις αιτήσεις που αναφέρονται σε φορολογικές περιόδους προγενέστερες της 1ης Ιανουαρίου 2011.

Για λόγους προστασίας των δεδομένων, η Επιτροπή δεν έχει πρόσβαση σε πληροφορίες σχετικά με μεμονωμένες αιτήσεις παροχής πληροφοριών που υποβάλλονται από τα κράτη μέλη.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004818/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Exchange of information on bank savings in the EU

In its reply (E-006872/2012) to my question on the sharing of bank information between Member State tax authorities in the event of spot checks, the Commission specifically states that 'Council Directive 2011/16/EU of 15 February 2011 on administrative cooperation in the field of taxation, due to enter into effect on 1 January 2013, explicitly foresees that the requested Member State may not decline to provide information solely because that information is held by a bank, other financial institution, nominee or person acting in an agency or fiduciary capacity or because it relates to ownership interests in a person'.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Are there any countries that have yet to incorporate Council Directive 2011/16/EU into their national laws? Has Greece incorporated it?

2. Are the tax authorities of Luxembourg and Austria obliged, under Council Directive 2011/16/EU, to provide the Greek authorities with names, balances and bank movements of accounts held by Greek enterprises and Greek savers in the banks of the above Member States if requested to do so by Greece within the framework of spot checks? If this is the case, does the Commission know whether such a request has been made by Greece?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2013)

Council Directive 2011/16/EU on administrative cooperation in the field of taxation should have been transposed into national legislation by 1 January 2013. However, it has not yet been transposed by all Member States. Greece, in particular, has not yet notified the Commission of the transposition of the directive.

The directive on Administrative Cooperation clearly provides in Article 18(2) that Article 17(2) and (4) shall in no case be construed as permitting a requested authority of a Member State to decline to supply information solely because this information is held by a bank, other financial institution, nominee or person acting in an agency or a fiduciary capacity or because it relates to ownership interests in a person. The only exemption, foreseen in Article 18(3), is for requests concerning taxable periods prior to 1 January 2011.

For reasons of data protection, the Commission does not have access to information about individual requests for information made by Member States.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004819/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(29 Απριλίου 2013)

Θέμα: Αύξηση του ελληνικού ελλείμματος

Σύμφωνα με τα πρόσφατα στοιχεία που απέστειλε η ελληνική κυβέρνηση στην Επιτροπή στα πλαίσια της Διαδικασίας Υπερβολικού Ελλείμματος (ΔΥΕ), το έλλειμμα του προϋπολογισμού της γενικής κυβέρνησης εμφανίζεται αρκετά μεγάλο, στο ύψος του 9,5% για το 2012. Η εξήγηση που δίνει το ελληνικό Υπουργείο Οικονομικών κάνει λόγο για «τεχνητή διόγκωση» του ελλείμματος, το οποίο θα είναι «προσωρινού χαρακτήρα», εξαιτίας των κεφαλαίων που κατέβαλε ή προτίθεται να καταβάλει για τη στήριξη των ελληνικών τραπεζών.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Γνωρίζει το μέγεθος των κρατικών δαπανών για κεφαλαιακές, ή άλλες, ενισχύσεις των ελληνικών τραπεζών για τα έτη 2011, 2012 και 2013;

2. Συγκεκριμένα για τις κρατικές δαπάνες ενίσχυσης των τραπεζών του έτους 2011, γνωρίζει εάν συνυπολογίστηκαν στο έλλειμμα του προϋπολογισμού της γενικής κυβέρνησης; Για τα έτη 2012 και 2013, τελικά θα συνυπολογιστούν οι κρατικές δαπάνες ενίσχυσης των τραπεζών;

3. Μπορεί να μου κοινοποιήσει συγκεκριμένα στοιχεία για την πορεία των κρατικών εσόδων για το έτος 2012, ανά κατηγορία εσόδων, καθώς επίσης τα προϋπολογισθέντα και πραγματοποιούμενα έσοδα των ασφαλιστικών ταμείων;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(4 Ιουλίου 2013)

Σύμφωνα με τα επίσημα στοιχεία της Eurostat, οι καθαρές δαπάνες κρατικής υποστήριξης για τις ελληνικές τράπεζες την περίοδο 2011-12 ήταν -0,3% και 4,0% του ΑΕΠ, αντίστοιχα. Τα καθαρά έσοδα για το 2011 συνδέονται με το γεγονός ότι τα έσοδα από τα τέλη για τις εγγυήσεις και το επιτόκιο των κρατικών δανείων στις τράπεζες στο πλαίσιο της υποστήριξης υπερέβη τις δαπάνες στήριξης των τραπεζών. Η καθαρή κρατική στήριξη και στα δύο χρόνια είχε ληφθεί υπόψη στην εκτίμηση του ελλείμματος ΕΣΛ 95 από τη Eurostat σε σχέση με την κοινοποίηση της ΔΥΕ. Η ανακεφαλαιοποίηση των τραπεζών που πραγματοποιείται το πρώτο εξάμηνο του 2013 αναμένεται να έχει αντίκτυπο στο ονομαστικό δημοσιονομικό έλλειμμα. Ωστόσο, η ακριβής φύση και το μέγεθος αυτών των επιπτώσεων θα εξαρτηθεί από την τελική μορφή των επιχειρήσεων, οι οποίες δεν έχουν ακόμη οριστικοποιηθεί.

Για τα πραγματικά έσοδα του κράτους, το αξιότιμο μέλος του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου παραπέμπεται στο δελτίο εκτέλεσης του προϋπολογισμού για το Δεκέμβριο του 2012 ([1]). Όπως αναφέρεται στην πρόσφατη έκθεση συμμόρφωσης όσον αφορά την Αναθεώρηση 2. στο πλαίσιο του δεύτερου προγράμματος οικονομικής προσαρμογής ([2]), παρά την κάπως βαθύτερη ύφεση το 2012 απ' ό, τι αναμενόταν κατά το διάστημα της Αξιολόγησης 1., οι άμεσοι φόροι ήταν ικανοποιητικοί σε σύγκριση με τους στόχους, αντισταθμίζοντας εν μέρει την αδύναμη έμμεση είσπραξη των φόρων, κυρίως του ΦΠΑ. Οι κοινωνικές εισφορές υστέρησαν σε σχέση με τον στόχο, καθώς επηρεάστηκαν αρνητικά από τις προσδοκίες του νέου συστήματος διακανονισμού οφειλόμενων εισφορών κοινωνικής ασφάλισης.

([1]) http://www.minfin.gr/portal/en/resource/contentObject/contentTypes/genericContentResourceObject,fileResourceObject,arrayOfFileResourceTypeObject/topicNames/budgetExecutionBulletin/pageNumber/3/resourceRepresentationTemplate/contentObjectListAlternativeTemplate#fragment-2

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2013/pdf/ocp148_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004819/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Increase in the Greek deficit

According to recent information sent by the Greek Government to the Commission under the excessive deficit procedure (EDP), the general government budget deficit appears quite large: 9.5% for 2012. The explanation from the Greek Finance Ministry mentions 'artificial increases' in the debt of a 'temporary nature', due to the funds it has contributed or is intending to contribute to support the Greek banks.

1. Does the Commission know the level of state spending on capital or other support for Greek banks for 2011, 2012 and 2013?

2. In relation to state spending in support of the banks in 2011, does it know whether this was factored into the general government budget deficit? Will state spending in support of the banks eventually be factored in for the years 2012 and 2013?

3. Can it provide specific information on the developments in state revenues in 2012, by revenue category, as well as forecast and actual revenues of the social insurance funds?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(4 July 2013)

According to the official Eurostat figures, the net state support expenditures for Greek banks in 2011-12 was -0.3% and 4.0% of GDP, respectively. The net revenues in 2011 pertain to the fact that revenues from fees on guarantees and interest on state loans provided to banks in relation to the support exceeded expenditures relating to bank support. The net state support in both years was factored into the ESA 95 deficit assessment by Eurostat in relation to the EDP notification. The bank recapitalisation taking place in the first half of 2013 is expected to impact on the headline fiscal deficit. However, the exact nature and size of such impact will depend on the ultimate form of the operations, which are not yet finalised.

For the actual state revenues, the honorable Member of the European Parliament is referred to the budget execution bulletin for December 2012 ([1]). As stated in the recent compliance report for the 2. Review under the Second Economic Adjustment Programme ([2]) despite the somewhat deeper recession in 2012 than expected at the time of the 1. Review, direct taxes held up quite well compared to targets, which partly compensated for weak indirect tax collection, notably VAT. Social contributions fell somewhat short of the target, as they were adversely affected by expectations of a new settlement scheme for social security debt.

([1]) http://www.minfin.gr/portal/en/resource/contentObject/contentTypes/genericContentResourceObject,fileResourceObject,arrayOfFileResourceTypeObject/topicNames/budgetExecutionBulletin/pageNumber/3/resourceRepresentationTemplate/contentObjectListAlternativeTemplate#fragment-2.

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2013/pdf/ocp148_en.pdf

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004820/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(29 Απριλίου 2013)

Θέμα: Επέκταση αεροδρομίου Χανίων και κρατική ενίσχυση

Πρόσφατα ανακοινώθηκε ότι το ελληνικό Υπουργείο Υποδομών ενέκρινε το αποτέλεσμα του διαγωνισμού του έργου «Επέκταση αεροσταθμού, λοιπές βοηθητικές εγκαταστάσεις και διαμόρφωση περιβάλλοντος χώρου στον Αερολιμένα Χανίων "Ι. Δασκαλογιάννης"» προϋπολογισμού 110 085 000 ευρώ. Ωστόσο, στην επίσημη ιστοσελίδα του Ταμείου Αξιοποίησης Ιδιωτικής Περιουσίας του Δημοσίου (ΤΑΙΠΕΔ), το συγκεκριμένο περιφερειακό αεροδρόμιο συγκαταλέγεται στα υπό ιδιωτικοποίηση περιουσιακά στοιχεία του δημοσίου.

Με δεδομένο ότι τα κονδύλια για την επέκταση του, υπό ιδιωτικοποίηση, περιφερειακού αεροδρομίου Χανίων προέρχονται τόσο από δημόσιους πόρους, όσο και από το ΕΣΠΑ, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Αποτελούν έμμεση κρατική ενίσχυση, προς την ιδιωτική εταιρεία που θα αγοράσει τελικά το αεροδρόμιο Χανίων, τα έργα εκσυγχρονισμού και επέκτασης, με δημόσιους και κοινοτικούς πόρους;

2. Τι προβλέπει ακριβώς η κοινοτική νομοθεσία για την αντιμετώπιση παρόμοιων περιπτώσεων;

Απάντηση του κ. Almunia εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(27 Ιουνίου 2013)

Στις 25 Ιουλίου 2012, η Επιτροπή ενέκρινε κοινοποιηθέν μέτρο σχετικά με τον εκσυγχρονισμό του αερολιμένα Χανίων στην Κρήτη. Η Επιτροπή κατέληξε στο συμπέρασμα ότι η δημόσια χρηματοδότηση (συμπεριλαμβανομένης της χρηματοδότησης που θα χορηγηθεί στο πλαίσιο των επιχειρησιακών προγραμμάτων της ΕΕ) συνιστά ενίσχυση προς τον φορέα λειτουργίας του αερολιμένα και ότι η ενίσχυση αυτή είναι συμβατή με την εσωτερική αγορά.

Στο στάδιο αυτό, η διαδικασία ιδιωτικοποίησης είναι σε εξέλιξη. Η Επιτροπή βρίσκεται σε στενή επαφή με τις ελληνικές αρχές, εξετάζοντας θέματα δικαίου ανταγωνισμού προκειμένου να εξασφαλιστεί ότι η διαδικασία ιδιωτικοποίησης δεν συνεπάγεται τη χορήγηση συμπληρωματικής ενίσχυσης στον αγοραστή.

Η σχετική νομοθεσία της ΕΕ περιλαμβάνεται στα κεφάλαια της Συνθήκης για τη λειτουργία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης σχετικά με τις δημόσιες συμβάσεις και το δίκαιο του ανταγωνισμού. Όσον αφορά τις κρατικές ενισχύσεις, παραπέμπουμε στην XXIII έκθεση για την πολιτική ανταγωνισμού, στην οποία εξετάζεται η ιδιωτικοποίηση των δημοσίων επιχειρήσεων ([1]). Όταν μια εταιρεία ιδιωτικοποιείται μέσω πώλησης, πρέπει να τηρούνται ορισμένες σωρευτικές προϋποθέσεις:

α) πρέπει να προκηρύσσεται πρόσκληση υποβολής προσφορών, ανοικτή σε όλους, διαφανής και άνευ όρων,

β) τα περιουσιακά στοιχεία πρέπει να πωλούνται στον πλειοδότη, και

γ) πρέπει να παρέχεται στους υποψήφιους επαρκής χρόνος και πληροφορίες με στόχο την κατάλληλη αξιολόγηση των περιουσιακών στοιχείων η οποία αποτελεί τη βάση για την προσφορά τους.

Εάν η ιδιωτικοποίηση πληροί τις προϋποθέσεις αυτές, η Επιτροπή θα θεωρήσει ότι η τιμή πώλησης ήταν η εύλογη αγοραία τιμή και ότι δεν υφίσταται κρατική ενίσχυση ([2]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/competition/publications/annual_report/2012/part1_el.pdf

([2]) Οι ακόλουθες αποφάσεις της Επιτροπής παρέχουν ορισμένα παραδείγματα της πρακτικής της Επιτροπής όσον αφορά τις ιδιωτικοποιήσεις: 92/321/ΕΟΚ, της 25ης Μαρτίου 1992, Intelhorce SA (ΕΕ L 176 της 22.6.1992, σ. 62), 2002/896/ΕΚ, της 30ής Ιανουαρίου 2002, Gothaer Fahrzeugtechnik (ΕΕ L 314 της 18.11.2002, σ. 62) 2001/1/ΕΚ, της 15ης Φεβρουαρίου 2001, Dessauer Gerδteindustrie GmbH (ΕΕ L 1 της 4.1.2001, σ. 10), αριθ. 1999/720/ΕΚ, ΕΚΑΧ της 8ης Ιουλίου 1999 (Gröditzer Stahlwerke (ΕΕ L 292 της 13.11.1999, σ. 27)· 2001/120/ΕΚ της 13.6.2000, Kali und Salz (ΕΕ L 44 της 15.2.2001, σ. 39)· 2001/798/ΕΚ της 13.12.2000, SKET Walzwerkstechnik (ΕΕ L 301 της 17.11.2001)· 1999/338/ΕΚ της 16.12.1998, Società Italiana per Condotte d'Acqua SpA (ΕΕ L 129 της 22.5.1999, σ. 30)· Απόφαση της 20.6.2001, στο πλαίσιο της κρατικής ενίσχυσης N 804/2000, πώληση μετοχών της GSG από το ομοσπονδιακό κρατίδιο του Βερολίνου (ΕΕ C 67 της 16.3.2002, σ. 33)· 2006/900/ΕΚ της 20.10.2005, Componenta (ΕΕ L 353 της 13.12.2006, σ. 36)· 97/81/ΕΚ της 30.7.1996, Head Tyrolia Mares (ΕΕ L 25 της 28.1.1997, σ. 26)· 2000/628/ΕΚ της 11.4.2000, Centrale del Latte di Roma (ΕΕ L 265 της 19.10.2000, σ. 15).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004820/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: State aid and the expansion of Chania airport

The Greek Ministry for Infrastructure, Transport and Networks recently approved the result of the 'Terminal extension, associated ancillary facilities and landscaping at Chania's I. Daskalogiannis Airport' tender, which has a budget of EUR 110 085 000. On the official website of the Hellenic Republic Asset Development Fund, however, the airport in question is listed among the state assets earmarked for privatisation.

Given that the funds for the expansion of Chania regional airport (under privatisation) come both from public sources and the NSRF, will the Commission say:

1. Does the use of State and Community funds to finance the modernisation and expansion activities constitute indirect state aid to the private company that will eventually acquire Chania Airport?

2. What exactly does Community legislation provide for in cases such as this?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2013)

On 25 July 2012, the Commission approved a notified measure concerning the modernisation of Chania Airport in Crete. The Commission concluded that the public funding (including the funding that will be granted under the framework of EU operational programmes) constitutes aid to the airport operator and that this aid is compatible with the internal market.

At this stage, the privatisation procedure is ongoing. The Commission is in close contact with the Greek authorities, addressing competition law concerns to ensure that the privatisation process does not entail the granting of additional aid to the purchaser.

The relevant EC law is contained in the Chapters of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union concerning Public Procurement and Competition Law. As far as state aid is concerned reference can be made to the XXIII report on competition policy which addresses privatisation of public companies ([1]). Where a company is privatised through a sale certain cumulative conditions must be observed :

(a) a competitive tender must be held that is open to all, is transparent and unconditional;

(b) the asset must be sold to the highest bidder; and

(c) bidders must be given enough time and information to carry out a proper valuation of the assets as the basis for their bid.

If the privatisation meets these conditions the Commission will assume that the sale price was the fair market price and that no state aid is involved ([2]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/competition/publications/annual_report/2012/part1_en.pdf

([2]) The following Commission decisions provide some examples of the Commission's practice on privatisations: 92/321/EEC of 25 March 1992 Intelhorce SA (OJ L 176, 22.6.1992, p. 62), 2002/896/EC of 30 January 2002 Gothaer Fahrzeugtechnik (OJ L 314, 18.11.2002, p.62); 2001/1/EC of 15 February 2001, Dessauer Geräteindustrie GmbH (OJ L 1, 4.1.2001, p. 10), 1999/720/EC, ECSC of 8 July 1999 Gröditzer Stahlwerke (OJ L 292, 13.11.1999, p. 27); 2001/120/EC of 13.6.2000 Kali und Salz (OJ L 44, 15.2.2001, p. 39); 2001/798/EC of 13.12.2000 SKET Walzwerkstechnik (OJ L 301, 17.11.2001); 1999/338/EC of 16.12.1998 Società Italiana per Condotte d'Acqua SpA (OJ L 129, 22.5.1999, p. 30); Decision of 20.6.2001 in state aid N 804/2000, Sale of shares of the GSG by Land Berlin (OJ C 67, 16.3.2002, p. 33); 2006/900/EC of 20.10.2005 Componenta (OJ L 353, 13.12.2006, p. 36); 97/81/EC of 30.7.1996 Head Tyrolia Mares (OJ L 25, 28.1.1997, p. 26); 2000/628/EC of 11.4.2000 Centrale del Latte di Roma (OJ L 265, 19.10.2000, p. 15).

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004821/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(29 Απριλίου 2013)

Θέμα: Οφειλές τραπεζών προς το ελληνικό Δημόσιο

Μετά από ερμηνεία του νόμου 3723/2008 σχετικά με την εξόφληση των κονδυλίων που έλαβαν οι ελληνικές τράπεζες από το Ελληνικό Ταμείο Χρηματοπιστωτικής Σταθερότητας, αποφασίσθηκε η επιστροφή εκ μέρους των ελληνικών τραπεζών, προς το ελληνικό δημόσιο, ποσού ύψους περίπου 500 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ ετησίως, το οποίο εγγράφηκε και στους σχετικούς προϋπολογισμούς.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Εκτελέσθηκαν οι υποχρεώσεις αυτές για το έτος 2012; Τι ποσό καταβλήθηκε εκ μέρους των τραπεζών; Καταβλήθηκαν τα ποσά για το 2013; Αν όχι, υπάρχουν δυσκολίες για την καταβολή τους; Τι είδους;

2. Το 2014 υποχρεούνται οι ανωτέρω τράπεζες να επιστρέψουν τα κεφάλαια (4,5 δισ.) στο ελληνικό δημόσιο δυνάμει του Νόμου 3723/2008. Υπάρχουν αυτά τα κεφάλαια; Τι επιπτώσεις θα έχει η επιστροφή τους στην κεφαλαιακή επάρκεια αυτών των τραπεζών;

3. Τι προβλέψεις έχει εγγράψει ο ελληνικός προϋπολογισμός του 2013 για την είσπραξη των αποδόσεων των Αντιστρέψιμων Ομολογιών (Cocos) που κατέχει το ελληνικό δημόσιο ως αντάλλαγμα στα κεφάλαια που διατέθηκαν το Δεκέμβριο του 2012 από το Ελληνικό Ταμείο Χρηματοπιστωτικής Σταθερότητας (ΕΤΧΣ) στις «συστημικές» ελληνικές τράπεζες;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(24 Ιουνίου 2013)

1. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή παραπέμπει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου στην απάντησή της στην ερώτηση E-3756/2013 ([1]).

2. Οι προνομιούχες μετοχές πρέπει να εξαγοράζονται από την τράπεζα στην τιμή έκδοσης, πέντε έτη μετά την απόκτησή τους ή ενωρίτερα, μετά από έγκριση της Τράπεζας της Ελλάδας. Μετά τη λήξη της πενταετούς περιόδου (Μάιος 2014), εάν η γενική συνέλευση των μετόχων της τράπεζας δεν έχει αποφασίσει να εξαγοράσει τις μετοχές, επιβάλλεται, με απόφαση του Υπουργού Οικονομικών μετά από εισήγηση της Τράπεζας της Ελλάδας, σωρευτική αύξηση της τιμής κατά 2% ετησίως, επιπλέον του ετήσιου σταθερού ποσοστού απόδοσης που οφείλεται στο Ελληνικό Δημόσιο σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 1 (3) του Ν. 3723/2008. Επιπλέον, το πρόγραμμα οικονομικής προσαρμογής για την Ελλάδα — δεύτερη αναθεώρηση — Μάιος του 2013 ([2]) — αναφέρει ότι ο νόμος 3723/2008 έχει τροποποιηθεί ώστε να εξασφαλιστεί ότι οι τράπεζες δεν θα είναι υποχρεωμένες να καταβάλλουν μερίσματα επί των προνομιούχων μετοχών, ή τέλη αντ' αυτών, έως ότου οι τράπεζες καταστούν κερδοφόρες.

3. Σε αντάλλαγμα για την ενδιάμεση χρηματοδότηση, το ΕΤΧΣ έχει ήδη εισπράξει ένα εφάπαξ τέλος τον Δεκέμβριο του 2012 για ολόκληρο το ποσό της ενδιάμεσης χρηματοδότησης. Επομένως δεν πρέπει να αναμένονται περαιτέρω τέλη για την ενδιάμεση χρηματοδότηση. Επιπλέον, δεδομένου ότι η διαδικασία ανακεφαλαιοποίησης είναι ακόμη σε εξέλιξη και συνεπώς η ποσότητα των προς έκδοση μετατρέψιμων ομολόγων είναι ακόμα άγνωστη, δεν έχουν γίνει ακόμη προβλέψεις στον ελληνικό προϋπολογισμό για την είσπραξη των τοκομεριδίων των «υπό αίρεση» μετατρέψιμων ομολόγων (CoCos).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2013/op148_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004821/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Bank debts to the Greek State

According to the interpretation of Law 3723/2008 on the settlement of funds obtained by Greek banks from the Hellenic Financial Stability Fund, it has been ruled that Greek banks should repay approximately EUR 500 million per annum to the Greek State and this has been entered in the relevant budgets.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Have these liabilities been discharged for 2012? How much have the banks paid? Have the amounts been paid for 2013? If not, was there difficulty paying them? What sort of difficulties?

2. In 2014, the above banks are obliged to repay capital (EUR 4.5 billion) to the Greek State under Law 3723/2008. Do these capital funds exist? What repercussions will their repayment have on the capital adequacy of these banks?

3. What forecasts have been made in the 2013 Greek budget for receipt of yields from the reversible bonds (Cocos) that the Greek State owns in exchange for the capital that was made available in December 2012 by the Hellenic Financial Stability Fund to the 'systemic' Greek banks?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(24 June 2013)

1. The European Commission invites the Honourable Member to see its reply to Question E-3756/2013 ([1]).

2. The preference shares are to be repurchased by the bank at the issue price, five years after their acquisition or earlier, following approval by the Bank of Greece. After the expiry of the five-year period (May 2014), if the General Assembly of the bank has not decided to repurchase the shares, a cumulative increase in the price of 2% per year will be imposed in addition to the annual fixed rate of return that is due to the Greek State under Article 1(3) of Law 3723/2008, by a decision of the Minister of Finance, following a recommendation of the Bank of Greece. Additionally, the Economic Adjustment Program for Greece — Second Review May 2013 ([2]) states that Law 3723/2008 has been amended to ensure that banks will not be required to pay any dividends on preference shares, or fees in lieu of this, until banks are profitable.

3. In return for the Bridge Capital, the HFSF received already a one-off fee in December 2012 for the entire amount of the Bridge Capital. Therefore no further fees for the bridge capital should be expected. Furthermore, since the recapitalisation process is still ongoing, and thus the amount of CoCo's to be issued is still unknown, no forecasts have been made yet for the Greek budget for the receipt of the CoCo coupons

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2013/op148_en.htm

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004823/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(29 Απριλίου 2013)

Θέμα: Stress-Tests ευρωπαϊκών τραπεζών

Ανησυχίες στο καταθετικό και επενδυτικό κοινό στην ΕΕ έχει δημιουργήσει το γεγονός ότι, παρά τα διαδοχικά stress tests στις ευρωπαϊκές τράπεζες, πολλές από αυτές παρουσιάζουν προβλήματα με την κεφαλαιακή τους επάρκεια. Παραδείγματος χάριν, τα stress-tests δεν φαίνεται να ήταν αποκαλυπτικά στην περίπτωση των τραπεζών της Κύπρου, οι οποίες σήμερα είναι πτωχευμένες και βρίσκονται σε διαδικασίες ανακεφαλαιοποίησης ούτε ανέδειξαν την έκθεση των γερμανικών τραπεζών σε πιστωτικά παράγωγα, όπως της γερμανικής τράπεζας Deutsche Bank, η οποία έχει τεθεί υπό καθεστώς ελέγχου, τόσο από την Αμερικανική Επιτροπή Κεφαλαιαγοράς (SEC), όσο και από την Κεντρική Τράπεζα της Γερμανίας (Bundesbank), για να εξακριβωθεί εάν, κατά τη διάρκεια της χρηματοπιστωτικής κρίσης 2007/2008, απέκρυψε ζημιές σε πιστωτικά παράγωγα περίπου 12 δισ. ευρώ.

Πρόσθετη, μάλιστα, ανησυχία δημιουργείται και από το γεγονός ότι πολλές από τις τράπεζες της Γερμανίας αποκλείστηκαν από τα stress-tests, τόσο του 2010, όσο και του 2011, με αποτέλεσμα να μην διαθέτουμε πλήρη στοιχεία, όσον αφορά τον κίνδυνο που ενδέχεται να παρουσιάζουν συγκεκριμένες τραπεζικές πρακτικές.

Με δεδομένα τα παραπάνω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Για ποιους λόγους και με ποια κριτήρια αποκλείστηκαν πολλές από τις γερμανικές τράπεζες, και κυρίως οι Landesbanken και Sparkassen, από τα πανευρωπαϊκά stress-test του 2010 και 2011;

2. Ποιες ήταν οι κύριες παραδοχές-σενάρια αυτών των ελέγχων;

3. Εξετάστηκε η ενδεχόμενη αλληλοσύνδεση των ισολογισμών των αποκλεισθεισών γερμανικών τραπεζών, με τις 12 τράπεζες που τελικά δέχτηκαν να ελεγχθούν στα stress-tests;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(19 Ιουνίου 2013)

Οι προσομοιώσεις ακραίων καταστάσεων (stress tests) που οργάνωσε η ΕΑΤ σε επίπεδο ΕΕ κάλυψαν πάνω από το 65% των συνολικών στοιχείων ενεργητικού του τραπεζικού συστήματος της ΕΕ και τουλάχιστον το 50% των εθνικών τραπεζικών τομέων σε κάθε κράτος μέλος της ΕΕ. Στον τελευταίο γύρω των προσομοιώσεων αυτών σε επίπεδο ΕΕ συμμετείχαν 91 τράπεζες, που αντιστοιχούν σε 27 τραπεζικά συστήματα.

Για λεπτομέρειες σχετικά με όλες τις τράπεζες που συμμετείχαν στις προσομοιώσεις ακραίων καταστάσεων σε επίπεδο ΕΕ (συμπεριλαμβανομένων των γερμανικών τραπεζών) βλ. την σελίδα ΕΑΤ ([1]) που περιλαμβάνει μεμονωμένα αποτελέσματα.

Όσον αφορά τις κύριες παραδοχές των σεναρίων αυτών των προσομοιώσεων, κατέδειξαν έντονη επιδείνωση των βασικών μακροοικονομικών μεταβλητών, όπως του ΑΕΠ, της ανεργίας και των τιμών των κατοικιών. Το αρνητικό σενάριο που εκπονήθηκε από την ΕΑΤ, συμπλήρωσε εν συνεχεία τις μακροοικονομικές προβλέψεις της Επιτροπής. Για περαιτέρω λεπτομέρειες, παρακαλείσθε να συμβουλευθείτε την ιστοσελίδα της ΕΑΤ στην οποία περιγράφεται λεπτομερώς η μεθοδολογία που χρησιμοποιήθηκε για τις προσομοιώσεις ακραίων καταστάσεων του 2011 ([2]).

Όπως και στις αντίστοιχες προσομοιώσεις του παρελθόντος, η ΕΑΤ δημοσίευσε τα αποτελέσματα των τραπεζών που συμμετείχαν στην προσομοίωση και συμφώνησαν για τη δημοσίευσή τους. Η μόνιμη αξιολόγηση ενός ολόκληρου εθνικού τραπεζικού συστήματος αποτελεί καθήκον του αρμόδιου εθνικού εποπτικού οργάνου. Επιπλέον, ο εντοπισμός συστημικών μακροοικονομικών κινδύνων στην ΕΕ εναπόκειται επίσης στην αρμοδιότητα του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου συστημικού κινδύνου. Τόσο τα εθνικά εποπτικά όργανα όσο και το Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο συστημικού κινδύνου συμμετείχαν στις προσομοιώσεις ακραίων καταστάσεων της ΕΑΤ.

([1]) http://www.eba.europa.eu/EU-wide-stress-testing/2011/2011-EU-wide-stress-test-results.aspx
([2]) http://www.eba.europa.eu/EU-wide-stress-testing/2011/The-EBA-publishes-details-of-its-stress-test-scena.aspx

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004823/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: European bank stress tests

Concerns have been raised among EU savers and investors by the fact that many European banks have capital adequacy issues in spite of successive stress tests. For example, the stress tests apparently failed to reveal the situation at the Cypriot banks which are now bankrupt and have commenced recapitalisation procedures, nor did they indicate the exposure to derivatives of German banks such as Deutsche Bank, which has been placed under a control regime both by the Securities and Exchange Commission in the US and by the Bundesbank, in order to ascertain whether it concealed losses in derivatives of around EUR 12 billion during the financial crisis of 2007-08.

Further concerns have also been provoked by the fact that many German banks were exempted from the stress test, both in 2010 and in 2011, with the result that we do not have the full facts in our possession regarding the risks that specific banking practices might present.

Given the above, will the Commission say:

1. For what reasons and according to which criteria were many German banks, in particular the Landesbanken and Sparkassen, exempted from the pan-European stress tests of 2010 and 2011?

2. What were the main assumptions and scenarios of those tests?

3. Has an examination been carried out into possible links between the balance sheets of the exempted German banks and those of the 12 banks that eventually agreed to undergo stress tests?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2013)

The EU-wide stress tests of 2010 and 2011 organised by the EBA covered over 65% of the EU banking system total assets, and at least 50% of the national banking sectors in each EU Member State. 91 banks participated in the last round of EU-wide stress tests, involving 27 banking systems.

For details on all the banks participating in the 2011 EU-wide stress tests (including the German) please see the EBA page ([1]) containing the individual results.

Regarding the main assumptions of the test's scenarios, these included a marked deterioration in the main macroeconomic variables, such as GDP, unemployment, and house prices. The adverse scenario was prepared by the ECB and then applied on top of the Commission's macroeconomic forecast. For further details please consult the EBA web page detailing the 2011 stress tests' methodology ([2]).

Following past stress test exercises the EBA has published the results of the banks that participated in the test and agreed to the publication. The permanent assessment of an entire national banking system is the task of the competent national supervisor. Additionally, identifying systemic macroeconomic risks in the EU is also the task of the European Systemic Risk Board. Both the national supervisors and the ESRB were closely involved in the EBA stress tests.

([1]) http://www.eba.europa.eu/EU-wide-stress-testing/2011/2011-EU-wide-stress-test-results.aspx.
([2]) http://www.eba.europa.eu/EU-wide-stress-testing/2011/The-EBA-publishes-details-of-its-stress-test-scena.aspx.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-004824/13
aan de Raad
Philip Claeys (NI)
(29 april 2013)

Betreft: Uittredingsvergoeding, wedde, pensioen, regelgeving verloning voorzitter Europese Raad

Wat is het huidige maandelijkse bruto basissalaris van de permanente voorzitter van de Europese Raad? Graag een antwoord in euro in de huidige situatie.

Welk percentage belastingen wordt hierop betaald?

Welk bedrag aan vergoedingen werd aan de permanente voorzitter in 2012 uitbetaald bovenop dit basissalaris? Graag een opsplitsing per categorie bijkomende vergoedingen (gezinstoelage, kindertoelage, standplaatstoelage, representatietoelage, inrichtingskosten, verhuiskosten, reiskosten, hotelkosten, …) en een antwoord in euro in de huidige situatie.

Wordt de uittredingsvergoeding van de voorzitter van de Raad nog steeds geregeld door verordening nr 422/67/EEG uit 1967? Zal deze dus vastgesteld worden op 50 % van het basissalaris gedurende 3 jaar?

De Verordening stelt dat pensioen kan aangevraagd worden vanaf 65 en dat elk mandaatjaar geldt voor 4,5 %. Wordt dit percentage ook toegekend voor de jaren uittredingsvergoeding?

Is de Raad van mening dat de huidige verloning strookt met de boodschap van besparingen en zuinigheid die de EU en de lidstaten momenteel verkondigen aan hun burgers?

Antwoord
(1 juli 2013)

Alle door het geachte Parlementslid genoemde punten zijn geregeld in besluiten en wettelijke voorschriften, waarvan iedereen dus kennis kan nemen.

De arbeidsvoorwaarden van de voorzitter van de Europese Raad zijn vastgesteld in het Raads-besluit van 1 december 2009 ([1]). Zij stemmen overeen met hetgeen is bepaald in Verordening nr. 422/67/EEG, nr. 5/67/Euratom van de Raad van 25 juli 1967 ([2]), die van toepassing is op de voorzitter van de Commissie en de president van het Hof van Justitie.

De overbruggingstoelage die de voorzitter van de Europese Raad geniet, is evenals de fiscale positie geregeld bij Verordening nr. 422/67/EEG, laatstelijk gewijzigd in 2012.

In die verordening is bepaald dat het pensioen kan worden aangevraagd vanaf de leeftijd van 65 jaar, en dat voor elk geheel ambtsjaar 4,275 % wordt toegekend (het percentage is in 2004 gewijzigd). Voor de jaren waarin de overbruggingstoelage wordt betaald, worden geen rechten opgebouwd.

([1]) PB L 322 van 9.12.2009, blz. 35.
([2]) PB L 187 van 8.8.1967, blz. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004824/13
to the Council
Philip Claeys (NI)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Retirement allowance, salary, pension and rules on the remuneration of the President of the European Council

What is the current gross monthly salary of the permanent President of the European Council? Please state it in euros in accordance with the present situation.

What percentage of this does he pay in tax?

In 2012, how much was paid to the permanent President in allowances in addition to this basic salary? Please provide a breakdown per category of allowance (family allowance, child allowance, residence allowance, entertainment allowance, installation allowance, removal expenses, travel expenses, hotel expenses, etc.) and state the figures in euros in accordance with the present situation.

Is the retirement allowance of the President of the Council still governed by Regulation (EEC) No 422/67 dating from 1967? Will it therefore comprise 50% of the basic salary for three years?

The regulation stipulates that a pension may be applied for from age 65 and that each year in office is worth 4.5%. Does an entitlement equivalent to this percentage also accrue during the years in which the retirement allowance is paid?

Does the Council consider the present remuneration to be compatible with the message of austerity and cost-cutting which the EU and the Member States are currently delivering to their citizens?

Reply
(1 July 2013)

The matters to which the Honourable Member refers are all governed by decisions and legislation and are therefore already in the public domain.

The Council Decision of 1 December 2009 lays down the conditions of employment of the President of the European Council ([1]). It lays down the same provisions as Council Regulation No 422/67/EEC, 5/67/Euratom of 25 July 1967 ([2]), which applies to the President of the Commission and to the President of the Court of Justice.

The transitional allowance of the President of the European Council is governed by Regulation No 422/67/EEC, last modified in 2012, as is taxation.

The regulation stipulates that a pension may be applied for from age 65 and that each year in office is worth 4.275% (percentage changed in 2004). No entitlements accrue during the years in which the transitional allowance is paid.

([1]) OJ L 322, 9.12.2009, p. 35.
([2]) OJ L 187, 8.8.1967, p. 1.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004825/13
à la Commission (Vice-Présidente / Haute Représentante)
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(29 avril 2013)

Objet: VP/HR — Prisonniers politiques palestiniens

Le 23 février 2013, Arafat Jaradat, 30 ans, est mort «d'un arrêt cardiaque» après cinq jours d'interrogatoire. Quelques semaines plus tard, Missarah Abu-Hamdieh, 64 ans, et atteint d'un cancer, est mort en prison, victime de négligence médicale.

Les prisonniers politiques palestiniens sont victimes de pratiques courantes dans les prisons israéliennes: torture, négligence médicale et maintien en détention administrative (enfermement sans charge ni procès, renouvelable à l'infini tous les 6 mois). Ces pratiques violent la 4e convention de Genève et le droit humanitaire international.

À ce jour, environ 4 800 prisonniers sont détenus dans les prisons et centres de détention israéliens. Parmi eux, au moins 220 enfants dont 45 de moins de 16 ans, 2 anciens ministres, 14 députés, 109 prisonniers d'avant les accords d'Oslo et 198 autres sont en détention administrative.

Plus de 200 Palestiniens sont décédés, depuis 1967, dans les prisons israéliennes ou centres de détention. D'après une récente déclaration de plus de 14 ONG palestiniennes et israéliennes, 71 prisonniers sont morts des conséquences des tortures infligées.

Des centaines de prisonniers palestiniens croupissent dans les prisons israéliennes dans des conditions de santé extrêmement graves, sans avoir droit à un suivi médical ni avoir accès aux soins de santé adéquats, à quoi vient s'ajouter l'isolement familial, ce qui aggrave d'autant plus leur situation.

Compte tenu du fait que l'Union européenne se doit de respecter et de faire respecter le droit humanitaire international avec ses partenaires commerciaux:

1. ne serait-il pas judicieux de la part de la Commission et de l'Union européenne de procéder au gel de tous les accords avec Israël jusqu'à ce que cessent de telles pratiques et que soient libérés les prisonniers politiques palestiniens, parmi lesquels se trouve Marwan Barghouthi, parlementaire palestinien et leader politique emprisonné depuis 11 ans?

2. quand l'Union va-t-elle appeler Israël à protéger la santé et la vie des prisonniers palestiniens en vertu de ses obligations en matière de droit international?

3. la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante ne pense-t-elle pas qu'il est temps de procéder à une enquête indépendante sur toutes les allégations de tortures (physiques et psychiques) infligées aux détenus et d'autres actes de cruauté, de traitement dégradant et inhumain subis par les prisonniers Palestiniens?

Réponse donnée par Mme Ashton, haute représentante/vice-présidente, au nom de la Commission
(20 juin 2013)

L'Honorable Parlementaire est invité à se référer à la réponse donnée à la question écrite E-003922/2013 ([1]) posée précédemment.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html#sidesForm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004825/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Palestinian political prisoners

On 23 February 2013, Arafat Jaradat, aged 30, died of a 'cardiac arrest' after being interrogated for five days. A few weeks later, Maysara Abu Hamdiyeh, aged 64, and a cancer patient, died in prison, a victim of medical negligence.

Palestinian political prisoners held in Israeli prisons are victims of common practices such as torture, medical negligence and administrative arrest (detention without charge or trial, which can be renewed indefinitely every six months). Those practices breach the Fourth Geneva Convention and international humanitarian law.

To date, some 4 800 prisoners are being held in Israeli prisons and detention centres. They include at least 220 children, 45 of whom are under 16 years old, 2 former ministers, 14 elected representatives, 109 pre-Oslo Accord prisoners, and 198 others held under administrative arrest.

Since 1967 more than 200 Palestinians have died in Israeli prisons or detention centres. According to a recent declaration by more than 14 Palestinian and Israeli non-governmental organisations, 71 prisoners have died as a result of torture.

Hundreds of Palestinian prisoners are rotting in Israeli jails in extremely serious health conditions, without having the right to medical supervision or access to proper healthcare. They are also isolated from their families, which makes their situation even worse.

Since the European Union has a duty to uphold and enforce international humanitarian law with its trade partners:

1. would it not be advisable for the Commission and the European Union to suspend all agreements with Israel until such practices cease and Palestinian political prisoners, including Marwan Barghouti, a Palestinian elected representative and political leader imprisoned for the last 11 years, are freed;

2. when will the EU call on Israel to protect the health and lives of Palestinian prisoners pursuant to its obligations under international law;

3. does the VP/HR not believe it is time to conduct an independent investigation into all the allegations of torture (physical and psychological) inflicted on the detainees and of other acts of cruelty and degrading and inhumane treatment suffered by Palestinian prisoners?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2013)

The Honourable Member is referred to the answer given to previous Written Question E-003922/2013 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq#sidesForm.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004826/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(29 Απριλίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ξέπλυμα μαύρου χρήματος σε χώρες της ΕΕ

Σύμφωνα με μελέτη του Basle Institute on Governance που κατατάσσει το σύνολο των χωρών ανάλογα με τον κίνδυνο να λαμβάνουν χώρα δραστηριότητες ξεπλύματος μαύρου χρήματος (AML Index 2012), το Λουξεμβούργο βρίσκεται στην 49η θέση, η Γερμανία στην 68η θέση και η Αυστρία στην 74η θέση, σε μεγάλη απόσταση από την Κύπρο, η οποία βρίσκεται στην 114η θέση της κατάταξης.

Με δεδομένο ότι μια από τις προϋποθέσεις που έθεσε η ΕΕ στην Κύπρο για τη λήψη χρηματοδοτικής στήριξης ήταν και η διενέργεια ενδελεχούς έρευνας για την εφαρμογή της νομοθεσίας κατά του ξεπλύματος μαύρου χρήματος από τη Moneyval του Συμβουλίου της Ευρώπης, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Πότε σκοπεύει να απαιτήσει από το Λουξεμβούργο, τη Γερμανία και την Αυστρία να τύχουν ενδελεχούς έρευνας από τη Moneyval του Συμβουλίου της Ευρώπης, όπως η Κύπρος, αφού στην κατάταξη AML Index 2012 βρίσκονται σε υψηλότερες θέσεις;

Απάντηση του κ. Barnier εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(25 Ιουνίου 2013)

Στις ιδιαίτερες συνθήκες του χρηματοδοτικού πακέτου βοήθειας, οι κυπριακές αρχές και η Ευρωομάδα συμφώνησαν να διενεργήσουν πρόσθετη ενδελεχή έρευνα όσον αφορά το καθεστώς για την καταπολέμηση της νομιμοποίησης εσόδων από παράνομες δραστηριότητες στην Κύπρο, και ιδίως όσον αφορά την πραγματική συμμόρφωση των τραπεζών με την κυπριακή νομοθεσία για την καταπολέμηση της νομιμοποίησης εσόδων από παράνομες δραστηριότητες. Ως εκ τούτου, η Επιτροπή δεν θεωρεί ότι επί του παρόντος απαιτούνται παρόμοιες έρευνες για άλλα κράτη μέλη. Κατά γενικό κανόνα, η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί την υλοποίηση του καθεστώτος της ΕΕ για την καταπολέμηση της νομιμοποίησης εσόδων από παράνομες δραστηριότητες σε όλα τα κράτη μέλη και τα τρία αναφερόμενα κράτη μέλη οπωσδήποτε υπόκεινται στις διαδικασίες αξιολόγησης και παρακολούθησης της συνέχειας.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004826/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Money laundering in the EU

According to a Basel Institute on Governance study that classifies all countries by risk levels in respect of money laundering activities (AML Index 2012), Luxembourg is ranked 49th, Germany 68th and Austria 74th, far ahead of Cyprus, which is 114th on the list.

Given that one of the preconditions imposed on Cyprus by the EU for the release of financial support was a thorough investigation by the Council of Europe's MONEYVAL into the implementation of legislation to combat money laundering, will the Commission say:

Since Luxembourg, Germany and Austria are in higher positions in the AML Index 2012, when does it intend to ask them to submit to a thorough investigation by the Council of Europe's MONEYVAL, similar to Cyprus?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(25 June 2013)

Additional in-depth investigation of the anti-money laundering regime in Cyprus and in particular into actual compliance by banks with the Cypriot anti-money laundering legislation was agreed between the Cypriot authorities and the Eurogroup in the particular circumstances of the financial assistance package. Accordingly, the Commission does not consider that similar investigations are necessary for other Member States at the present time. As a general matter, the Commission follows the implemetation of the EU AML regime in all Member States and in addition, the three Member States referred to are, in any event, subject to the evaluation and follow-up procedures of the Financial Action Task Force.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004827/13
to the Commission
Derek Vaughan (S&D)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Rare earth metals

Rare earth metals have become a highly sought after resource for use in the high technology and low carbon industries. With global demand increasing while relying on a limited number of sources, concerns have understandably been raised over future availability.

1. What action is the Commission taking to ensure security of supply and fair distribution of rare earth metals either mined in or imported into the EU?

2. What steps are being taken to prevent the involvement of illegal organisations and organised crime in the supply of rare earth metals?

3. What protection is available to small investors involved in the rare earth metals market?

4. With the possibility of rare earth metals, along with other valuable natural resources, being present on the Moon, what discussions has the Commission held in order to prevent excessive lunar mining activity taking place in the future?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(1 July 2013)

1. The Commission facilitates the secure supply and fair distribution of rare earth elements (REE/rare earths) through the 2008 Raw Materials Initiative ([1]), as updated in the European Innovation Partnership ([2]). In 2010 REE were indentified as raw materials critical for the European economy, as an early alert to consumers and Member States to intensify REE exploration.

REE are not mined in the EU but imported, mostly from China, which has about 95% of current world production and applies export restrictions. After the success of a first WTO dispute settlement case against China's export restrictions on a number of raw materials ([3]), the EU has challenged China's export restrictions on 17 rare earths, plus tungsten and molybdenum. Meanwhile, a few Member States reported potential REE deposits, e.g. Sweden, whose Norra Kärr site already has mining rights and is due to operate by 2016.

2. The Commission is not aware of illegal REE supply by criminal organisations.

3. No special regulatory protection exists for small investors in the REE market at EU level.

4. The recent attention on the REE has brought to mind the moon and its famous rare earth rich KREEP basalts (the REE in KREEP stands for rare earth elements). There is no specific discussion on the prevention of excessive lunar mining at EU level so far because lunar mining for export to earth is not technically and economically viable today. The 1979 Moon Treaty, a UN convention, hands jurisdiction over all celestial bodies to the international community and places their resource extraction and allocation under an international regime.

([1]) COM(2008)699.
([2]) COM(2012)82.
([3]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-12-87_en.htm?locale=en.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004828/13
alla Commissione
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(29 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Attuazione delle raccomandazioni contenute nella relazione Vitorino relativa ai prelievi nella UE sulle copie private

Il 23 novembre 2011, il Commissario Michel Barnier ha nominato Antonio Vitorino mediatore nel dialogo sui prelievi per le copie private. Vitorino ha moderato le discussioni con le parti interessate nel 2012 e, come concordato con la Commissione nel quadro del suo mandato di mediazione, ha presentato le proprie raccomandazioni al Commissario Barnier il 31 gennaio 2013.

Nella relazione, il mediatore conclude che i sistemi di prelievo attuali creano grandi problemi per il mercato interno, e sottolinea che il sistema di prelievo non è adattato all'era digitale. Inoltre, si evidenziano chiaramente le conseguenze inique create dai prelievi per copia privata sui consumatori, creatori e fornitori di servizi. Successivamente alla pubblicazione del rapporto di mediazione, la Commissione non ha chiarito le sue vedute sulle conclusioni di Vitorino né sulle proposte né su come prevede di mettere in atto le raccomandazioni.

Dato che la dichiarazione del Commissario Barnier, determina in via preliminare che il processo «ha lo scopo di preparare il terreno per un'azione legislativa sui prelievi per copia privata a livello UE», e considerando che le regolamentazioni vigenti in materia di prelievi per copia privata appaiono senza dubbio superate rispetto ai nuovi scenari creati dalla rapida evoluzione delle tecnologie dell'informazione, qual è il programma della Commissione in ordine all'attuazione delle raccomandazioni formulate?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(4 luglio 2013)

Le raccomandazioni di Antonio Vitorino identificano una serie di problemi per il funzionamento del mercato interno connessi alle disparità tra i sistemi di prelievo nazionali. Nelle raccomandazioni si illustra l'attuale sviluppo di modelli d'impresa online nuovi e innovativi i quali, in vista del loro funzionamento, possono a lungo termine influire sulle considerazioni alla base delle eccezioni alla copia privata e ai relativi prelievi.

Il 29 maggio 2013 Antonio Vitorino ha presentato tali raccomandazioni al Consiglio Competitività e gli Stati membri hanno formulato una prima reazione. La Commissione ha avuto per la prima volta la possibilità di comprendere meglio le posizioni degli Stati membri e di valutare in che misura le raccomandazioni di Antonio Vitorino possano essere accolte a livello nazionale e se alcune possano necessitare di un intervento a livello dell'UE.

In parallelo, la Commissione sta esaminando attentamente le suddette raccomandazioni. Esse costituiscono un elemento importante dell'attuale controllo dell'adeguatezza del sistema dei diritti d'autore avviato dalla Commissione il 18 dicembre 2012 con l'adozione della comunicazione sui contenuti del mercato unico digitale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004828/13
to the Commission
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Implementation of the recommendations contained in the Vitorino report on private copying levies in the EU

On 23 November 2011, Commissioner Michel Barnier appointed Antonio Vitorino as mediator in the dialogue on private copying levies. Mr Vitorino moderated discussions with the relevant stakeholders in 2012, and, as agreed with the Commission in the framework of his mediation mandate, submitted his recommendations to Mr Barnier on 31 January 2013.

In his report, the mediator concludes that the current levy systems raise major issues for the internal market and points out that the levy system is not adapted to the digital age. He also highlights the unfair consequences of private copying levies for consumers, creators and service providers. Since the publication of the mediation report, the Commission has not clarified its views on the Vitorino conclusions and proposals or on how it plans to enact the recommendations.

Given that Commissioner Barnier's statement at the outset that the process 'has as its objective laying the ground for legislative action on private copying levies at EU level', and that the current regulations on private copying levies are clearly no longer suited to the new scenarios created by rapidly evolving information technologies, what is the Commission planning to do in order to implement the recommendations put forward?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(4 July 2013)

Mr Vitorino's Recommendations identify a number of problems which the disparity of the national levy systems pose to the functioning of the internal market. They also identify the current development of new, innovative business models on line which, in view of their functioning, may in the long run have a bearing on the considerations underpinning the private copy exceptions and the corresponding levies.

On 29 May 2013 Mr Vitorino presented its Recommendations to the Competitiveness Council and the Member States expressed a first reaction to these recommendations. This was a first opportunity for the Commission to better understand the Member States' positions, to assess to what extent some of Mr Vitorino's recommendations could be taken-up at national level and whether some could require action at EU level.

In parallel, the recommendations are being carefully analysed by the Commission. They constitute an important element feeding into the ongoing 'fitness check' of the copyright system as initiated by the Commission on 18 December 2012 with the adoption of the communication on Content in the Digital Single Market.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004830/13
alla Commissione
Barbara Matera (PPE)
(29 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Cura e ricerca nel settore delle malattie rare

Le malattie rare sono un ampio gruppo di affezioni che interessano una bassa percentuale della popolazione.

Nell'UE sono considerate rare le malattie che colpiscono meno di 5 persone su 10 000. Si tratta di una cifra apparentemente bassa ma, considerando la popolazione dei 27 Stati membri, ciò significa che per ciascuna vi sono nell'UE circa 246 000 malati. La maggior parte dei pazienti è affetta da malattie ancora più rare, che colpiscono una persona su 100 000 o più.

Si stima che oggi nell'UE le 5 000 e le 8 000 malattie rare esistenti colpiscano nell'insieme il 6-8 % della popolazione, ossia da 27 a 36 milioni di persone.

L'Unione europea aiuta a mettere in comune le scarse risorse attualmente disperse nei diversi Stati membri e promuove azioni comuni per la condivisione di conoscenze e informazioni tra pazienti e operatori sanitari.

Una malattia rara deve essere riconosciuta attraverso gli studi e le ricerche di centri universitari qualificati; tra le malattie rare in attesa di legittimazione rientrano Pandas, Pans e Pitand, individuate nel 1998, che riguardano infezioni da streptococco e che colpiscono migliaia di bambini e adolescenti in tutto il continente.

A tale proposito, si chiede alla Commissione quanto segue:

1. L'UE assicura una codificazione e tracciabilità adeguate delle malattie rare in tutti i sistemi d'informazione sanitaria?

2. L'UE intende destinare fondi specifici alla ricerca per trovare una cura per le malattie rare?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(20 giugno 2013)

Secondo la banca dati ORPHANET soltanto 250 delle migliaia di patologie rare ormai note e clinicamente identificabili hanno un codice nell'attuale classificazione internazionale delle malattie.

Nel 2007 l'Organizzazione mondiale della sanità (OMS) ha avviato il processo di revisione della classificazione internazionale delle malattie. Al fine di sostenere tale processo l'azione comune dell'EUCERD cofinanziata dal programma di sanità pubblica contiene un pacchetto di lavoro sulla codificazione delle malattie rare.

La raccomandazione del Consiglio dell'8 giugno 2009 su un'azione comunitaria nel settore delle malattie rare ([1])chiede agli Stati membri di garantire che le malattie rare siano adeguatamente codificate e rintracciabili in tutti i sistemi di informazione sanitaria, e inoltre che siano riconosciute dai sistemi di rimborso e assistenza sanitaria nazionali in base alla classificazione internazionale delle malattie, pur nel rispetto delle procedure interne.

La Commissione ha inoltre investito quasi 500 milioni di euro in progetti collaborativi di ricerca nel campo delle malattie rare nell'ambito del tema «Salute» del Settimo programma quadro di ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico. Ci si attende che questo grande impegno nella ricerca sulle malattie rare sia mantenuto anche nel prossimo programma quadro per la ricerca e l'innovazione «Orizzonte 2020».

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2009:151:0007:0010:IT:PDF.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004830/13
to the Commission
Barbara Matera (PPE)
(29 April 2013)

Subject: Treatment and research in the field of rare diseases

Rare diseases are a broad group of conditions which affect a small percentage of the population.

In the EU, any disease affecting fewer than five people in 10 000 is considered rare. That number may seem small, but it translates into approximately 246 000 people throughout the EU's 27 Member States. Most patients suffer from even rarer diseases affecting one person in 100 000 or more.

It is estimated that today in the EU, 5 000 to 8 000 distinct rare diseases affect 6-8% of the population, namely between 27 and 36 million people.

The European Union is helping to pool scarce resources that are currently fragmented across individual Member States, and is promoting joint action to help patients and health professionals share expertise and information across borders.

A rare disease must be recognised on the basis of studies and research carried out by qualified university centres; among the rare diseases waiting to be officially recognised are Pandas, Pans and Pitand, identified in 1998, which are associated with streptococcal infections and which affect thousands of children and adolescents across Europe.

In this regard, can the Commission answer the following:

1. Does the EU ensure that rare diseases are adequately coded and traceable in all health information systems?

2. Will the EU allocate specific funds to research to find cures for rare diseases?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2013)

According to the ORPHANET database, of the thousands of known rare diseases for which a clinical identification is possible, only 250 have a code in the existing International Classification of Diseases.

In 2007 the World Health Organisation (WHO) launched the process of revision of the International Classification of Diseases. In order to support the process of revision of the International classification, the Joint Action 'EUCERD' co-funded from the Health Programme contains a work package on the coding of rare diseases.

The Council Recommendation of 8 June 2009 on an action in the field of rare diseases ([1]) calls upon Member States to ensure that rare diseases are adequately coded and traceable in all health information systems, and recognised in the national healthcare and reimbursement systems based on the International Classification of Diseases while respecting national procedures.

In addition, the Commission has invested close to EUR 500 million in collaborative research projects related to rare diseases under the Health Theme of the EU's 7th Framework Programmes for Research and Technological Development. The strong commitment to rare diseases research is expected to continue in the next Framework Programme for Research and Innovation, Horizon 2020.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2009:151:0007:0010:EN:PDF.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-004831/13
до Комисията
Herbert Dorfmann (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Elisabeth Jeggle (PPE), Aldo Patriciello (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Hans-Peter Mayer (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Salvatore Iacolino (PPE), Peter Jahr (PPE), Michel Dantin (PPE), Albert Deß (PPE), Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Paolo De Castro (S&D), Esther Herranz García (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Angelika Niebler (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Agnès Le Brun (PPE), Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), Anja Weisgerber (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Lorenzo Fontana (EFD), Vincenzo Iovine (S&D), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Christa Klaß (PPE), Markus Ferber (PPE), Dimitar Stoyanov (NI) и Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR)
(30 април 2013 г.)

Относно: Износ на вино за САЩ

Европейският съюз е голям износител на селскостопански продукти. Виното е един от най-важните селскостопански продукти за износ и САЩ е един от нашите най-значими експортни пазари.

През последните години има увеличаване на проблемите, свързани с контрола на пестицидите при вносните стоки за САЩ.

Добър пример е пенконазолът, който е одобрен за ползване върху грозде в рамките на Европейския съюз, но е нерегистриран пестицид в САЩ.

САЩ разполагат със строг митнически контрол, който улавя възможни налични следи от широк набор от активни вещества в състава на продуктите за растителна защита. Много от тези пестициди не се признават от САЩ.

Продукти със следи от тези вещества се отхвърлят от митническите органи на САЩ поради действащия принцип на нулева толерантност, въпреки че риск за здравето на потребителя не съществува.

1. Как е възможно дадени пестициди, които са регистрирани в Европейския съюз, да не се признават в САЩ? Има ли възможност за взаимно признаване на регистрирани пестициди?

2. Какви действия е предприела Комисията във връзка с принципа на нулева толерантност, който възпрепятства/нарушава износа на ЕС за САЩ?

3. Възнамерява ли Комисията да повдигне този въпрос по време на предстоящите преговори със САЩ за трансатлантическо споразумение за свободна търговия и да постигне ефикасно решение (например като част от амбициозна глава посветена на санитарните и фитосанитарните мерки)?

Отговор, даден от г-н Чолош от името на Комисията
(21 юни 2013 г.)

Комисията е наясно с проблемите, свързани с откриването от страна на органите на САЩ на следи от пестициди, които не са разрешени в САЩ, в пратки от вина от ЕС за САЩ.

ЕС и САЩ разполагат с отделни системи за разрешаване на пестициди. И двете системи се основават на оценка на риска, извършена от съответните компетентни органи. Органите както на ЕС, така и на САЩ запазват прерогативите си по отношение на оценката на риска и разрешаването на пестициди. Тези оценки не се ограничават единствено до рисковете за безопасността на храните, а също така отчитат аспектите, свързани с опазването на околната среда и на работниците. В резултат на това определен брой пестициди са разрешени в ЕС, но не и в САЩ и обратно.

ЕС и САЩ могат също да определят максимално допустимите граници на остатъчни вещества (МДГОВ) за веществата, които могат да бъдат открити в продуктите, разпространявани на техните пазари. В ЕС МГДОВ се определят, като се взема предвид научното становище на Европейския орган за безопасност на храните (ЕОБХ), докато в САЩ тази задача е от компетентността на Агенцията за опазване на околната среда.

Комисията е в контакт с органите на САЩ, включително в рамките на предстоящите преговори за трансатлантическо партньорство за търговия и инвестиции, в търсене на възможно решение за несъответствията между двете страни при определянето на МДГОВ.

Ако е налице научна обосновка, Комисията също така ще подкрепи всяко подадено пред органите на САЩ заявление за одобрение на вещества във вино, както и всяко искане от държава членка на ЕС за установяване на допустимост на вноса.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004831/13
a la Comisión
Herbert Dorfmann (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Elisabeth Jeggle (PPE), Aldo Patriciello (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Hans-Peter Mayer (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Salvatore Iacolino (PPE), Peter Jahr (PPE), Michel Dantin (PPE), Albert Deß (PPE), Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Paolo De Castro (S&D), Esther Herranz García (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Angelika Niebler (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Agnès Le Brun (PPE), Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), Anja Weisgerber (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Lorenzo Fontana (EFD), Vincenzo Iovine (S&D), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Christa Klaß (PPE), Markus Ferber (PPE), Dimitar Stoyanov (NI) y Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR)
(30 de abril de 2013)

Asunto: Exportaciones de vino a los EE.UU.

La UE es un exportador de primer orden de productos agrícolas. El vino es una de las principales exportaciones, y los EE.UU. son uno de nuestros mercados de exportación más importantes.

Estos últimos años han aumentado los problemas con el control de plaguicidas de los productos importados por los EE.UU.

Resulta significativo el ejemplo del penconazol, cuyo uso en la uva está autorizado en la EU, pero que no está registrado como plaguicida en los EE.UU.

Los EE.UU. tienen controles aduaneros estrictos, que detectan múltiples principios activos de productos fitosanitarios que pueden estar presentes en cantidades residuales. Los EE.UU. no reconocen muchos de estos plaguicidas.

Las aduanas estadounidenses rechazan los productos con cantidades residuales de estas sustancias debido al principio que hay de tolerancia cero, a pesar de que no existe ningún riesgo para la salud del consumidor.

1. ¿Cómo es posible que algunos plaguicidas estén registrados en la EU, pero no sean reconocidos por los EE.UU.? ¿Sería posible el reconocimiento mutuo de los plaguicidas registrados?

2. ¿Qué está haciendo la Comisión respecto al principio de tolerancia cero, que está obstruyendo y perturbando las exportaciones de la UE a los EE.UU.?

3. ¿Tiene la Comisión la intención de abordar este tema en las próximas negociaciones con los EE.UU. en torno a un acuerdo de libre comercio trasatlántico y de hallar una solución eficaz (por ejemplo, como parte de un ambicioso capítulo sobre medidas sanitarias y fitosanitarias)?

Respuesta del Sr. Cioloş en nombre de la Comisión
(21 de junio de 2013)

La Comisión está al corriente de los problemas ocasionados por la detección por parte de las autoridades estadounidenses de residuos de plaguicidas no autorizados en los EE.UU. en las exportaciones de vinos de la UE a los EE.UU.

La UE y los EE.UU. cuentan con sistemas distintos de autorización de plaguicidas. Ambos sistemas se basan en una evaluación de riesgos efectuada por las autoridades competentes. Tanto las autoridades de la UE como las de los EE.UU. mantienen sus prerrogativas en lo que respecta a la evaluación de riesgos y a la autorización efectiva de los plaguicidas. Estas evaluaciones no se limitan a los riesgos para la seguridad alimentaria, sino que también toman en consideración los aspectos medioambientales y de protección de los trabajadores. Como consecuencia de ello, algunos plaguicidas están autorizados en la EU y no en los EE.UU., y viceversa.

La UE y los EE.UU. también pueden establecer límites máximos de residuos (LMR) respecto de las sustancias que pueden encontrarse en los productos distribuidos en sus mercados. En la UE los LMR se establecen atendiendo al dictamen científico de la Autoridad Europea de Seguridad Alimentaria (EFSA), mientras que en los EE.UU. esa tarea compete a la Agencia de protección del medio ambiente (EPA).

La Comisión sigue en contacto con las autoridades estadounidenses, por ejemplo en el marco de las próximas negociaciones con miras al acuerdo de asociación transatlántica para el comercio y la inversión (ATCI), con el fin de encontrar una posible solución a la diferencia entre ambas Partes en relación con el establecimiento de los LMR.

Siempre que exista una justificación científica, la Comisión apoyará asimismo toda solicitud de aprobación de sustancias en el vino, o cualquier petición de fijación de un límite de tolerancia de importación formulada por un Estado miembro de la UE, presentadas a las autoridades de los EE.UU.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004831/13
an die Kommission
Herbert Dorfmann (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Elisabeth Jeggle (PPE), Aldo Patriciello (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Hans-Peter Mayer (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Salvatore Iacolino (PPE), Peter Jahr (PPE), Michel Dantin (PPE), Albert Deß (PPE), Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Paolo De Castro (S&D), Esther Herranz García (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Angelika Niebler (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Agnès Le Brun (PPE), Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), Anja Weisgerber (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Lorenzo Fontana (EFD), Vincenzo Iovine (S&D), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Christa Klaß (PPE), Markus Ferber (PPE), Dimitar Stoyanov (NI) und Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR)
(30. April 2013)

Betrifft: Weinausfuhren in die USA

Die EU ist einer der größten Exporteure landwirtschaftlicher Erzeugnisse. Wein zählt zu den wichtigsten landwirtschaftlichen Ausfuhrprodukten, und die USA sind einer der wichtigsten Exportmärkte der EU.

In den letzten Jahren häufen sich die Probleme mit Pestizidkontrollen bei Einfuhren in die USA.

Ein Beispiel ist Penconazol, das in der EU für den Einsatz an Weintrauben zugelassen, in den USA hingegen nicht als Pestizid registriert ist.

Bei den strengen Zollkontrollen der USA werden viele Wirkstoffe in Pflanzenschutzmitteln entdeckt, die mitunter nur in Spuren vorhanden sind. Viele dieser Pestizide sind in den USA nicht anerkannt.

Mittel mit Spuren dieser Stoffe werden aufgrund des Nulltoleranz-Prinzips vom US-amerikanischen Zoll zurückgewiesen, auch wenn für den Verbraucher kein Gesundheitsrisiko besteht.

1. Wie kann es sein, dass manche Pestizide in der EU registriert, in den USA jedoch nicht anerkannt sind? Wäre eine gegenseitige Anerkennung registrierter Pestizide möglich?

2. Was unternimmt die Kommission gegen das Nulltoleranz-Prinzip, das die Ausfuhren aus der EU in die USA behindert und stört?

3. Wird die Kommission das Thema bei den anstehenden Verhandlungen mit den USA über ein transatlantisches Freihandelsabkommen ansprechen und eine konstruktive Lösung anbieten (beispielsweise im Rahmen eines ambitionierten Kapitels über gesundheitspolizeiliche und pflanzenschutzrechtliche Maßnahmen)?

Antwort von Herrn Cioloş im Namen der Kommission
(21. Juni 2013)

Die Kommission ist sich der Probleme bewusst, die entstehen, wenn die US-Behörden Spuren von Pestiziden, die in den USA nicht zugelassen sind, in EU-Weinlieferungen in die USA feststellen.

Die EU und die USA haben unterschiedliche Systeme für die Zulassung von Schädlingsbekämpfungsmitteln. Beiden Systemen liegt eine Risikobewertung zugrunde, die von den jeweils zuständigen Behörden vorgenommen wird. Sowohl die EU- als auch die US-Behörden halten an ihren Zuständigkeiten für die Risikobewertung und die tatsächliche Zulassung von Pestiziden fest. Solche Bewertungen sind nicht nur auf Gefahren für die Lebensmittelsicherheit beschränkt, sondern betreffen auch Aspekte des Umwelt- und des Arbeitsschutzes. So gibt es Schädlingsbekämpfungsmittel, die in der EU zugelassen und in den USA verboten sind, und umgekehrt.

Die EU und die USA können auch Höchstwerte für Rückstände (MRL) in Erzeugnissen, die auf den jeweiligen Markt gebracht werden sollen, festlegen. In der EU werden die MRL-Werte unter Berücksichtigung des wissenschaftlichen Gutachtens der Europäischen Behörde für Lebensmittelsicherheit (EFSA) festgelegt, während diese Zuständigkeit in den USA bei der Umweltschutzbehörde (*Environmental Protection Authority (EPA)*) liegt.

Die Kommission hält weiterhin Kontakt zu den US-Behörden, auch im Rahmen der anstehenden Verhandlungen über eine Transatlantische Handels- und Investitionspartnerschaft (TTIP — Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership), um möglicherweise eine Lösung für die zwischen den beiden Parteien bestehende Diskrepanz bei der Festlegung der MRL-Werte zu finden.

Darüber hinaus wird die Kommission — sofern wissenschaftlich fundiert — Eingaben und Petitionen eines Mitgliedstaats bei den US-Behörden unterstützen, die eine Genehmigung von Rückständen in Wein und die Festlegung einer Einfuhrtoleranz zum Ziel haben.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004831/13
à la Commission
Herbert Dorfmann (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Elisabeth Jeggle (PPE), Aldo Patriciello (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Hans-Peter Mayer (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Salvatore Iacolino (PPE), Peter Jahr (PPE), Michel Dantin (PPE), Albert Deß (PPE), Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Paolo De Castro (S&D), Esther Herranz García (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Angelika Niebler (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Agnès Le Brun (PPE), Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), Anja Weisgerber (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Lorenzo Fontana (EFD), Vincenzo Iovine (S&D), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Christa Klaß (PPE), Markus Ferber (PPE), Dimitar Stoyanov (NI) et Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR)
(30 avril 2013)

Objet: Exportation de vin à destination des États-Unis

L'Union européenne est un exportateur majeur de produits agricoles. Le vin est l'un des principaux produits agricoles exportés et les États-Unis représentent l'un de nos premiers marchés d'exportation.

Au cours de ces dernières années, on a assisté à une recrudescence des problèmes lors des contrôles des importations de pesticides aux États-Unis.

Le cas du penconazole, substance active dont l'utilisation est autorisée dans la culture du raisin au sein de l'Union mais qui n'est pas enregistrée comme pesticide aux États-Unis, illustre bien cette situation.

Les États-Unis procèdent à des contrôles douaniers stricts qui détectent de nombreuses substances actives provenant de produits phytopharmaceutiques pouvant être présentes sous forme de traces. Nombre de ces pesticides ne sont pas reconnus comme tels par les États-Unis.

Les produits contenant des traces de ces substances, bien qu'ils ne présentent aucun risque pour la santé du consommateur, sont saisis par les douanes américaines, conformément au principe de «tolérance zéro».

1. Comment est-il possible que des pesticides enregistrés au sein de l'Union européenne ne soient pas reconnus en tant que tels aux États-Unis? Une reconnaissance mutuelle des pesticides enregistrés serait-elle possible?

2. Que fait la Commission à propos du principe de «tolérance zéro» qui entrave/gêne l'exportation en provenance de l'Union et à destination des États-Unis?

3. La Commission a-t-elle l'intention d'aborder ce problème lors de ses prochaines négociations avec les États-Unis sur un accord de libre-échange transatlantique et de proposer une solution efficace (faisant par exemple partie d'un chapitre ambitieux consacré aux mesures sanitaires et phytosanitaires (SPS))?

Réponse donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(21 juin 2013)

La Commission est consciente des problèmes liés à la détection, par les autorités américaines, de traces de pesticides non autorisés aux États-Unis dans des cargaisons de vin provenant de l'Union européenne et à destination des États-Unis.

L'Union européenne et les États-Unis appliquent des systèmes différents en ce qui concerne l'autorisation des pesticides. Les deux systèmes reposent sur une évaluation des risques réalisée par les autorités compétentes. Les autorités européennes tout comme les autorités américaines conservent leurs prérogatives pour ce qui est de l'évaluation des risques et de l'autorisation effective des pesticides. Ce type d'évaluations ne se limite pas aux risques relatifs à la sécurité alimentaire, mais prend également en considération des aspects liés à la protection de l'environnement et à la protection des travailleurs. Par conséquent, un certain nombre de pesticides sont autorisés au sein de l'Union européenne mais pas aux États-Unis et vice versa.

L'Union européenne et les États-Unis pourraient également fixer des teneurs maximales en résidus (TMR) pour les substances qui peuvent être présentes dans les produits distribués sur leurs marchés. Au sein de l'Union européenne, les TMR sont fixées en tenant compte de l'avis scientifique publié par l'autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments (EFSA), alors que dans le système américain, c'est l'autorité de protection de l'environnement (EPA) qui est compétente en la matière.

La Commission reste en contact avec les autorités américaines, y compris dans le cadre des prochaines négociations concernant le partenariat transatlantique de commerce et d'investissement, afin de trouver une éventuelle solution pour remédier aux divergences existant entre les deux parties en ce qui concerne la fixation des TMR.

La Commission soutiendra également toute demande d'approbation concernant des substances présentes dans le vin, ou toute demande introduite auprès des autorités américaines par un État membre de l'Union concernant la mise en place d'une tolérance à l'importation, si celles-ci sont scientifiquement justifiées.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004831/13
alla Commissione
Herbert Dorfmann (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Elisabeth Jeggle (PPE), Aldo Patriciello (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Hans-Peter Mayer (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Salvatore Iacolino (PPE), Peter Jahr (PPE), Michel Dantin (PPE), Albert Deß (PPE), Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Paolo De Castro (S&D), Esther Herranz García (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Angelika Niebler (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Agnès Le Brun (PPE), Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), Anja Weisgerber (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Lorenzo Fontana (EFD), Vincenzo Iovine (S&D), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Christa Klaß (PPE), Markus Ferber (PPE), Dimitar Stoyanov (NI) e Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR)
(30 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Esportazioni di vino negli USA

L'UE è un grande esportatore di prodotti agricoli, tra i più importanti dei quali figura il vino, e gli Stati Uniti rappresentano uno dei principali mercati di esportazione.

Negli ultimi anni, sono aumentati i problemi connessi ai controlli volti a escludere la presenza di pesticidi nei prodotti importati negli USA.

È esemplare il caso del penconazolo, un pesticida il cui uso sulla vite è consentito nell'Unione europea, ma che non rientra fra i prodotti registrati negli Stati Uniti.

La legislazione statunitense prevede severi controlli doganali per il rilevamento di numerosi principi attivi contenuti nei prodotti fitosanitari, anche nel caso in cui siano presenti in tracce, dal momento che l'uso di molti di questi pesticidi non è autorizzato negli USA.

Se si rilevano tracce di queste sostanze, i prodotti importati sono respinti dalla dogana statunitense in virtù del principio della tolleranza zero esistente, anche qualora non sussistano rischi per la salute dei consumatori.

1. Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione chiarire per quale motivo alcuni pesticidi registrati nell'Unione europea non sono riconosciuti negli USA? Sarebbe ipotizzabile un riconoscimento reciproco dei pesticidi registrati?

2. Quali misure intende la Commissione adottare riguardo al principio della tolleranza zero, che ostacola/impedisce le esportazioni dall'UE verso gli USA?

3. Intende la Commissione affrontare tale questione in occasione dei prossimi negoziati con gli Stati Uniti su un accordo di libero scambio transatlantico e fornire una soluzione efficace (ad esempio, nel quadro di un ambizioso capitolo relativo alle misure sanitarie e fitosanitarie)?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(21 giugno 2013)

La Commissione è a conoscenza dei problemi correlati al rilevamento da parte delle autorità statunitensi di tracce di pesticidi non autorizzati negli Stati Uniti, durante le spedizioni di vini europei verso gli USA.

L'UE e gli USA hanno sistemi diversi per l'autorizzazione di pesticidi. Entrambi i sistemi si basano su una valutazione del rischio effettuata dalle autorità competenti. Sia l'UE sia gli USA sostengono le proprie prerogative per quanto riguarda l'analisi della valutazione dei rischi e l'effettiva autorizzazione dei pesticidi. Tali valutazioni non si limitano solo a rischi in materia di sicurezza alimentare, ma considerano anche la protezione dell'ambiente e dei lavoratori. Di conseguenza, un certo numero di antiparassitari sono autorizzati nell'UE ma non negli USA e viceversa.

L'UE e gli USA possono anche stabilire i livelli massimi di residui (LMR) per le sostanze che si possono trovare in prodotti distribuiti nei loro mercati. Nell'UE, i livelli massimi di residui di pesticidi sono stabiliti tenendo conto del parere scientifico pubblicato dall'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare (European Food Safety Authority — EFSA), mentre nel sistema statunitense ciò è di competenza dell'Autorità per la tutela dell'ambiente (Environmental Protection Authority — EPA).

La Commissione è in costante contatto con le autorità americane, anche nell'ambito degli imminenti negoziati previsti dall'accordo di partenariato transatlantico su commercio e investimenti (TTIP), allo scopo di trovare una possibile soluzione per le differenze nel modo in cui le due parti stabiliscono i livelli massimi di residui di pesticidi.

Se scientificamente provate, la Commissione, sosterrà inoltre le richieste di approvazione di sostanze antiparassitarie nel vino e le petizioni per la concessione di una tolleranza all'importazione che gli Stati membri dell'UE presenteranno alle autorità statunitensi competenti.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-004831/13
do Komisji
Herbert Dorfmann (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Elisabeth Jeggle (PPE), Aldo Patriciello (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Hans-Peter Mayer (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Salvatore Iacolino (PPE), Peter Jahr (PPE), Michel Dantin (PPE), Albert Deß (PPE), Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Paolo De Castro (S&D), Esther Herranz García (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Angelika Niebler (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Agnès Le Brun (PPE), Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), Anja Weisgerber (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Lorenzo Fontana (EFD), Vincenzo Iovine (S&D), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Christa Klaß (PPE), Markus Ferber (PPE), Dimitar Stoyanov (NI) oraz Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR)
(30 kwietnia 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Eksport wina do Stanów Zjednoczonych

UE jest głównym eksporterem produktów rolnych. Wino jest jednym z najważniejszych eksportowanych produktów rolnych, a Stany Zjednoczone są jednym z naszych najważniejszych rynków eksportowych.

W ostatnich latach pojawia się coraz więcej problemów dotyczących kontroli produktów importowanych do Stanów Zjednoczonych na obecność pestycydów.

Jaskrawym przykładem jest penkonazol – dopuszczony do stosowania na winogronach w UE, natomiast niezarejestrowany w Stanach Zjednoczonych.

Stany Zjednoczone przeprowadzają surowsze kontrole celne, w czasie których wykrywane są liczne składniki aktywne wchodzące w skład środków ochrony roślin, choć ich obecność jest często śladowa. Wiele z tych pestycydów nie jest uznawanych przez Stany Zjednoczone.

Produkty zawierające śladowe ilości tych składników, mimo że nie stwarzają zagrożenia dla zdrowia konsumentów, są odrzucane przez amerykańskie organy celne ze względu na obowiązującą zasadę zerowej tolerancji.

1. Jak to możliwe, że niektóre pestycydy zarejestrowane w UE nie są uznawane w Stanach Zjednoczonych? Czy możliwe byłoby wzajemne uznawanie zarejestrowanych środków ochrony roślin?

2. Jakie działania podejmuje Komisja w związku z zasadą zerowej tolerancji, która hamuje/utrudnia eksport produktów z UE do Stanów Zjednoczonych?

3. Czy Komisja zamierza zająć się tą kwestią w czasie zbliżających się negocjacji ze Stanami Zjednoczonymi w sprawie transatlantyckiej umowy o wolnym handlu i przyjąć skuteczne rozwiązanie (na przykład w ramach ambitnego rozdziału dotyczącego środków sanitarnych i fitosanitarnych)?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Daciana Cioloşa w imieniu Komisji
(21 czerwca 2013 r.)

Komisja zdaje sobie sprawę z problemów, jakie stwarza wykrycie przez władze USA w transporcie wina z UE do Stanów Zjednoczonych śladowych ilości niedozwolonych w USA pestycydów.

UE i USA mają oddzielne systemy udzielania zezwoleń na pestycydy. Oba systemy opierają się na ocenie ryzyka, którą przeprowadzają właściwe organy. Zarówno organy UE, jak i władze USA utrzymują swoje prerogatywy w zakresie oceny ryzyka, a także samego udzielania zezwoleń na pestycydy. W ocenach takich bierze się pod uwagę nie tylko ryzyko w zakresie bezpieczeństwa żywności, lecz także kwestie dotyczące środowiska oraz bezpieczeństwa pracy. W związku z tym niektóre pestycydy dopuszczone do obrotu w UE są niedozwolone w USA i vice versa.

W odniesieniu do substancji, które są obecne w produktach znajdujących się w obrocie na ich rynku, UE i USA mogą również ustanawiać najwyższe dopuszczalne poziomy pozostałości. W UE najwyższe dopuszczalne poziomy pozostałości ustanawia się na podstawie opinii naukowej Europejskiego Urzędu ds. Bezpieczeństwa Żywności (EFSA). W systemie amerykańskim wydawanie takich opinii należy do kompetencji Agencji Ochrony Środowiska (Environmental Protection Authority, EPA).

Aby rozwiązać kwestię rozbieżności w zakresie ustanawiania najwyższych dopuszczalnych poziomów pozostałości, Komisja jest w stałym kontakcie z władzami Stanów Zjednoczonych, m.in. w ramach negocjacji partnerstwa TTIP (transatlantyckiego partnerstwa w dziedzinie handlu i inwestycji).

Komisja będzie także wspierać wszelkie skierowane do władz USA wnioski o zatwierdzenie substancji obecnych w winie i petycje państw członkowskich UE dotyczące określenia poziomu tolerancji dla produktów importowanych, o ile będzie to uzasadnione z naukowego punktu widzenia.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004831/13
à Comissão
Herbert Dorfmann (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Elisabeth Jeggle (PPE), Aldo Patriciello (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Hans-Peter Mayer (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Salvatore Iacolino (PPE), Peter Jahr (PPE), Michel Dantin (PPE), Albert Deß (PPE), Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Paolo De Castro (S&D), Esther Herranz García (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Angelika Niebler (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Agnès Le Brun (PPE), Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), Anja Weisgerber (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Lorenzo Fontana (EFD), Vincenzo Iovine (S&D), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Christa Klaß (PPE), Markus Ferber (PPE), Dimitar Stoyanov (NI) e Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR)
(30 de abril de 2013)

Assunto: Exportações de vinhos para os EUA

A UE é uma importante exportadora de produtos agrícolas. O vinho é uma das mais importantes exportações agrícolas e os EUA são um dos mais importantes mercados de exportação.

Nos últimos anos verificou-se um aumento dos problemas com controlos de pesticidas nas exportações para os EUA.

Um bom exemplo é o penconazole, um pesticida aprovado para utilização nas uvas na UE mas não registado nos EUA.

Os EUA possuem controlos alfandegários rigorosos que detetam inúmeras substâncias ativas de produtos fitossanitários que podem estar presentes em quantidades vestigiais. Muitos destes pesticidas não são reconhecidos pelos EUA.

Os serviços alfandegários dos EUA rejeitam os produtos com quantidades vestigiais destas substâncias devido à política de tolerância zero em vigor, mesmo que não haja nenhum risco sanitário para os consumidores.

1. Como é possível que alguns pesticidas registados na UE não sejam reconhecidos nos EUA? Será possível um reconhecimento mútuo dos pesticidas registados?

2. Que faz a Comissão acerca do princípio de tolerância zero que dificulta/perturba as exportações da UE para os EUA?

3. Tenciona a Comissão abordar esta questão nas próximas negociações com os EUA sobre um acordo de comércio livre transatlântico e apresentar uma solução eficaz (por exemplo, como parte dum ambicioso capítulo SPS)?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(21 de junho de 2013)

A Comissão está ciente dos problemas relacionados com a deteção, pelas autoridades dos EUA, de vestígios de pesticidas não autorizados nos EUA em remessas de vinhos da UE expedidas para os EUA.

A UE e os EUA dispõem de sistemas distintos para a autorização de pesticidas. Ambos os sistemas se baseiam numa avaliação dos riscos efetuada pelas autoridades competentes. Tanto as autoridades da UE como as dos EUA mantêm as suas prerrogativas no respeitante às avaliações dos riscos e à autorização de pesticidas. Essas avaliações não estão só limitadas aos riscos para a segurança dos alimentos, mas têm também em consideração aspetos ambientais e de proteção dos trabalhadores. Em consequência, determinados pesticidas são autorizados na UE e não nos EUA e *vice versa*.

A UE e os EUA podem também estabelecer limites máximos de resíduos para as substâncias que podem ser detetadas em produtos distribuídos nos seus mercados. Na UE, os limites máximos de resíduos são estabelecidos tendo em conta os pareceres científicos emitidos pela Autoridade Europeia para a Segurança dos Alimentos (EFSA), enquanto no sistema dos EUA tal é da competência da *Environmental Protection Authority* (EPA).

A Comissão continua a estar em contacto com as autoridades dos EUA, inclusivamente no quadro das próximas negociações sobre a Parceria Transatlântica de Comércio e Investimento, com o objetivo de encontrar uma possível solução para as discrepâncias existentes entre as duas Partes a respeito do estabelecimento dos limites máximos de resíduos.

Caso tenham fundamento científico, a Comissão apoiará também quaisquer pedidos de aprovação de substâncias no vinho, ou qualquer pedido efetuado por um Estado-Membro da UE de estabelecimento de tolerâncias de importação, apresentados às autoridades dos EUA.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-004831/13
adresată Comisiei
Herbert Dorfmann (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Elisabeth Jeggle (PPE), Aldo Patriciello (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Hans-Peter Mayer (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Salvatore Iacolino (PPE), Peter Jahr (PPE), Michel Dantin (PPE), Albert Deß (PPE), Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Paolo De Castro (S&D), Esther Herranz García (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Angelika Niebler (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Agnès Le Brun (PPE), Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), Anja Weisgerber (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Lorenzo Fontana (EFD), Vincenzo Iovine (S&D), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Christa Klaß (PPE), Markus Ferber (PPE), Dimitar Stoyanov (NI) şi Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR)
(30 aprilie 2013)

Subiect: Exportul de vinuri în SUA

UE este un exportator important de produse agricole. Vinul reprezintă unul dintre produsele agricole cele mai importante exportate, iar Statele SUA este una dintre pieţele noastre de export cele mai importante.

În ultimii ani, au apărut tot mai multe probleme cu controalele la pesticide la importurile în SUA.

Un prim exemplu este penconazol, care a fost aprobat pentru utilizarea la struguri în UE, dar este un pesticid neînregistrat în SUA.

SUA efectuează controale vamale stricte, care detectează numeroase substanţe din produsele pentru protecţia plantelor ce pot fi prezente în cantităţi infime. Multe dintre aceste pesticide nu sunt recunoscute în SUA.

Produsele care conţin cantităţi infime din aceste substanţe sunt respinse la vama SUA datorită aplicării principiului toleranţei zero, chiar dacă nu există niciun risc pentru consumator.

1. Cum este posibil ca unele pesticide înregistrate în UE să nu fie recunoscute în SUA? Ar fi posibilă o recunoaştere reciprocă a pesticidelor înregistrate?

2. Cum acţionează Comisia cu privire la principiul toleranţei zero, care obstrucţionează/perturbă exporturile din UE către SUA?

3. Intenţionează Comisia să abordeze această problemă în viitoarele negocieri cu SUA privind un Acord transatlantic de liber schimb şi să prezinte o soluţie eficace (de exemplu ca parte a unui ambiţios capitol privind SPS)?

Răspuns dat de dl Cioloş în numele Comisiei
(21 iunie 2013)

Comisia este conştientă de problemele referitoare la detectarea de către autorităţile americane a unor urme de pesticide care nu sunt autorizate în SUA în transporturile de vin provenind din UE şi având ca destinaţie Statele Unite.

UE şi SUA au sisteme separate de autorizare a pesticidelor. Ambele sisteme se bazează pe o evaluare a riscului efectuată de autorităţile competente relevante. Atât autorităţile europene, cât şi cele americane îşi menţin prerogativele cu privire la evaluarea riscului şi autorizarea efectivă a pesticidelor. Aceste evaluări nu se limitează numai la riscurile în materie de siguranţă alimentară, ci iau în calcul şi aspectele legate de protecţia mediului şi a lucrătorilor. Prin urmare, un anumit număr de pesticide sunt autorizate în UE şi nu în SUA şi viceversa.

UE şi SUA pot, de asemenea, să stabilească limite maxime de reziduuri (LMR) pentru substanţele care se pot găsi în produsele comercializate pe pieţele lor. În UE, LMR-urile sunt stabilite ţinând cont de avizul ştiinţific formulat de Autoritatea Europeană pentru Siguranţa Alimentară (EFSA), în timp ce în sistemul american acest lucru este de competenţa Autorităţii de Protecţie a Mediului (EPA).

Comisia este în contact cu autorităţile americane, inclusiv în cadrul viitoarelor negocieri privind Parteneriatul transatlantic pentru comerţ şi investiţii (TTIP), pentru a găsi o posibilă soluţie în ceea ce priveşte diferenţele existente între cele două părţi în materie de stabilire a LMR-urilor.

În cazul în care acest lucru se justifică din punct de vedere ştiinţific, Comisia va sprijini, de asemenea, transmiterea către autorităţile americane a unor cereri de aprobare a substanţelor conţinute în vin sau o eventuală petiţie formulată de un stat membru UE pentru stabilirea unei toleranţe la import.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004831/13
to the Commission
Herbert Dorfmann (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Elisabeth Jeggle (PPE), Aldo Patriciello (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Hans-Peter Mayer (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Mariya Gabriel (PPE), Salvatore Iacolino (PPE), Peter Jahr (PPE), Michel Dantin (PPE), Albert Deß (PPE), Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Paolo De Castro (S&D), Esther Herranz García (PPE), Mairead McGuinness (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Angelika Niebler (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Agnès Le Brun (PPE), Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), Anja Weisgerber (PPE), Licia Ronzulli (PPE), Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Lorenzo Fontana (EFD), Vincenzo Iovine (S&D), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Salvatore Tatarella (PPE), Christa Klaß (PPE), Markus Ferber (PPE), Dimitar Stoyanov (NI) and Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR)
(30 April 2013)

Subject: Wine exports to the USA

The EU is a major exporter of agricultural products. Wine is one of the most important agricultural exports and the USA is one of our most important export markets.

In recent years, there has been an increase in problems with pesticide controls on imports into the USA.

A prime example is Penconazole, which is approved for use on grapes in the EU but is an unregistered pesticide in the USA.

The USA has stringent customs controls which detect numerous active substances from plant protection products which may be present in trace amounts. Many of these pesticides are not recognised by the USA.

Products with trace amounts of these substances are rejected by US customs because of the existing zero-tolerance principle, even though there is no health risk to the consumer.

1. How is it possible that some pesticides which are registered in the EU are not recognised in the USA? Would the mutual recognition of registered pesticides be possible?

2. What is the Commission doing about the zero-tolerance principle which is obstructing/disturbing exports from the EU to the USA?

3. Does the Commission intend to address this issue in its forthcoming negotiations with the USA on a transatlantic Free Trade Agreement and deliver an effective solution (for instance as part of an ambitious SPS chapter)?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(21 June 2013)

The Commission is aware of the problems related to the detection by the US authorities of traces of pesticides which are not authorised in US on shipments of EU wine to the US.

The EU and the US have separate systems for the authorisation of pesticides. Both systems are based on a risk assessment carried out by the relevant competent authorities. Both the EU and the US authorities maintain their prerogatives with regard to the evaluation of risk assessment and to the actual authorisation of pesticides. Such assessments are not only limited to food safety risks but also consider environmental and worker protection aspects. As a result, a certain number of pesticides are authorised in the EU and not in the US and vice versa.

The EU and the US may also establish maximum residue levels (MRLs) for substances that can be found in products distributed in their markets. In the EU, MRLs are established taking into account the scientific opinion released by the European Food Safety Authorities (EFSA), while in the US system this is the competence of the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA).

The Commission continues to be in contact with the U.S. authorities, including within the framework of the forthcoming TTIP (Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership) negotiations, with a view to finding a possible solution to the discrepancy existing between the two Parties on establishing MRLs.

If scientifically justified, the Commission will also support any submission for the approval of substances in wine, or any petition made by an EU Member State for the establishment of an import tolerance, to the US authorities.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004832/13
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(30. April 2013)

Betrifft: Alkoholmissbrauch bei männlichen Jugendlichen — Prävention

Die Berichte über einen problematischen Umgang mit Alkohol bei Jugendlichen (sogenanntes „Komatrinken") häufen sich zunehmend und weisen auf eine geschlechtsspezifische Problematik hin: Mehr männliche als weibliche Jugendliche werden aufgrund von Alkoholvergiftungen in Krankenhäuser eingeliefert und neigen statistisch gesehen generell zu häufigerem und schwererem Alkoholkonsum.

1. Sind der Kommission die oben genannten Tatsachen bekannt?

2. Gibt es bereits EU-weite Programme zur Prävention (Aufklärung und Bildung) speziell im Bereich der männlichen Jugendlichen?

3. Gibt es bereits eine EU-weite kommunikative und fachliche Vernetzung, um sich über die Erfahrungen mit den verschiedenen Regelungen in den EU-Mitgliedstaaten auszutauschen?

4. Wenn nicht, sind derartige Maßnahmen geplant?

Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(20. Juni 2013)

Der Kommission ist bekannt, dass gelegentliche Alkoholexzesse („Komatrinken") bei jungen Männern häufiger vorkommen als bei jungen Frauen. Der ESPAD-Befragung von 2011 ([1]) zufolge sind die Fälle von Komatrinken bei Mädchen jedoch von 29 % im Jahr 1995 auf 38 % im Jahr 2011 gestiegen, während die Zahl der Komatrinker unter Jungen etwas stabiler zu sein scheint (41 % im Jahr 1995 bzw. 43 % im Jahr 2011).

Zwei wesentliche Schwerpunkte der europäischen Alkoholstrategie ([2]) bilden Information und Aufklärung. Mitglieder des EU-Forums „Alkohol und Gesundheit" und Gesundheitsbehörden der Mitgliedstaaten führen dementsprechend im Rahmen freiwilliger Verpflichtungen verschiedene Maßnahmen durch. Es besteht jedoch diesbezüglich weder ein EU-weites Programm noch ein spezielles paneuropäisches Kommunikationsnetz.

Die Kommission unterstützte in der letzten Zeit ein Projekt, in dessen Rahmen ein Netz zuständiger Behörden in den Mitgliedstaaten eingerichtet werden soll, um Altersgrenzen für den Verkauf und Ausschank alkoholischer Getränke durchzusetzen. In diesem Zusammenhang soll in den Mitgliedstaaten auch ein Austausch über bewährte Verfahrensweisen zu Fragen im Zusammenhang mit Komatrinken bei jungen Menschen stattfinden.

([1]) http://www.espad.org/Uploads/ESPAD_reports/2011/Extended_EMCDDA_2011_ESPAD_Summary_EN.pdf
([2]) KOM(2006)625 endg.
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/de/com/2006/com2006_0625de01.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004832/13
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(30 April 2013)

Subject: Alcohol abuse among young males — prevention

An increasing number of reports have highlighted the problematic consumption of alcohol by young people ('binge drinking') and pointed out that this is a gender-specific problem; more young males than young females are taken to hospital because of alcohol poisoning, and in general terms they are statistically likely to consume more alcohol more frequently.

1. Is the Commission familiar with the above facts?

2. Are EU-wide prevention (information and education) programmes already in place, in particular targeted at young males?

3. Has a pan-European specialist communications network already been set up to promote an exchange of experiences on the various approaches taken in the EU Member States?

4. If not, are there any plans for such a network?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2013)

The Commission is aware that heavy episodic drinking (binge drinking) among young men happens more recurrently than inyoung women. However, according to the 2011 ESPAD survey ([1]) binge drinking in girls has increased from 29% in 1995 to 38% in 2011. Among boys binge drinking tends to be more stable (41% in 1995 and 43% in 2011).

Information and education are two key priorities of the EU alcohol strategy ([2]), and different actions are taken as voluntary commitments by members of the European Alcohol and Health Forum and by health authorities in the Member States. However, there is neither an EU wide programme on this issue nor a specialised pan-European communication network.

The Commission has recently supported a project to create a network of competent authorities in Member States responsible for enforcement of age limits for selling and serving alcoholic beverage. This will include exchange of good practices taken by Member States on matters related to binge drinking in young people.

([1]) http://www.espad.org/Uploads/ESPAD_reports/2011/Extended_EMCDDA_2011_ESPAD_Summary_EN.pdf
([2]) COM(2006) 625 Final.
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2006/com2006_0625en01.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004833/13
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(30. April 2013)

Betrifft: Bedarf an geschlechtsspezifischer Förderung in Schulen

In den letzten Monaten häuften sich Presseartikel über eine Benachteiligung von männlichen Schülern aufgrund fehlendem geschlechtsspezifischem Unterricht in Schulen. Darin wird vor allem auf die nicht Jungen-spezifische Art des Schulunterrichts und die fehlenden männlichen Bezugspersonen (besonders in den unteren Schulstufen und im Kindergarten) eingegangen. Studien weisen auf vermehrte Verhaltensauffälligkeiten und im Durchschnitt schlechtere Schulabschlüsse von Jungen hin.

1. Sind der Kommission die oben genannten Umstände bekannt?

2. Wenn ja, gibt es bereits Programme auf EU-Ebene, um geschlechtsspezifische Benachteiligung von Jungen zu verhindern und eine gezielte Förderung zu erreichen?

3. Gibt es generelle geschlechtsspezifische politische Maßnahmen zur Förderung von Jungen?

4. Wenn nicht, sind derartige Programme in Planung?

Antwort von Frau Vassiliou im Namen der Kommission
(17. Juni 2013)

Gemäß Artikel 165 des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union sind ausschließlich die Mitgliedstaaten für die Lehrinhalte und die Gestaltung des Bildungssystems verantwortlich.

Die Kommission unterstützt die Mitgliedstaaten dadurch, dass sie die politische Zusammenarbeit zwischen ihnen in Fragen von gemeinsamem Interesse fördert, zum Beispiel durch den Austausch bewährter Verfahren und das Peer Learning.

Die Kommission befasst sich im Rahmen ihrer Finanzierungsprogramme außerdem mit Themen wie der Ungleichheit der Geschlechter in der Bildung. Die Eindämmung von sozialer Ausgrenzung und geschlechterbedingter Ungleichbehandlung ist eine Schlüsselpriorität der mehrjährigen Bildungsprojekte und -partnerschaften, die zurzeit mit Mitteln aus dem Programm für lebenslanges Lernen (2007-2013) bzw. (ab 2014) aus dessen Nachfolgerprogramm finanziert werden.

Wie bereits im Jahr 2008 in der Mitteilung „Bessere Kompetenzen für das 21. Jahrhundert: eine Agenda für die europäische Zusammenarbeit im Schulwesen" ([1]) formuliert, ist die Kommission fest davon überzeugt, dass der Unterricht im Rahmen des Möglichen auf die individuellen, auch genderbedingten Bedürfnisse der Lernenden abgestimmt werden sollte, um das Interesse und die Beteiligung der Schülerinnen und Schüler an den Lernaktivitäten zu erhöhen und ihre Ergebnisse zu verbessern.

Aus einem Eurydice-Bericht von 2010 ([2]) geht hervor, dass die allermeisten europäischen Länder Maßnahmen zur Gleichstellung der Geschlechter ergriffen hatten oder planten, um im Bildungsbereich traditionelle Geschlechterrollen und -stereotype zu überwinden. Der Bericht analysiert auch die genderbedingten Unterschiede beim Bildungserfolg (Noten, Prüfungserfolge, Nichtaufsteigen, Schulabbruch).

([1]) KOM(2008)425: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2008:0425:FIN:DE:PDF
([2]) Geschlechterunterschiede bei Bildungsresultaten: Derzeitige Situation und aktuelle Maßnahmen in Europa (2010): http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/thematic_reports/120de.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004833/13
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(30 April 2013)

Subject: Gender-specific support requirements in schools

In recent months there has been an increasing number of press reports on the disadvantages faced by male school pupils due to the lack of gender-specific teaching in schools. The reports make particular reference to the failure by schools to provide teaching which is targeted at boys and to the absence of male role models, particularly at the primary and early years stages. Studies have highlighted an increase in behavioural problems and the fact that, on average, boys leave school with worse marks.

1. Is the Commission familiar with the above facts?

2. If so, are programmes already in place at EU level to prevent boys being placed at a gender-specific disadvantage, and to ensure that targeted support is provided?

3. Are there any gender-specific political measures in general to support boys?

4. If not, are there any plans for programmes of this kind?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2013)

In accordance with Article 165 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the responsibility for the content and organisation of education and training systems rests entirely with Member States.

The Commission supports Member States by facilitating policy cooperation between them about common challenges, for example through exchanges of good practice and peer learning.

The Commission also addresses issues such as gender inequality in education through its funding programmes. Tackling social exclusion and gender inequality are key priorities for the multinational education projects and partnerships funded through the Lifelong Learning Programme (2007-13) and will continue to be addressed in its successor programme from 2014 onwards.

As stated in the 2008 Communication on 'Improving competences for the 21st century: an agenda for European cooperation on schools' ([1]) the Commission firmly believes that teaching should be personalised as much as possible according to individual learners' needs, including those arising from gender, in order to increase student interest and commitment in learning activities and to improve their results.

A 2010 Eurydice report ([2]) found that, with a few exceptions, all European countries apply, or then planned to apply, gender equality policies in education, with a view to challenging traditional gender roles and stereotypes. The report also looked into gender differences with regard to grades and pass rates in examinations as well as drop-out rates and grade retention.

([1]) (COM(2008)425): http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2008:0425:FIN:EN:PDF.
([2]) Gender Differences in Educational Outcomes: Study on the Measures Taken and the Current Situation in Europe (2010): http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/thematic_reports/120en.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004834/13
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(30. April 2013)

Betrifft: EU-Saatgutverordnung

Rund um den Entwurf der neuen EU-Saatgutverordnung häufen sich in hohem Ausmaß die Befürchtungen und Bedenken der Bürgerinnen und Bürger. Die Zulassungsverfahren für alle Sorten gleichermaßen benachteiligen sogenannte „Alte Sorten" (die aufgrund ihrer biologischen Beschaffenheit nicht zu identen und uniformen Früchten reifen können), und führen zu einem unverhältnismäßig großen Verwaltungs- und Finanzaufwand (besonders für kleinere Betriebe).

1. Ist eine Unterscheidung zwischen industrieller und privater Verwendung einerseits und zwischen Industriesorten und „Alten Sorten" andererseits bereits angedacht?

2. Wenn nicht, wie verträgt sich eine Praxis, die „alte Sorten" und somit genetische Ressourcen gefährdet, mit dem erklärten Ziel der Artenvielfalt?

3. Wie wird der Tatsache Rechnung getragen, dass es sich bei den gefährdeten Arten auch um einen Teil des kulturellen und kulinarischen Erbes eines Landes handelt?

4. Ist generell ein Schutz der Vielfalt von Obst- und Gemüsesorten geplant, insbesondere im Hinblick auf die Tatsache, dass in den letzten 100 Jahren 75 % aller Sorten durch die Intensivierung der Landwirtschaft zum Verschwinden gebracht worden sind?

5. Gibt es Pläne, den Austausch von Samen zwischen Privatpersonen aus dem Anmeldeverfahren auszunehmen?

Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(17. Juni 2013)

1.-3. Der Vorschlag der Kommission betreffend die Erzeugung von Pflanzenvermehrungsmaterial und dessen Bereitstellung auf dem Markt wurde am 6. Mai 2013 angenommen. Pflanzenvermehrungsmaterial, das für die private Verwendung erzeugt wird, unterliegt nicht den Vorschriften dieses Vorschlags. Für althergebrachte Sorten gilt in der Regel die Definition als Sorte, für die eine amtlich anerkannte Beschreibung vorliegt, und für die Registrierung und Bereitstellung dieser Sorten auf dem Markt gelten weniger strenge Bedingungen. Gemäß diesem weniger strengen Verfahren muss lediglich eine Beschreibung der Sorte vorgelegt werden, Tests sind nicht erforderlich. Die Mitgliedstaaten wenden ermäßigte Gebührensätze für die Registrierung dieser Sorten an, und es werden keine Jahresgebühren für ihre Erhaltung erhoben. Kleinstunternehmen sind von allen Registrierungsgebühren befreit. Saatgut althergebrachter Sorten darf nur in der/den jeweiligen Ursprungsregion(en) erzeugt werden.

All diese Vorschriften zielen auf eine leichtere Registrierung und damit auf die Erhaltung alterhergebrachter, traditioneller Sorten ab.

4. Die weniger strengen Registrierungsanforderungen für alte Sorten (als Sorten mit offiziell anerkannter Beschreibung) sollten dazu beitragen, dass viele Obst- und Gemüsesorten sowie sonstige Sorten erhalten bleiben, die sonst verloren gingen.

5. Der Austausch von Pflanzenvermehrungsmaterial zwischen nicht gewerblichen Akteuren ist von den Bestimmungen des Vorschlags ausgenommen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004834/13
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(30 April 2013)

Subject: EU seed regulation

Citizens are becoming increasingly anxious and concerned about the draft of the new EU seed regulation. The approval procedures, which will apply similarly to all varieties, will place 'old varieties' at a disadvantage since their biological make-up makes it impossible for them to mature into identical and uniform fruits, and will result in disproportionately high administrative and financial burdens, particularly for smaller enterprises.

1. Are plans already in place to distinguish between industrial and private use on the one hand, and between industrial varieties and 'old varieties' on the other?

2. If not, how can a practice which jeopardises 'old varieties,' and thus genetic resources, be reconciled with the stated objective of biodiversity?

3. What account has been taken of the fact that the varieties at risk are also part of a country's cultural and culinary heritage?

4. In general terms, are there any plans to protect the diversity of fruit and vegetable varieties, in particular given that 75% of all varieties have become extinct over the past 100 years due to the intensification of agriculture?

5. Are any plans to introduce an exemption from the registration procedure for the exchange of seeds between individuals?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(17 June 2013)

1-3. The Commission proposal on the production and marketing of plant reproductive material was adopted on 6 May 2013. Any production of plant reproductive material for private use is not part of the scope of the proposal. Old varieties usually fall under the definition of a variety provided with an officially recognised description, which may be registered and marketed under a lighter procedure. That procedure only requires the availability of a description of the variety, while no testing is required. Member States shall apply reduced fees for their registration and no annual fees shall be imposed for the maintenance of those varieties. Micro-enterprises shall be fully exempted from any registration fees. Old varieties shall only be produced in their regions of origin.

All those provisions aim at supporting the easy registration and thus maintenance of old, traditional varieties.

4. The registration of old varieties, with less stringent requirements (as varieties with officially recognised description), should help with the maintenance of many fruit, vegetable and other varieties, which otherwise would be lost.

5. Exchange in kind of plant reproductive material between non-professionals is exempted from the provisions of the proposal.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004835/13
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(30. April 2013)

Betrifft: Früherkennung von Depressionen bei männlichen Patienten

Studien verdeutlichen eine zutiefst bedenkliche Entwicklung im Bereich von psychischen Krankheiten bei Männern (vor allem Depressionen): Obwohl es deutlich weniger depressive Männer als Frauen gibt, begehen dreimal mehr Männer Suizid (aufgrund einer unerkannten depressiven Erkrankung). Die immer noch bestehende Stigmatisierung von psychischen Krankheiten, von der Männer besonders betroffen sind, führt einerseits dazu, dass vom Patienten später medizinische Hilfe in Anspruch genommen wird und andererseits die Erkrankung vom behandelnden Arzt und vom privaten Umfeld später erkannt wird. Dazu trägt auch das herrschende Männerbild in großem Ausmaß bei; mittlerweile sind Depressionen die häufigste Todesursache bei unter 45-jährigen Menschen. Generell bekommen nur drei von hundert Erkrankten weltweit eine angemessene Therapie (laut WHO).

1. Sind der Kommission die oben genannten Zahlen und Fakten bekannt?

2. Wenn ja, gibt es bereits EU-weite Programme zur spezifischen Vorsorge und Früherkennung von Depressionen bei männlichen Patienten?

3. Gibt es bereits Initiativen auf EU-Ebene, die für eine Veränderung des weitgehenden vorherrschenden unrealistischen Männerbildes sorgen sollen und zu einem Rückgang der Stigmatisierung von Männern mit psychischen Krankheiten führen?

Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(20. Juni 2013)

Der Kommission sind das Ausmaß von Depressionen und die entsprechenden Folgen sowie die Tatsache bekannt, dass Frauen häufiger als Männer von Depressionen betroffen sind und Selbstmord oft mit psychischen Krankheiten im Zusammenhang steht. Ebenfalls ist ihr bewusst, dass es bei der Behandlung psychischer Störungen Diskrepanzen gibt, die teilweise daraus resultieren, dass Männer eher zögern, Hilfe in Anspruch zu nehmen.

Den amtlichen EU-Statistiken zufolge gelten Depressionen in der EU nicht als häufigste Todesursache. So nehmen Todesfälle durch Selbstmord sowie aufgrund von psychischen und Verhaltensstörungen ([1]) bei den Todesursachen der Bevölkerung unter 45 Jahren den fünften Platz ein (13,9 % der Todesfälle im Jahr 2010).

Die Einrichtung von Programmen zur Förderung der gezielten Vorsorge und Früherkennung von Depressionen in der Bevölkerung obliegt primär den Mitgliedstaaten.

Die Kommission leistet finanzielle Unterstützung im Rahmen des EU-Gesundheitsprogramms für eine Gemeinsame Aktion für psychische Gesundheit und Wohlbefinden, bei welcher die teilnehmenden Mitgliedstaaten und assoziierten Staaten zusammenarbeiten, um bewährte Verfahrensweisen zur Bekämpfung von Depressionen und zur Verhinderung von Selbstmord zu ermitteln.

Des Weiteren unterstützt die Kommission das Projekt „Preventing Depression and Improving Awareness through Networking in the EU" (PREDI-NU) ([2]), bei dem es darum geht, mithilfe des Internets Informationen über Depressionen und Selbstmanagementinstrumente zu verbreiten. Der Projektansatz ist auf die bevorzugten Verhaltensweisen von Männern bei der Inanspruchnahme von Hilfe ausgerichtet. „OSPI Europe — optimizing suicide prevention programs and their implementation in Europe" ([3]) stellt ein weiteres maßgebliches Programm dar, das im Rahmen des 7. Forschungsrahmenprogramms unterstützt wird.

([1]) Platz im Jahr 2010, wobei die Todesursachen „Selbstverletzung", „Psychische und Verhaltensstörungen" und „Alkoholbedingte psychische und Verhaltensstörungen" hinzukamen.
([2]) http://www.predi-nu.eu/
([3]) http://www.ospi-europe.com/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004835/13
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(30 April 2013)

Subject: Early diagnosis of depression in male patients

Studies have highlighted an extremely concerning development in the field of male mental health, relating particularly to depression: although significantly fewer men than women suffer from depression, three times more men commit suicide because of an undiagnosed depressive illness. The ongoing stigmatisation of mental illness, particularly among men, means not only that patients seek medical assistance later, but also that the disease is identified later by the attending doctor or the patient's friends and family. Another key contributing factor is the prevailing perception of males. Depression is now the leading cause of death for people under 45, and in more general terms the WHO has stated that only three out of every hundred patients suffering from the disease worldwide receive appropriate treatment.

1. Is the Commission familiar with the above facts and figures?

2. If so, have EU-wide programmes already been put in place to promote the targeted prevention and early diagnosis of depression in male patients?

3. Are there already initiatives at EU level aimed at changing the unrealistic but largely prevailing perception of males and reducing the stigmatisation of male mental illness?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2013)

The Commission is aware of the dimension of depression and its implications, of the fact that more women than men suffer from depression, and that suicides are often associated with a history of mental illness. The Commission is also aware of the treatment gap for mental disorders, partly because men may be reluctant to seek help.

According to the official EU-statistics, depression is not the leading cause of death in the EU. Deaths caused by suicide and mental and behavioural disorders ([1]) rank fifth as cause of death in the population below 45 years of age (13.9% of deaths in 2010).

Putting in place programmes to promote the targeted prevention and early diagnosis of depression in the population would be primarily a responsibility of Member States themselves.

The Commission provides financial support from the EU-Health Programme to a Joint Action on Mental Health and Well-being, under which the participating Member States and Associated Countries collaborate to identify best practices in action against depression and to prevent suicide.

In addition, the Commission supports the project 'Preventing Depression and Improving Awareness through Networking in the EU (PREDI-NU)' ([2]), which is about using the Internet to disseminate information about depression and self-management tools. The approach of this project responds to the preferences of male help-seeking behaviour. Another relevant project is 'OSPI Europe — optimizing suicide prevention programs and their implementation in Europe' ([3]), which receives support from the 7th Framework Research Programme.

([1]) Rank in 2010 after addition of causes of death 'intentional self-harm', 'Mental and behavioural disorders' and 'Mental and behavioural disorders due to use of alcohol'.
([2]) http://www.predi-nu.eu/
([3]) http://www.ospi-europe.com/

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-004836/13
aan de Commissie
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(30 april 2013)

Betreft: Weigering Europese ziekteverzekeringskaart Spanje

Een groeiend aantal Europese burgers die in Spanje met vakantie zijn, wordt in Spaanse ziekenhuizen geconfronteerd met een weigering van hun geldige Europese ziekteverzekeringskaart EHIC (European Health Insurance Card).

In haar antwoord op vraag E-008406/2012 bevestigde de Commissie dat zij op de hoogte is van het probleem en dat zij een onderzoek opende om de situatie te bestuderen.

Kan de Commissie de resultaten van dit onderzoek meedelen?

Welke stappen zal de Commissie verder ondernemen om aan deze praktijk een einde te maken?

Antwoord van de heer Andor namens de Commissie
(24 mei 2013)

De Commissie voert nog overleg met de Spaanse regering om te proberen een einde te maken aan de voortdurende situatie waarin bepaalde ziekenhuizen in toeristische gebieden van Spanje de Europese ziekteverzekeringskaart (EHIC) weigeren te aanvaarden. Deze situatie is in strijd met het EU-recht en de Commissie zal als hoedster van het Verdrag optreden om te waarborgen dat de rechten van de EU-burgers worden gerespecteerd.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004836/13
to the Commission
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(30 April 2013)

Subject: Refusal to recognise the European Health Insurance Card in Spain

A growing number of European citizens visiting Spain on holiday find that Spanish hospitals refuse to recognise a valid European Health Insurance Card (EHIC).

In its answer to Question E-008406/2012, the Commission confirmed that it was aware of the problem and that it had opened an investigation to study the situation.

Can the Commission communicate the results of this investigation?

What further steps will the Commission take in order to put an end to this practice?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(24 May 2013)

The Commission is still engaged in discussions with the Spanish Government in an attempt to bring to an end the continuing practice of certain hospitals in tourist areas of Spain to refuse to accept the European Health Insurance Card (EHIC). This practice is in breach of EC law and the Commission will act in its role as guardian of the Treaty to ensure that EU citizens' rights are respected.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-004837/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(30 de abril de 2013)

Asunto: Condiciones para formar parte de la UE

El Tratado de la UE establece que todos los Estados europeos que quieran adherirse a la UE han de cumplir los valores democráticos de la UE y han de estar comprometidos a promocionarlos.

De hecho, en el proceso de adhesión se establece que el primer paso que un Estado ha de hacer es cumplir unos mínimos requisitos. Entre otros, en el criterio de Copenhague del año 1993 se establece «la necesidad de tener instituciones estables que garanticen la democracia, el respeto a la ley, a los derechos humanos y el respeto y protección de las minorías».

El Ministerio de Educación ha decidido no renovar a la académica española Clara Ponsatí en su puesto como profesora visitante de la cátedra Príncipe de Asturias en la Universidad de Georgetown en lo que la docente considera una maniobra de «censura» ante opiniones de ésta a favor del derecho a decidir del pueblo catalán. De hecho, según declaraciones del jefe del departamento de la Universidad de Georgetown, EUA, Jeff Anderson, en una conversación con el embajador español en Washington éste «dejó claro que no estaba de acuerdo con las opiniones de la profesora» a lo que él respondió que «ella es libre de tenerlas». Aunque los responsables de la Universidad de Georgetown consideran que la Sra. Ponsatí resultaba idónea para el programa que desarrollan, «la cátedra quedará vacante el curso que viene, a no ser que el Ministerio quiera rectificar, pero la Universidad de Georgetown ha optado por dejarla vacante en vista de que no prosperaba», ha resaltado Clara Ponsatí ([1]).

Dado que la CE controla y supervisa el progreso del Estado candidato para acceder en la EU y teniendo en cuenta la legislación establecida en el Tratado de Lisboa,

1. ¿Aceptaría la Comisión a un Estado candidato que censurara e impidiera la libertad de pensamiento y expresión?

Respuesta del Sr. Füle en nombre de la Comisión
(30 de agosto de 2013)

La protección de los derechos humanos es parte esencial de los criterios de Copenhague para la adhesión a la UE y juega un papel clave en el proceso de adhesión. La Comisión hace gran hincapié, en particular, en que se fortalezca la libertad de expresión en los países candidatos a la adhesión. A este respecto, en junio de 2013, la Comisión y el Parlamento celebraron la conferencia Speak-Up!2 que reunió a cientos de personas con interés directo en la cuestión procedentes de los medios de comunicación, de la sociedad civil y de las autoridades nacionales.

La Comisión, sin embargo, no está en posición de comentar o de hacer cualquier valoración del caso concreto descrito. Son los órganos jurisdiccionales competentes los que deben ocuparse de esta supuesta violación de los derechos individuales de un ciudadano.

([1]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/politica/20130425/54372815799/profesora-catalana-acusa-gobierno-vetarla-soberanismo.html
http://www.lavanguardia.com/politica/20130425/54371542226/mas-colell-atribuye-estado-veto-profesora-catalana-georgetown.html

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004837/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(30 April 2013)

Subject: Conditions for being part of the EU

The Treaty on European Union lays down that all European States wishing to join the European Union must respect the EU's democratic values and be committed to promoting them.

Compliance with certain minimum requirements is in fact the first step any State has to take in the accession process. The 1993 Copenhagen criteria stipulate as one such requirement: 'stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights, and respect for and protection of minorities'.

The Ministry of Education has decided not to renew Spanish academic Clara Ponsatí's appointment as visiting professor to the Prince of Asturias Chair at Georgetown University (USA), in what Ms Ponsatí views as an move to 'censure' her for supporting the Catalan people's right to a free choice. Jeff Anderson, head of department at Georgetown University, has said that during a conversation with the Spanish Ambassador in Washington, '[The Ambassador] certainly made it clear that he did not agree with her position.' Mr Anderson replied that, 'she was free to have that position.' Georgetown University considers Ms Ponsatí to be highly suitable for the programme they are running but, according to Ms Ponsatí, 'The Chair will remain vacant during the next academic year, unless the Ministry wishes to revise its position, but Georgetown University has chosen to leave the Chair vacant so they do not win' ([1]).

1. When countries apply to join the EU, the Commission supervises and monitors their progress towards accession. Bearing this and the laws under the Lisbon Treaty in mind, would the Commission accept a candidate country that censured and prevented freedom of thought and freedom of expression?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(30 August 2013)

The protection of human rights is an essential part of the Copenhagen criteria for EU accession and plays a key role in the accession process. The Commission puts great emphasis in particular on strengthening the freedom of expression in the enlargement countries. In this regard, in June 2013, the Commission together with Parliament held a Speak-Up! 2 conference which brought together hundreds of key stakeholders from the media, civil society and national authorities.

The Commission, however, is in no position to comment or give any assessment on the concrete case described. Such alleged violation of individual rights of a citizen is to be dealt with by the competent courts.

([1]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/politica/20130425/54372815799/profesora-catalana-acusa-gobierno-vetarla-soberanismo.html
http://www.lavanguardia.com/politica/20130425/54371542226/mas-colell-atribuye-estado-veto-profesora-catalana-georgetown.html

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004838/13
à la Commission (Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante)
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(30 avril 2013)

Objet: VP/HR — Destruction, par l'armée israélienne, d'un camp bédouin dans la vallée du Jourdain

Le 23 avril dernier, l'armée israélienne a attaqué et détruit un campement d'une communauté de bédouins palestiniens dans le nord de la vallée du Jourdain. Plusieurs tentes de ce campement avaient été financées par la France au titre de son aide humanitaire d'urgence et étaient parfaitement identifiables comme telles.

Les missions de l'Union européenne (UE) à Jérusalem et à Ramallah ont exprimé leurs «sérieuses inquiétudes» à la suite de la démolition de 22 habitats palestiniens les 23 et 24 avril par l'armée israélienne en Cisjordanie et à Jérusalem-Est occupées.

La destruction de ces habitats, situés sur huit sites différents, a contraint 28 personnes, dont 18 enfants, à quitter les lieux, tandis que 120 autres personnes ont été affectées, dont 57 enfants.

1. Quelles ont été la réaction et les actions urgentes de l'UE auprès des autorités israéliennes pour exiger ces dernières à cesser les destructions d'habitations, les déplacements de populations ainsi que les destructions d'infrastructures humanitaires d'urgence en zone C qui sont contraires au droit international humanitaire?

2. Mis à part le fait que des missions de l'UE ont exprimé de «sérieuses inquiétudes», ne serait-il pas envisageable que l'UE procède au gel des accords signés avec Israël sur la base de la violation flagrante des droits humains et donc de l'article 2 de l'accord d'association UE-Israël?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission
(1^er^ juillet 2013)

Les missions de l'UE à Jérusalem et à Ramallah continuent à suivre la situation de près.

Ces démolitions ainsi que d'autres destructions récentes semblent marquer la fin d'une période d'accalmie encourageante sur ce plan. Depuis 2008, plus de 2 400 constructions et logements palestiniens ont été démolis dans la zone C et à Jérusalem-Est, entraînant le déplacement de plus de 4 400 personnes.

Dans les conclusions du Conseil du 14 mai 2012, l'UE engageait Israël à respecter les obligations qui lui incombent s'agissant des conditions de vie de la population palestinienne dans la zone C, notamment en mettant un terme aux déplacements forcés de populations et à la démolition d'infrastructures et de logements palestiniens.

Le cas échéant, l'UE continuera de faire part à Israël de ses préoccupations au sujet de la démolition de bâtiments et logements palestiniens dans le cadre des relations bilatérales qu'elle entretient avec ce pays.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004838/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(30 April 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Destruction of a Bedouin camp in the Jordan Valley by the Israeli army

On 23 April 2013 the Israeli army attacked and destroyed a camp occupied by a Palestinian Bedouin community in the north of the Jordan Valley. Several tents in the camp had been funded by France as part of its emergency humanitarian aid efforts and were easily identifiable as such.

The European Union missions in Jerusalem and Ramallah have expressed their 'serious concerns' following the Israeli army's demolition, on 23 and 24 April, of 22 Palestinian homes in the occupied territories of the West Bank and East Jerusalem.

The destruction of those homes, in eight different locations, has forced 28 people, including 18 children, to move elsewhere, while another 120 people, including 57 children, have been otherwise affected.

1. How has the EU responded to the Israeli authorities and what urgent action has it taken to make them stop demolishing homes, displacing populations and destroying emergency humanitarian infrastructure in Area C, in breach of international humanitarian law?

2. Aside from the fact that EU missions have expressed 'serious concerns', would it not be possible for the EU to suspend agreements signed with Israel on the grounds of its clear violation of human rights and hence of Article 2 of the EU-Israel Association Agreement?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(1 July 2013)

The EU missions in Jerusalem and Ramallah continue to monitor the situation closely.

These and other recent demolitions appear to put an end to a period in which a welcome reduction in demolitions had been noted. Since the year 2008 more than 2 400 Palestinian houses and structures have been demolished in Area C and East Jerusalem, displacing more than 4 400 people.

In the 14 May 2012 Council conclusions, the EU called upon Israel to meet its obligations regarding the living conditions of the Palestinian population in Area C, including by halting forced transfer of population and demolition of Palestinian housing and infrastructure.

As appropriate, the EU will continue to raise its concerns on the demolition of Palestinian buildings and housing stock in the framework of its bilateral relations with Israel.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004839/13
aan de Commissie
Philip Claeys (NI)
(30 april 2013)

Betreft: Uittredingsvergoeding, wedde, pensioen, regelgeving bezoldiging voorzitter Commissie

Wat is het huidige maandelijkse brutobasissalaris van de voorzitter van de Commissie? Graag een antwoord in euro in de huidige situatie.

Welk percentage belastingen wordt hierop betaald?

Welk bedrag aan vergoedingen werd aan de voorzitter uitbetaald bovenop dit basissalaris? Graag een opsplitsing per categorie bijkomende vergoedingen (gezinstoelage, kindertoelage, standplaatstoelage, representatietoelage, inrichtingskosten, verhuiskosten, reiskosten, hotelkosten, …) en een antwoord in euro in de huidige situatie.

Wordt de uittredingsvergoeding van de voorzitter nog steeds geregeld door Verordening nr. 422/67/EEG uit 1967? Zal deze dus vastgesteld worden op 50 % van het basissalaris gedurende 3 jaar?

De verordening stelt dat pensioen kan worden aangevraagd vanaf de leeftijd van 65 jaar en dat elk mandaatjaar geldt voor 4,5 %. Wordt dit percentage ook toegekend voor de jaren uittredingsvergoeding?

Is de Commissie van mening dat de huidige bezoldiging van haar voorzitter strookt met de boodschap van besparingen en zuinigheid die de EU en de lidstaten momenteel verkondigen aan hun burgers?

Antwoord van de heer Šefčovič namens de Commissie
(1 augustus 2013)

Overeenkomstig artikel 243 van het VWEU wordt de bezoldiging van de voorzitter van de Commissie is vastgesteld in een verordening van de Raad.

Het gaat meer bepaald om Verordening nr. 422/67/EEG van de Raad tot vaststelling van de geldelijke regeling voor de voorzitter en de leden van de Commissie, de president, de rechters en de griffier van, alsmede de advocaten-generaal bij het Hof van Justitie.

De precieze bezoldiging die een lid van de Commissie ontvangt, is afhankelijk van zijn of haar persoonlijke omstandigheden, zoals onder meer het aantal gezinsleden. Deze gegevens zijn van persoonlijke aard en kunnen bijgevolg niet worden vrijgegeven.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004839/13
to the Commission
Philip Claeys (NI)
(30 April 2013)

Subject: Retirement allowance, salary, pension and rules on the remuneration of the President of the Commission

What is the current gross monthly salary of the President of the Commission? Please state it in euros in accordance with the present situation.

What percentage of this does he pay in tax?

What amount has the President received in allowances in addition to his basic salary? Please provide a breakdown per category of allowance (family allowance, child allowance, residence allowance, entertainment allowance, installation allowance, removal expenses, travel expenses, hotel expenses, etc.) and state the figures in euros in accordance with the present situation.

Is the President's retirement allowance still governed by Regulation (EEC) No 422/67 dating from 1967? Will it, therefore, be set at 50% of the basic salary for three years?

The regulation stipulates that a pension may be applied for from age 65 and that each year in office is worth 4.5%. Does an entitlement equivalent to this percentage also accrue during the years in which the retirement allowance is paid?

Does the Commission consider the present remuneration of its President to be compatible with the message of austerity and cost-cutting which the EU and Member States are currently delivering to their citizens?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(1 August 2013)

According to Article 243 of the TFEU, the remuneration of the President of the Commission is determined by a Council Regulation.

The relevant regulation is Council Regulation No 422/67/EEC, determining the emoluments of the President and members of the Commission and of the President, Judges, Advocates-General and Registrar of the Court of Justice.

The exact remuneration of any individual Member depends on his or her personal circumstances, including for example the number of people in his or her family etc. This is personal data, which cannot therefore be disclosed.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004840/13
aan de Commissie
Philip Claeys (NI)
(30 april 2013)

Betreft: Uittredingsvergoeding, wedde, pensioen, regelgeving bezoldiging Hoge Vertegenwoordiger buitenlands beleid

Wat is het huidige maandelijkse brutobasissalaris van de Hoge Vertegenwoordiger buitenlands beleid? Graag een antwoord in euro in de huidige situatie.

Welk percentage belastingen wordt hierop betaald?

Welk bedrag aan vergoedingen werd aan de Hoge Vertegenwoordiger in 2012 uitbetaald bovenop dit basissalaris? Graag een opsplitsing per categorie bijkomende vergoedingen (gezinstoelage, kindertoelage, standplaatstoelage, representatietoelage, inrichtingskosten, verhuiskosten, reiskosten, hotelkosten, …) en een antwoord in euro in de huidige situatie.

Wordt de uittredingsvergoeding van de Hoge Vertegenwoordiger nog steeds geregeld door Verordening nr. 422/67/EEG uit 1967? Zal deze dus vastgesteld worden op 50 % van het basissalaris gedurende 3 jaar?

De verordening stelt dat pensioen kan worden aangevraagd vanaf de leeftijd van 65 jaar en dat elk mandaatjaar geldt voor 4,5 %. Wordt dit percentage ook toegekend voor de jaren uittredingsvergoeding?

Is de Commissie van mening dat de huidige bezoldiging van de Hoge Vertegenwoordiger strookt met de boodschap van besparingen en zuinigheid die de EU en de lidstaten momenteel verkondigen aan hun burgers?

Antwoord van de heer Šefčovič namens de Commissie
(15 juli 2013)

Overeenkomstig artikel 243 van het Verdrag betreffende de werking van de Europese Unie (VWEU) worden de emolumenten van de leden van de Commissie, van de voorzitter van de Europese Raad, van de hoge vertegenwoordiger van de Unie voor buitenlandse zaken en veiligheidsbeleid, van de presidenten, de leden en de griffiers van het Hof van Justitie van de Europese Unie, alsmede van de secretaris-generaal van de Raad vastgesteld door de Raad overeenkomstig Verordening nr. 422/67/EEG, nr. 5/67/Euratom van 25 juli 1967, gewijzigd bij Verordening (EU, Euratom) nr. 904/2012.

De belastingen die de hoge vertegenwoordiger van de Unie voor buitenlandse zaken en veiligheidsbeleid moet betalen, zijn eveneens door de Raad vastgesteld in Verordening nr. 260/68.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004840/13
to the Commission
Philip Claeys (NI)
(30 April 2013)

Subject: Retirement allowance, salary, pension and rules on the remuneration of the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy

What is the current gross monthly salary of the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy? Please state it in euros in accordance with the present situation.

What percentage of this does she pay in tax?

What amount did the High Representative receive in allowances in addition to her basic salary? Please provide a breakdown per category of allowance (family allowance, child allowance, residence allowance, entertainment allowance, installation allowance, removal expenses, travel expenses, hotel expenses, etc.) and state the figures in euros in accordance with the present situation.

Is the High Representative's retirement allowance still governed by Regulation (EEC) No 422/67 dating from 1967? Will it, therefore, be set at 50% of the basic salary for three years?

The regulation stipulates that a pension may be applied for from age 65 and that each year in office is worth 4.5%. Does an entitlement equivalent to this percentage also accrue during the years in which the retirement allowance is paid?

Does the Commission consider the High Representative's present remuneration to be compatible with the message of austerity and cost-cutting which the EU and the Member States are currently delivering to their citizens?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(15 July 2013)

Under Article 243 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) the emoluments of the Members of the Commission, the President of the European Council, the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, the Presidents, Members and Registrars of the Court of Justice of the European Union, and the Secretary-General of the Council are determined by the Council under Regulation No 422/67EEC, 5/67Euratom of 25 July 1967 amended by Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 904/2012.

The taxes to be paid by the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security policy are also set out by the Council in the regulation No 260/68.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004841/13
aan de Commissie
Philip Claeys (NI)
(30 april 2013)

Betreft: Activiteit gepensioneerde ambtenaren van de Commissie in gebouwen Europese instellingen

Bestaan er richtlijnen, voorschriften of afspraken inzake de aanwezigheid van gepensioneerde ambtenaren van de Commissie in de gebouwen van de Europese instellingen na hun pensionering?

Mogen zij zich vrijwel permanent in de gebouwen van de instellingen bevinden?

Mogen zij van alle voorzieningen (zoals restaurants) blijven gebruikmaken?

Mogen zij zich aandienen bij actieve ambtenaren, informeren naar de stand van zaken van dossiers en daarbij „raad" geven, en dit met de melding dat zij handelen in opdracht van een ngo en/of een andere instelling?

Indien een gepensioneerd ambtenaar aldus wenst te lobbyen voor een ngo en/of een andere instelling, aan welke voorschriften dient dan voldaan te worden?

Worden ambtenaren die met pensioen gaan van deze regels op de hoogte gebracht?

Antwoord van de heer Šefčovič namens de Commissie
(5 juli 2013)

Voormalige ambtenaren zijn gehouden betamelijkheid en kiesheid te betrachten bij het aanvaarden van bepaalde functies of voordelen.

Volgens artikel 16 van het personeelsstatuut moet een ambtenaar die binnen twee jaar na beëindiging van de dienst al dan niet bezoldigde beroepsbezigheden wenst uit te oefenen, de instelling daarvan in kennis stellen. Als deze beroepsbezigheden mogelijk niet verenigbaar zijn met de legitieme belangen van de instelling, kan het tot aanstelling bevoegde gezag besluiten de bezigheden te verbieden of de uitoefening ervan aan bepaalde voorwaarden te onderwerpen (inclusief een verbod op beroepsmatige contacten met voormalige diensten en een verbod op het werken aan bepaalde specifieke zaken). Tot dergelijke voorwaarden wordt besloten op basis van de merites van elk individueel geval en daarbij wordt gezocht naar een juist evenwicht tussen het recht op arbeid en de legitieme belangen van de instelling.

De Commissie voert een proactief beleid ten aanzien van ambtenaren en andere personeelsleden die de dienst beëindigen, om te garanderen dat zij worden geïnformeerd over hun verplichtingen middels specifieke opleidingscursussen, informatie op de interne website van de Commissie en herinneringen tijdens dienstbeëindigingsformaliteiten.

De gepensioneerde ambtenaren van de Commissie hebben toegang tot een beperkt aantal gebouwen van de Commissie in Brussel waar verschillende administratieve en sociale diensten gehuisvest zijn. Behalve voor deze beperkte toegangsmogelijkheden moeten gepensioneerde ambtenaren die een Commissiegebouw willen betreden, net als alle andere externe bezoekers van de kantoren van de Commissie, toegang voor „bezoekers" aanvragen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004841/13
to the Commission
Philip Claeys (NI)
(30 April 2013)

Subject: Activities of retired officials of the Commission in European institution buildings

Are there any guidelines, rules or arrangements concerning the presence of retired officials of the Commission in the buildings of European institutions after their retirement?

Are they allowed to be present almost permanently in the buildings of the institutions?

Are they allowed to continue using all the amenities (such as restaurants)?

Are they allowed to announce their arrival to officials in active service and enquire about the status of dossiers, thereby giving 'advice', and so act on behalf of an NGO and/or other institution in this capacity?

If, therefore, a retired official wishes to lobby for an NGO and/or other institution, what rules does he or she need to observe?

Are officials who are retiring informed about these rules?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(5 July 2013)

Former officials are bound by the duty to behave with integrity and discretion as regards the acceptance of certain appointments.

According to Article 16 of the SR, any official who has left the services and wishing to engage in an occupational activity, whether gainful or not, within two years of leaving the service shall inform the institution thereof. If that activity could lead to a conflict with the legitimate interest of the institution, the Appointing Authority may either forbid the activity or give its approval subject to any conditions it thinks fit (including prohibition to have professional contacts with former services or working on some specific cases). Such conditions are decided based on the merits of each individual case, bearing in mind the need to find an appropriate balance between the individual's right to work and the legitimate interests of the institution.

The Commission applies a pro-active policy towards officials and other agents who are leaving the service to ensure they are informed about their obligations by means of dedicated training courses, information on the Commission's internal website, and reminders during leaving formalities.

The statutory pensioners of the Commission have access to a limited number of Commission buildings in Brussels housing various administrative and social services. Except for those limited access possibilities, retired officials wishing to enter a Commission building have to require a 'visitors' access as any other external visitor entering the Commission premises.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004842/13
à la Commission
Alain Cadec (PPE)
(30 avril 2013)

Objet: Marché européen de l'oeuf

La filière œufs française rencontre en ce moment de grands problèmes de concurrence sur le marché européen de l'œuf. En effet, l'application du règlement d'exécution (UE) nº 88/2013 sur les importations d'œufs en provenance de pays tiers et l'application de la directive 1999/74/CE sur le bien-être animal entraînent de grandes difficultés sur le marché.

Le prix de l'œuf est au plus bas, alors que les producteurs ont massivement investi pour mettre aux normes leurs sites de production à la suite de l'application de la directive sur le bien-être animal. Cette baisse du prix de l'œuf est due notamment à l'application du règlement (UE) nº 88/2013 sur les importations d'œufs en provenance de pays tiers.

La Commission peut-elle démontrer que toutes les mesures ont été prises en matière de réciprocité et de traçabilité des œufs en provenance de pays tiers?

La Commission peut-elle démontrer que des contrôles stricts sont effectués pour vérifier le respect de la directive 1999/74/CE par les États membres et les pays tiers exportant vers l'Union européenne?

La Commission proposera-t-elle rapidement le classement des œufs comme «produits sensibles» dans le cadre des négociations commerciales afin qu'ils bénéficient d'une réduction tarifaire moins élevée que celle appliquée aux produits non alimentaires? Ceci permettrait la mise en place d'une réelle réciprocité avec les œufs et ovoproduits en provenance des pays tiers.

Réponse donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(4 juillet 2013)

L'Union européenne dispose d'une législation harmonisée relative à la santé animale et la santé publique en ce qui concerne les importations de produits d'origine animale, y compris les œufs et les ovoproduits. La Commission procède actuellement à des audits dans les États membres et les pays tiers afin de vérifier la mise en œuvre de cette législation et prend les mesures appropriées lorsque celle-ci n'est pas appliquée.

La baisse des prix des œufs observée depuis le mois de janvier est liée à un ajustement de ces prix après une hausse spectaculaire enregistrée en 2012, suivie d'une offre excédentaire d'œufs en 2013. Le règlement (UE) n° 88/2013 ([1]) autorisant l'Ukraine à exporter des œufs et des ovoproduits vers l'Union européenne sous certaines conditions est entré en vigueur le 21 février 2013 et n'a, jusqu'ici, eu aucun effet sur le marché des œufs de l'Union, puisqu'il n'y a eu aucune importation d'œufs et d'ovoproduits en provenance de l'Ukraine entre février et mai 2013.

En ce qui concerne la vérification du respect de la directive 1999/74/CE ([2]), la Commission renvoie à sa réponse à la question parlementaire E-4763/2013 ([3]).

Au cours des négociations des accords de libre-échange avec les pays tiers, la Commission examine toujours les éventuelles conséquences positives et négatives que ce type d'accords pourrait avoir sur le marché des œufs et des ovoproduits. En fonction du pays tiers concerné, la Commission peut obtenir des avantages en vue de l'exportation de ces produits ou, au contraire, les considérer comme sensibles et limiter l'octroi d'éventuelles concessions aux importations de pays tiers.

([1]) JO L 32 du 1.2.2013.
([2]) JO L 203 du 3.8.1999.
([3]) http://wwws.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004842/13
to the Commission
Alain Cadec (PPE)
(30 April 2013)

Subject: European egg market

The French egg industry is currently facing major competition problems in the European egg market. The application of Implementing Regulation (EU) No 88/2013 on egg imports from third countries and the application of Directive 1999/74/EC on animal welfare are causing serious problems on the market.

Egg prices are at rock bottom, even though producers have invested huge amounts of money to ensure that their production sites meet current standards following the application of the directive on animal welfare. This fall in egg prices is due in particular to the application of Regulation (EU) No 88/2013 on egg imports from third countries.

Can the Commission demonstrate that all measures have been taken with regard to reciprocity and traceability of eggs from third countries?

Can the Commission demonstrate that stringent checks are carried out to verify compliance with Directive 1999/74/EC by the Member States and third countries exporting to the European Union?

Will the Commission shortly propose that eggs be classified as 'sensitive goods' in trade negotiations so that they receive a smaller tariff reduction than the one applied to non-food goods? This would mean that genuine reciprocity with third-country eggs and egg products could be established.

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(4 July 2013)

The European Union has harmonised animal and public health legislation in place for imports of products of animal origin, including eggs and egg products. The Commission carries out audits in Member States and third countries to check its implementation and takes appropriate actions when this legislation is not applied.

The decrease of egg prices observed since January is linked to the adjustment of prices after the exceptionally high prices in 2012 followed by an oversupply of eggs in 2013. Regulation (EU) No 88/2013 ([1]) authorising Ukraine to export to the EU eggs and egg products under certain conditions entered into force on 21 February 2013 has had no effect on the Union egg market so far, since there were no imports of egg or egg products from Ukraine between February and May 2013.

As regards verifying compliance with Directive 1999/74/EC ([2]) the Commission refers to its reply to Parliamentary Question E-4763/2013 ([3]).

During free trade agreements' negotiations with third countries, the Commission always examines the potential positive and negative effects of such agreements on the egg and egg product market. Depending on the third country, the Commission can obtain advantages to export these products or alternatively can consider them as sensitive and limit possible concessions to third countries' imports.

([1]) OJ L 32, 1.2.2013.
([2]) OJ L203, 3.8.1999.
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004843/13
à la Commission (Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante)
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(30 avril 2013)

Objet: VP/HR — Étiquetage des produits des colonies de Cisjordanie et de Jérusalem-Est par les États membres

En mars 2013, le gouvernement des Pays-Bas a élaboré des textes législatifs pour son secteur privé relatifs à l'étiquetage des produits des colonies israéliennes. Ce pays a été le deuxième à procéder ainsi après le Royaume-Uni qui a mené une telle politique depuis quelques années. Quelques jours après la publication des textes, le gouvernement néerlandais a fait marche arrière indiquant que ceux-ci étaient un projet à développer.

Selon les textes, les produits suivants seront estampillés: les légumes et fruits frais, le vin, le miel, l'huile d'olive, le poisson, le bœuf, le poulet, les œufs, tout comme les cosmétiques, produits «dans les colonies d'Israël sur les hauteurs du Golan, à Jérusalem-Est, en Cisjordanie, ou dans les territoires palestiniens».

Par ailleurs, le 13 avril dernier, une lettre portant la signature de 13 des 27 ministres des affaires étrangères de l'Union européenne (Autriche, Belgique, Danemark, Espagne, Finlande, France, Grande-Bretagne, Irlande, Luxembourg, Malte, Pays-Bas, Portugal et Slovénie) accueillait «chaleureusement» l'engagement de la VP/HR à œuvrer avec les collègues commissaires pour préparer les directives de l'Union sur l'étiquetage de la production des colonies.

1. La Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante est-elle au courant des textes élaborés par le gouvernement des Pays-Bas? Quelles sont les conditions nécessaires pour que de telles propositions puissent être mises en œuvre au niveau de l'Union européenne?

2. Concernant la lettre du 13 avril 2013, à quel stade se trouve la coopération avec la Commission concernant l'étiquetage des produits des colonies? À quel type d'engagement entre la Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante et les commissaires visant à préparer les directives de l'Union sur l'étiquetage de la production des colonies les ministres des affaires étrangères des 13 États membres de l'Union font-ils référence? Quels sont les délais et étapes de cet engagement?

Réponse donnée par la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante Ashton au nom de la Commission
(31 juillet 2013)

Dans les conclusions du Conseil du 14 mai 2012, l'UE et ses États membres ont réaffirmé leur détermination à mettre en œuvre effectivement et pleinement la législation de l'UE en vigueur et les accords bilatéraux applicables aux produits des colonies. Le Conseil a souligné l'importance de l'action qui est actuellement menée à cet égard, conjointement avec la Commission. Par ailleurs, cette position a été rappelée dans les conclusions du Conseil du 10 décembre 2012.

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante estime que la législation de l'UE en vigueur concernant ces questions est suffisamment claire et précise. Cependant, si la mise en œuvre de la législation de l'UE relative à l'indication de l'origine relève des autorités compétentes des États membres, la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante les a instamment priées de prêter une grande attention à l'importance d'une application pleine et effective de la législation de l'UE en matière d'étiquetage dans le cas d'Israël et à la nécessité d'intensifier leurs efforts à cette fin. Les initiatives récentes du Royaume-Uni et du Danemark sont pleinement conformes à la législation de l'UE. La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante a connaissance des discussions en cours dans plusieurs autres États membres, qui mettent au point leurs propres initiatives. Néanmoins, elle entend s'employer, avec les autres membres de la Commission, à élaborer, dans le courant de l'année 2013, des lignes directrices applicables au niveau de l'UE, qui permettraient de renforcer la mise en œuvre homogène de la législation de l'UE dans ce domaine et sa cohérence avec les positions de l'UE en matière de politique étrangère. La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante a la volonté de faire progresser ces travaux le plus rapidement possible.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004843/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(30 April 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Labelling of West Bank and East Jerusalem settlement goods by the Member States

In March 2013 the Dutch Government drafted legislative texts for its private sector concerning the labelling of Israeli settlement goods. The Netherlands was the second country to do so after the United Kingdom, which has had such a policy for a few years. A few days after the texts were published, the Dutch Government backtracked, claiming that the texts were drafts to be developed further.

According to the texts, the following goods will be marked: fresh fruit and vegetables, wine, honey, olive oil, fish, beef, chicken and eggs, as well as cosmetics produced 'in Israeli settlements in the Golan Heights, East Jerusalem, the West Bank or the Palestinian territories'.

Furthermore, on 13 April 2013 a letter signed by 13 of the 27 EU foreign ministers (Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, Finland, France, the United Kingdom, Ireland, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Portugal and Slovenia) 'warmly' welcomed the VP/HR's commitment to work with her fellow Commissioners to prepare EU-wide guidelines on the labelling of settlement produce.

1. Is the VP/HR aware of the texts drafted by the Dutch Government? What conditions are necessary for the EU-wide implementation of such proposals?

2. With regard to the letter of 13 April 2013, what stage has been reached regarding cooperation with the Commission on the labelling of settlement produce? What kind of commitment between the VP/HR and the Commissioners to prepare EU-wide guidelines on the labelling of settlement produce are the foreign ministers of the 13 EU Member States referring to? What are the time limits for this commitment and how will it be broken down?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(31 July 2013)

In the Council conclusions of 14 May 2012, the EU and its Member States reaffirmed their commitment to fully and effectively implement existing EU legislation and the bilateral arrangements applicable to settlement products. The Council underlined the importance of the work being carried out together with the Commission in this regard. This position was further recalled in Council conclusions of 10 December 2012.

The HR/VP considers that existing EU legislation on these matters is sufficiently clear and precise. However, while implementation of EU legislation on origin labelling is the responsibility of Member States' competent authorities, the HR/VP has urged them to pay close attention to the significance of the full and effective enforcement of EU labelling legislation in the case of Israel and the need for enhanced efforts on the part of competent authorities to that end. Recent initiatives by the United Kingdom and Denmark are fully in line with EU legislation. The HR/VP is aware of discussions in a number of other Member States on the preparation of their own initiatives. Nevertheless, she is committed to working with her fellow Commissioners in the course of 2013 on preparing EU-wide guidelines that would strengthen the coherent implementation of relevant EU legislation and its consistency with EU foreign policy positions. The HR/VP is committed to taking forward this work as quickly as possible.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004844/13
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(30 de abril de 2013)

Asunto: Importación de productos ecológicos a Europa

La Comisión Europea está aplicando tres regimenes diferentes para autorizar la importación de alimentos ecológicos a la Unión Europea. Este triple régimen es un espacio de inseguridad jurídica que permite que millones de toneladas de alimentos calificados de «ecológicos», crucen nuestras fronteras sin superar las rigurosas exigencias de certificación que los agricultores europeos deben superar para que sus productos puedan ser comercializados en los Estados miembros.

El sector de la agricultura ecológica en uno de los segmentos de mercado que más está creciendo en el ámbito agroalimentario. Esto supone una oportunidad excepcional para aprovechar dicho incremento de la demanda y que los agricultores ecológicos europeos incrementen su producción y otros agricultores convencionales entren en transición para que la agricultura europea sea capaz de producir de una manera más sostenible. Sin embargo, la Comisión Europea, en lugar de esto, está facilitando la importación de productos avalando la certificación de más de 130 países en todo el mundo. Las exigencias para los agricultores ecológicos europeos son muy estrictas y con estas autorizaciones se está produciendo un dumping de la normativa europea, incluso se aceptan regímenes de certificación abiertamente rechazados dentro de la Unión. Esto supone un claro ejemplo de competencia desleal. Otros países del mundo como EE.UU. protegen sus mercados y exigen los mismos requisitos para productores internos y externos de cara a garantizar que los agricultores locales cumplan cada vez más con los criterios ambientales. La importación masiva de estos productos certificados como «ecológicos» solo redunda en beneficio de las grandes cadenas distribuidoras y en perjuicio de los agricultores europeos.

¿No considera la Comisión que aceptar productos certificados como «ecológicos» sin exigir que cumplan las mismas normas que en Europa puede suponer un caso de competencia desleal?

¿No cree la Comisión que permitir importar productos «ecológicos» que no cumplen la normativa europea en los mismos términos que los productos de los agricultores europeos va en perjuicio de los mismos?

¿No cree que es «dumping ecológico» el aceptar certificaciones mucho más laxas que la europea, ya que supone una penalización a agricultores que cumplen con la normativa europea y los criterios ambientales de la PAC?

Respuesta del Sr. Cioloş en nombre de la Comisión
(21 de junio de 2013)

El Reglamento (CE) n° 834/2007 del Consejo ([1]) establece dos sistemas en relación con las importaciones de productos ecológicos en la EU, a saber, el de cumplimiento y el de equivalencia. Hasta ahora, solo se viene aplicando el de equivalencia, bien con terceros países, bien con organismos de control privados. Además, como norma transitoria, las autoridades competentes de los Estados miembros pueden conceder autorizaciones de importación, lote por lote, en determinadas condiciones.

Los sistemas equivalentes permiten alcanzar los mismos objetivos y principios que los que establece la legislación de la UE a través de una serie de normas que garantizan el mismo nivel de conformidad, por lo que los productores de productos ecológicos de terceros países pueden aplicar normas ligeramente diferentes y exportar estos productos a la UE, siempre que sus normas y sistema de control hayan sido reconocidos como equivalentes a los de la UE.

El programa de trabajo de la Comisión para 2013 incluye una revisión del marco legislativo y político actual aplicable a los productos ecológicos y, en particular, del Reglamento (CE) n° 834/2007 del Consejo. En este contexto, se está llevando a cabo una evaluación de impacto y una evaluación a fondo de esta política, incluidos los aspectos internacionales y comerciales.

([1]) Reglamento (CE) n° 834/2007 del Consejo, de 28 de junio de 2007, sobre producción y etiquetado de los productos ecológicos (DO L 189 de 20.7.2007).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004844/13
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(30 April 2013)

Subject: Imports of organic products into Europe

The Commission is applying three different systems to authorise imports of organic food into the European Union. This triple system is an area of legal uncertainty which allows millions of tonnes of food classified as 'organic' to cross our borders without meeting the rigorous certification requirements that European farmers must meet in order for their products to be marketed in the Member States.

The organic agriculture sector is one of the market segments with the highest rate of growth in the field of agri-food. This represents an exceptional opportunity to take advantage of this increase in demand and for European organic farmers to increase their production and for other conventional farmers to enter into a transition so that European agriculture is able to produce more sustainably. However, instead of this, the Commission is facilitating imports of products bearing certifications from more than 130 countries throughout the world. The requirements for European organic farmers are very strict and these authorisations are leading to disregard for European legislation; even certification systems that have openly been rejected within the EU are being accepted. This is a clear example of unfair competition. Other countries in the world, such as the United States, protect their markets and demand the same requirements for internal and external producers in order to ensure that local farmers increasingly meet environmental criteria. Large-scale imports of these products certified as 'organic' only serve to benefit large distribution chains and to harm European farmers.

Does the Commission not consider that accepting products certified as 'organic' without requiring them to comply with the same standards as in Europe could represent a case of unfair competition?

Does the Commission not believe that allowing 'organic' products that do not comply with European legislation to be imported under the same terms as products from European farmers undermines that very legislation?

Does it not believe that it is 'organic dumping' to accept certifications much more lax than European ones, as this penalises farmers who comply with European legislation and with the environmental criteria in the CAP?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(21 June 2013)

Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 ([1]) provides for two systems to deal with imports of organic products into the EU, compliance and equivalence. Only the equivalence system has been implemented until now, either with third countries or with private control bodies. In addition, as a transitional rule, Member States competent authorities can grant import authorisations consignment by consignment under specific conditions.

Equivalent systems are capable of meeting the same objectives and principles as set in the EU's legislation by applying rules which ensure the same level of assurance of conformity. Therefore organic producers in third countries can apply slightly different rules and export organic products to the EU, provided the organic standard and the control system have been recognised as equivalent to the EU ones.

The Commission work programme for 2013 includes a review of the current political and legislative framework for organic production in particular Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007. In this context, an impact assessment is being carried out and a though evaluation of this policy is being finalised, including international and trade aspects.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products (OJ L 189, 20.7.2007).

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004845/13
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(30 de abril de 2013)

Asunto: Sistemas Participativos de Garantía

Los Sistemas Participativos de Garantía son sistemas de certificación que involucran a productores y consumidores en la certificación de productos orgánicos. Este tipo de sistemas nacen al calor de la expansión de la producción ecológica y la escasez de medios suficientes por parte de las empresas certificadoras para cubrir a agricultores dispersos.

Estos Sistemas de Garantía permiten incrementar la confianza en los productos orgánicos a través del contacto entre productores y consumidores, dando a éstos últimos la posibilidad de aceptar las prácticas de los productores certificándolos como ecológicos. La aplicación de este tipo de prácticas en la certificación de productos ecológicos en Europa ha sido rechazada por la Comisión Europea por no ser posible cumplir con la numerosa legislación. Sin embargo, en el caos que supone la aplicación de diferentes regímenes de importación de productos ecológicos, la Unión Europea está aceptando estos mismos Sistemas Participativos de Garantía para los productos importados. Esta diferenciación que la Comisión Europea aplica con los productos importados es solo un ejemplo más de cómo tan solo se pretende beneficiar a las grandes cadenas distribuidoras en lugar de a los productores. Se acepta todo tipo de certificación para los productos importados con tal de garantizar que las cadenas distribuidoras puedan cubrir la demanda de productos ecológicos. Sin embargo, los productores ecológicos europeos no pueden aprovechar el boom expansivo de la demanda de este tipo de productos debido a este «dumping ecológico» que la Comisión está autorizando en beneficio de las grandes empresas distribuidoras.

¿Cuáles son las razones que esgrime la Comisión para no aceptar Sistemas Participativos de Garantía para productos ecológicos en el territorio de la Unión Europea y en cambio sí aceptarlos para los productos importados?

¿Está la Comisión en condiciones de garantizar que las certificaciones ecológicas a través de Sistemas Participativos de Garantía puedan cumplir en términos de igualdad con las exigencias a los productos ecológicos europeos?

¿Piensa legislar para poder autorizar normas más flexibles de certificación ecológica y permitir que sean los agricultores europeos los que aprovechen el incremento de la demanda de este tipo de productos?

Respuesta del Sr. Cioloş en nombre de la Comisión
(21 de junio de 2013)

Los Sistemas Participativos de Garantía son sistemas de aseguramiento de la calidad preponderantemente locales que certifican a los productores ecológicos basándose en la participación activa de las partes interesadas. Permiten la participación directa de las partes interesadas en la elección y definición de las normas, el desarrollo y la aplicación de los procedimientos de certificación y las decisiones de certificación.

La Comisión no acepta los Sistemas Participativos de Garantía para la certificación de los productos ecológicos por tratarse de un enfoque alternativo a la certificación por terceros recogida en el marco jurídico de la UE relativo al sistema de control de la producción ecológica, que se establece en el Reglamento (CE) n° 834/2007 ([1]) y en el Reglamento (CE) n° 889/2008 de la Comisión ([2]).

Sobre la posibilidad de aplicar normas diferentes, a condición de que el sistema de control haya sido reconocido como equivalente, véase la respuesta a la pregunta escrita n° E-004844/2013 ([3]).

El programa de trabajo de la Comisión para 2013 incluye una revisión del marco político y legislativo de la producción ecológica, basada en una evaluación de la política y una evaluación de impacto. En este contexto, se evaluará en profundidad el sistema de control de la producción ecológica.

([1]) Reglamento (CE) n° 834/2007 del Consejo, de 28 de junio de 2007, sobre producción y etiquetado de los productos ecológicos (DO L 189 de 20.7.2007).

([2]) Reglamento (CE) n° 889/2008 de la Comisión, de 5 de septiembre de 2008, por el que se establecen disposiciones de aplicación del Reglamento (CE) n° 834/2007 del Consejo sobre producción y etiquetado de los productos ecológicos, con respecto a la producción ecológica, su etiquetado y su control (DO L 250 de 18.9.2008).

([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/es/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004845/13
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(30 April 2013)

Subject: Participatory Guarantee Systems

Participatory Guarantee Systems are certification systems which involve producers and consumers in the certification of organic products. These kinds of systems were prompted by the expansion of organic production and the lack of sufficient means on the part of certification companies to cover farmers spread out over a large area.

These Guarantee Systems allow confidence in organic products to be increased through contact between producers and consumers, giving consumers the opportunity to accept producers' practices by certifying them as organic. The application of such certification practices on organic products in Europe has been rejected by the Commission because it is impossible to comply with the numerous pieces of legislation. However, in the chaos of applying the different import regimes for organic products, the European Union is accepting these same Participatory Guarantee Systems for imported products. This differentiation that the Commission applies to imported products is just another example of how it only seeks to benefit large distribution chains rather than producers. Any kind of certification is accepted for imported products provided that it ensures that distribution chains can meet the demand for organic products. However, European organic producers cannot take advantage of the widespread boom in demand for these kinds of products due to the 'organic dumping' that the Commission is authorising for the benefit of large distribution companies.

What are the Commission's reasons for not accepting Participatory Guarantee Systems for organic products within the territory of the European Union while accepting them for imported products?

Is the Commission in a position to ensure that organic certifications through Participatory Guarantee Systems can comply with the demands placed on European organic products in terms of equality?

Does it intend to legislate in order to be able to authorise more flexible organic certification standards and allow European farmers to benefit from the increased demand for these kinds of products?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(21 June 2013)

Participatory Guarantee Systems are locally focused quality assurance systems that certify organic producers based on stakeholders' active participation. They enable the direct participation of stakeholders in the choice and definition of the standards, the development and implementation of certification procedures, and the certification decisions.

The Commission does not accept Participatory Guarantee Systems for the certification of organic products because this approach is alternative to the third party certification that is retained in the EU legal framework on the control system for organic production, set out in Council Regulation No 834/2007 ([1]) and in Commission Regulation No 889/2008 ([2]).

On the possibility of applying different rules, provided that the control system has been recognised as equivalent, please see reply to written question No E-004844/2013 ([3]).

The Commission work programme for 2013 includes a review of the political and legislative framework for organic production, underpinned by an evaluation of the policy and impact assessment. In this context, the control system for organic production will be thoroughly assessed.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products (OJ L 189, 20.7.2007).
([2]) Commission Regulation (EC) No 889/2008 of 5 September 2008 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products with regard to organic production, labelling and control (OJ L 250, 18.9.2008).
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004846/13
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(30 de abril de 2013)

Asunto: Exportación de productos ecológicos

En la política de promoción de las exportaciones que la Comisión Europea lleva a cabo en las diferentes Delegaciones de la Unión Europea, podemos observar cómo es imposible localizar productos ecológicos debido a que la Comisión Europea no está llevando a cabo ningún programa de apoyo a la exportación de productos ecológicos europeos.

La exportación de productos ecológicos europeos está siempre vinculada al consumo de productos de calidad, a ofrecer parte de la tradición cultural de muchos Estados miembros a través de los productos de su gastronomía. Muchos productos exportados por la agricultura europea están así relacionados con la calidad y la producción artesana y ecológica; sin embargo, estos productos no pueden encontrar ni tan siquiera el mínimo apoyo ni promoción comercial por parte de las instituciones europeas. La promoción de estos productos, considerando que cumplen con una de las normativas más exigentes del mundo, debería ser central para apoyar a los productores europeos y generar demanda exterior para sus productos.

Esto supone que la Comisión Europea no ha estado apoyando la exportación de los productores ecológicos, siendo estos los que mejores perspectivas de mercado podrían tener. Parece ser que la política comercial de la Unión Europea con respecto a los productos ecológicos está orientada a su desaparición, puesto que no existe sector más desprotegido de la competencia por el lado del consumo y con más exigencias por el lado de la producción en toda la economía europea.

¿Cómo justifica la Comisión que no haya existido apoyo comercial alguno a la exportación de productos del sector de la agricultura ecológica?

¿Considera que se debe apoyar con planes específicos la comercialización exterior de los productos ecológicos europeos?

¿Considera la Comisión que los productos ecológicos pueden ser diferenciados a través de la noción de calidad en mercados exteriores? ¿Qué iniciativas ha adoptado al respecto?

Respuesta del Sr. Cioloş en nombre de la Comisión
(11 de junio de 2013)

El Reglamento (CE) n° 834/2007 del Consejo, de 28 de junio de 2007, sobre producción y etiquetado de los productos ecológicos ([1]), no incluye medidas de apoyo en su ámbito de aplicación.

El apoyo a la promoción de productos ecológicos se ofrece a través de las campañas cofinanciadas de información y promoción previstas en el Reglamento (CE) n° 3/2008 del Consejo sobre acciones de información y de promoción de los productos agrícolas en el mercado interior y en terceros países ([2]).

Desde 2003, se han cofinanciado en terceros países ocho programas de promoción de productos ecológicos, dos de ellos combinados con productos con DOP/IGP. El valor total de las medidas cofinanciadas por la UE ascendió a unos 7 millones de euros. Los países o regiones a los que se destinaron tales programas fueron Norteamérica, China, Japón, Rusia, Oriente Medio, Suiza y Noruega.

La Comisión Europea, por iniciativa propia y a través de diversos departamentos de la DG de Agricultura y Desarrollo Rural, instala todos los años una caseta en una o dos grandes ferias comerciales. Siempre se invita a las asociaciones o empresas de agricultura ecológica a participar en estas iniciativas.

El programa de trabajo de la Comisión para 2013 incluye una revisión del marco político y legislativo vigente de la agricultura ecológica y, en este contexto, se está realizando una evaluación de impacto que también aborda la manera de mejorar la comunicación y la promoción de los productos ecológicos.

([1]) DO L 189 de 20.7.2007.
([2]) DO L 3 de 5.1.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004846/13
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(30 April 2013)

Subject: Exports of organic products

In the policy of promoting exports, which the Commission implements in the various Delegations of the European Union, we notice that it is impossible to locate organic products. This is because the European Commission does not run any programme of support for exports of European organic products.

Exports of European organic products are always linked to the consumption of quality products and to offering part of the cultural tradition of many Member States through their cuisine's products. Many products exported by European agriculture are therefore related to quality and small-scale organic production; however, these products do not receive even minimum support or trade promotion from European institutions. The promotion of these products, considering that they comply with one of the most demanding pieces of legislation in the world, should be a key element in supporting European producers and generating external demand for their products.

This means that the Commission has not supported exports of organic products, which are the products with the best possible market prospects. It seems that the EU's trade policy with regard to organic products is geared towards making them disappear, as no other sector in the whole European economy is so poorly protected from competition in terms of consumption while facing so many demands in terms of production.

How does the Commission justify the fact that there has been no trade support whatsoever for exports of products from the organic farming sector?

Does it consider that it should support through specific plans the external marketing of European organic products?

Does the Commission believe that organic products can be differentiated using the notion of quality in external markets? What initiatives has it adopted in this regard?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2013)

Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 ([1]) of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products does not include support measures in its scope.

Support for promotion of organic products is available via co-financed information and promotion campaigns through the Council regulation (EC) No 3/2008 ([2]) on information provision and promotion measures for agricultural products on internal market and in third countries.

Since 2003 8 promotion programmes have been co financed in third countries dedicated to organic products, two of them in combination with PDO/PGI products. The total value of EU co-financing amounted to approx. EUR 7 million. The regions/countries targeted were North America, China, Japan, Russia, Middle East, Switzerland and Norway.

The European Commission under its own initiative and through different services of DG Agriculture and Rural Development assures participation at 1-2 major trade fair per year with a stand. Organic farmers associations or companies are always invited to take part in these initiatives.

The Commission work programme for 2013 includes a review of the current political and legislative framework for organic production and within this context an impact assessment is being carried out, covering also matters related to better communication and promotion of organic production.

([1]) OJ L 189, 20.7.2007.
([2]) OJ L 3, 5.1.2008.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004847/13
a la Comisión
Raimon Obiols (S&D)
(30 de abril de 2013)

Asunto: Situación de la industria textil en Bangladés

La pasada semana se derrumbó un edificio de ocho plantas en las afueras de Daca (Bangladés) en el que trabajaban precariamente cientos de personas para la industria textil. A fecha de hoy, el saldo de víctimas es de más de 300 muertos y cientos de desaparecidos. Hace pocos meses, un incendio en otro taller bangladesí se saldó con la muerte de un centenar de trabajadores.

Estas catástrofes están evidenciando las precarias condiciones laborales de los empleados que trabajan en las fábricas textiles de la zona, que en un 90 % son mujeres, cobran alrededor de 32 euros al mes y sólo un 1 % está sindicado. Se trata de uno de los colectivos peor pagados del mundo, con menos derechos laborales y que, además, trabajan en fábricas que no cumplen los requerimientos mínimos de seguridad.

Pese a ello, el peso del sector textil en la economía del país es más que considerable: supone el 70 % de las exportaciones (cuyos destinos principales son Europa y Estados Unidos) y el 17 % del PIB, según la Asociación de Fabricantes y Exportadores de Ropa de Bangladesh.

Ante esta grave situación:

1. ¿Tiene la Comisión constancia de cuántas empresas textiles europeas poseen fábricas o contratan producción textil en Bangladesh?

2. ¿Va a tomar la Comisión Europea alguna iniciativa para forzar a las empresas europeas que producen o contratan en Bangladesh a tomar medidas para asegurar unas condiciones laborales dignas y seguras en los talleres textiles?

Respuesta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión
(24 de junio de 2013)

La Comisión y el Servicio Europeo de Acción Exterior se mantienen en contacto con el Gobierno de Bangladés en lo que respecta a la salud y la seguridad, especialmente en las fábricas que abastecen a los mercados europeos. Nos encontramos en un proceso de reflexión sobre la mejor manera de utilizar la asistencia de la UE a Bangladés para hacer frente a estos problemas.

La Comisión no dispone de información detallada sobre las empresas que subcontratan la producción textil en Bangladés. No obstante, apoya iniciativas en las que participan importantes minoristas y marcas de Europa que subcontratan su producción en otras partes del mundo, incluido Bangladés, y se congratula de que algunas de las mayores marcas de confección y de venta al por menor (principalmente europeas) hayan firmado un acuerdo ([1]) en el que se comprometen a realizar actividades de inspección, formación y rehabilitación.

La Comisión tiene como objetivo garantizar que las empresas apliquen normas similares en relación con las normas laborales dentro y fuera de la UE.

La OIT ([2]) es un organismo especialmente adecuado para promover el progreso de las condiciones laborales. La UE sigue estando dispuesta a ayudar al Gobierno de Bangladés a cumplir las normas pertinentes de la OIT. Será de capital importancia una aplicación eficaz de los acuerdos tripartitos entre el Gobierno de Bangladés, la industria y los trabajadores.

La UE promueve los principios de responsabilidad social de las empresas ([3]). La Comisión alienta a las empresas de la UE a promover mejor las normas de salud y seguridad en las empresas de confección de Bangladés a través de estos principios, y fomenta el diálogo social en las empresas radicadas en la EU y en sus cadenas de suministro globales. La Comisión apoya la mejora de la responsabilidad social de las empresas a través del «Marco Estratégico de la Unión Europea y el Plan de Acción para los Derechos Humanos y la Democracia» adoptado en 2012 ([4]).

Remitimos a Su Señoría a anteriores preguntas ([5]) así como a la Declaración de la Comisión ante el Parlamento Europeo de 23 de mayo de 2013, en la que se presenta información más detallada al respecto.

([1]) Acuerdo de Bangladés sobre la seguridad de los edificios y la seguridad en caso de incendio.
([2]) Organización Internacional del Trabajo.
([3]) Como por ejemplo las Orientaciones de la OCDE para las Empresas Multinacionales, la Declaración Tripartita de la OIT sobre las Empresas Multinacionales y los Principios Rectores de las Naciones Unidas sobre Empresas y Derechos Humanos.
([4]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/131181.pdf
([5]) E-011460/2012, E-004552/2013, E-004788/2013 y P-004922/2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004847/13
to the Commission
Raimon Obiols (S&D)
(30 April 2013)

Subject: Situation of the textile industry in Bangladesh

Last week, an eight-storey building collapsed in the outskirts of Dhaka (Bangladesh), where hundreds of people were working in precarious conditions for the textile industry. To date, more than 300 people have died as a result of the incident, and hundreds more have disappeared. A few months ago, a fire in another Bangladeshi workshop led to the deaths of around one hundred workers.

These disasters are evidence of the precarious working conditions of employees working in textile factories in the area, 90% of whom are women, who earn EUR 32 per month, and only 1% of whom belong to a trade union. They are one of the worst paid groups in the world, with the fewest employment rights and, moreover, they work in factories that do not meet minimum safety requirements.

Despite this, the textile sector has considerable importance for the country's economy: it represents 70% of exports (for which the main destinations are Europe and the United States) and 17% of GDP, according to the Bangladesh Garment Manufacturers and Exporters Association.

In view of this serious situation:

1. Is the Commission aware of how many European textile companies have factories, or subcontract textile production, in Bangladesh?

2. Will the Commission take any initiatives to force European companies that manufacture or subcontract in Bangladesh to take measures to ensure safe and decent working conditions in textile workshops?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(24 June 2013)

The Commission and the EEAS are in contact with the Government of Bangladesh regarding health and safety, especially in factories serving European markets. We are reflecting on how best to use EU assistance to Bangladesh to address these problems.

The Commission does not have detailed information on companies subcontracting textile production in Bangladesh. However it supports, initiatives bringing together major European retailers and brands subcontracting in the world, including Bangladesh and welcomes that some of the major (mostly European) garment and retail brands signed an agreement ([1]) committing to inspections, training and remediation activities.

The Commission aims to ensure that enterprises apply similar rules regarding labour standards within and outside the EU.

The ILO ([2]) is well placed to promote progress on labour conditions. The EU remains ready to assist the Government of Bangladesh to comply with the relevant ILO standards. Effective implementation of the tripartite agreements between the Bangladeshi Government, industry and workers will be crucial.

The EU promotes Corporate Social Responsibility principles ([3]). The Commission encourages EU companies to promote better health and safety standards in garment factories in Bangladesh via these principles, as well as social dialogue in EU-based companies and in their global supply chains. The Commission supports CSR improvement by the 'EU strategic framework and action plan on human rights and democracy' adopted in 2012 ([4]).

The Honourable Member may refer to earlier questions ([5]) and the Statement by the Commission at the European Parliament on 23 May 2013 which give supplementary details on the issue.

([1]) Accord on Fire and Building Safety in Bangladesh.
([2]) International Labour Organisation.
([3]) Such as the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, the ILO Tripartite Declaration on Multinational Enterprises, and the UN's Guiding Principles on business and human rights.
([4]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/131181.pdf
([5]) E-011460/2012. E-004552/2013, E-004788/2013 and P-004922/2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004848/13
alla Commissione
Giommaria Uggias (ALDE)
(30 aprile 2013)

Oggetto: Legge Regione Autonoma della Sardegna n. 18/2012 del 12.10.2012 che istituisce la Flotta Sarda S.p.A.

Il Consiglio Regionale della Sardegna, in armonia con l'articolo 117 della Costituzione italiana e in applicazione del regolamento (CEE) n. 3577/92, secondo quanto riportato nella legge, ha approvato la legge in oggetto concernente disposizioni in materia di continuità territoriale marittima.

Tale legge prevede all'articolo 6 la costituzione della «Flotta Sarda S.p.A.», una società per azioni avente ad oggetto l'esercizio di servizi di navigazione di preminente interesse regionale, con capitale iniziale di nove milioni di euro interamente partecipato dalla regione. È prevista inoltre la possibilità di «corrispondere contributi annui destinati unicamente a coprire il costo aggiuntivo netto derivante dallo svolgimento degli obblighi di servizio pubblico», col limite di 20 milioni/anno per la durata di un quinquennio.

La legge regionale in oggetto, tra le altre, non contiene alcun riferimento all'eventuale esito della consultazione di cui all'articolo 9 del regolamento (CEE) n. 3577/92 e non riporta alcuna citazione né della decisione della Commissione europea 20.12.2011 sugli aiuti di Stato (SIEG 2011) né della delibera CIPE n. 111/2007.

Tutto ciò premesso, considerato che il Presidente della regione Sardegna ha in più occasioni ufficialmente affermato l'intendimento di varare la «Flotta Sarda S.p.A.» non appena dovesse pervenire l'assenso della Commissione, si chiede di far conoscere:

1. se e quando la Commissione sia stata consultata sulla legge regionale in questione e, in caso affermativo, le iniziative assunte o le decisioni eventualmente adottate in merito;

2. a quale punto sia l'attuale iter della decisione che la Commissione dovrà assumere per rendere il parere cui fa riferimento il Presidente della regione Sardegna ai fini del varo della Flotta Sarda S.p.A.

Risposta di Siim Kallas a nome della Commissione
(21 giugno 2013)

Nell'estate del 2012 i servizi della Commissione sono stati contattati dalle autorità regionali sarde in relazione alla conformità del previsto progetto Flotta Sarda S.p.A. con il regolamento (CEE) n. 3577/92 del Consiglio, del 7 dicembre 1992, concernente l'applicazione del principio della libera prestazione dei servizi ai trasporti marittimi fra Stati membri (cabotaggio marittimo) ([1]). Tuttavia, ad oggi, le autorità italiane non hanno avviato al riguardo la consultazione formale con la Commissione di cui all'articolo 9 di tale regolamento.

Nel quadro degli scambi informali con le autorità regionali sarde, i servizi della Commissione hanno sollevato una serie di questioni riguardanti, fra l'altro, lo status giuridico della società Flotta Sarda, i collegamenti marittimi che questa effettuerebbe e la relazione tra i contratti di servizio pubblico che verrebbero assegnati a tale società e il servizio pubblico tra l'Italia continentale e la Sardegna già fornito dalla Compagnia italiana di navigazione (CIN) nell'ambito dei contratti di servizio pubblico ripresi dalla Tirrenia di Navigazione.

Dallo scorso autunno i servizi della Commissione non hanno ricevuto nessuna informazione aggiuntiva in merito alla costituzione e al funzionamento di Flotta Sarda S.p.A.

([1]) GU L 364 del 12.12.1992.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004848/13
to the Commission
Giommaria Uggias (ALDE)
(30 April 2013)

Subject: Law of the Autonomous Region of Sardinia No 18/2012 of 12 October 2012 establishing Flotta Sarda Spa

In compliance with Article 117 of the Italian Constitution and under Regulation (EEC) No 3577/92, the Regional Council of Sardinia adopted the law in question regarding provisions on maritime territorial continuity, according to the provisions of the law.

Article 6 of this law provides for the establishment of Flotta Sarda Spa, a public limited-liability company providing principally regional shipping services, with initial capital of EUR 9 million, entirely financed by the Region. Furthermore, the law also provides for the possibility of paying annual contributions for the sole purpose of covering the additional net cost of discharging the public service obligations, with a limit of EUR 20 million per year over a five-year period.

The regional law in question, *inter alia*, does not contain any reference to the outcome of a consultation, as specified in Article 9 of Regulation (EEC) No 3577/92, and makes no mention of the Commission decision of 20 December 2011 on state aid (SGEI 2011), or Decision No 111/2007 of the Italian Interministerial Economic Planning Committee (CIPE).

In light of the above, given that the President of the Region of Sardinia has on several occasions officially stated his intention to launch Flotta Sarda Spa as soon as the Commission gives its approval, can the Commission state:

1. If and when it was consulted on the regional law in question and, if it was consulted, what steps or decisions have been taken on this matter;

2. What stage the Commission's decision-making process has now reached with a view to providing the opinion referred to by the President of the Region of Sardinia in order to establish Flotta Sarda Spa?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(21 June 2013)

The Commission services have been approached by the Sardinian regional authorities in summer 2012 regarding the compliance of the envisaged Flotta Sarda Spa project with Council Regulation (EEC) No 3577/92 of 7 December 1992 applying the principle of freedom to provide services to maritime transport within Member States (maritime cabotage) ([1]). However, to date no formal consultation under Article 9 of this regulation has been submitted to the Commission by the Italian authorities in this respect.

In the framework of informal exchanges with the Sardinian regional authorities the Commission services raised a number of questions regarding, among others, the legal status of the Flotta Sarda company, the maritime connections it would be providing and the relationship between the public service contracts that this company would be entrusted with and the public service already provided between the mainland Italy and Sardinia by Compania Italiana di Navigazione (CIN), under public service contracts taken over from Tirrenia di Navigazione.

Since autumn last year the Commission services have not received any further information in respect to the establishment and operation of Flotta Sarda Spa.

([1]) OJ L 364, 12.12.1992.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-004850/13
a Bizottság számára
Göncz Kinga (S&D)
(2013. április 30.)

Tárgy: Politikatörténeti Intézet levéltárának államosítása

A köziratokról, a közlevéltárakról és a magánlevéltári anyag védelméről szóló 1995. évi LVI. törvény 2012. évi módosítása a Magyarországon egyetlen baloldali tudományos műhely, a Politikatörténeti Intézet Közhasznú Nonprofit Kft. tulajdonában, illetőleg kezelésében lévő magániratokat és az általa működtetett nyilvános magánlevéltár anyagát – kiemelve a magánlevéltárak közül – egyedüliként államosítja. Az intézet az Alkotmánybírósághoz fordult, mivel szerinte a kifogásolt törvény ellentmond Magyarország Alaptörvénye XIII. cikke (2) bekezdésének, mely a kisajátítás három együttes feltételét fekteti le, valamint VI. cikke (2) bekezdésének, amely szerint mindenkinek joga van személyes adatai védelméhez. A módosítás az Emberi Jogok és Alapvető Szabadságok Védelméről szóló Egyezmény 14. és 17. cikkébe is ütközik.

A benyújtott panasz ügyét azonban kérdésessé teszi az Alaptörvény negyedik módosítása, s annak U. cikke, mely példátlan módon egy konkrét magánlevéltár meghatározott iratanyagát államosítja. A Negyedik Módosítás az Alapjogi Charta 17. cikkébe foglaltaknak több vonatkozásban sem felel meg: tulajdonától senkit sem lehet megfosztani, kivéve, ha ez közérdekből, a törvényben meghatározott esetekben és feltételekkel, valamint kártalanítás mellett történik. A kérdéses tulajdonelvonást közérdek nem indokolja, a feltételeket és a kártalanítást a szabályozás, illetve a Negyedik Módosítás sem rendezi. Az államosításban tetten érhető a politikai megkülönböztetés, mivel az államosítás egyedül a baloldali Politikatörténeti Intézet által működtetett levéltár iratait érinti, és ezáltal az Alapjogi Charta 21. cikkét sérti. Ezen kívül az Európai Unió alapvető normáinak sérelme is megmutatkozik az Alaptörvény módosítása tekintetében, miután az Alaptörvény módosítása egy konkrét ügy szabályozását tartalmazza. Ez, mint szabályozási mód az alkotmányozás jogelveivel ellentétes.

Nem gondolja a Bizottság, hogy a törvénymódosítás és az Alaptörvény-módosítás az Európai Unió jogával, konkrétan az Európai Unió Alapjogi Chartájában foglalt, s fent említett rendelkezésekbe ütközik? Nem találja az Unió normáival ellentétesnek azt a módszert, miszerint egy egyedi ügyet alkotmányos szintre emel a törvényalkotó, mielőtt még az Alkotmánybíróság kialakította volna az álláspontját az ezzel kapcsolatos beadványról? Tervezi-e a Bizottság a jogsértés megvizsgálását?

Viviane Reding válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. augusztus 16.)

Főszabályként a Bizottságnak a tagállamok intézkedéseivel és mulasztásaival kapcsolatos hatásköre az uniós jog alkalmazásának felügyeletére korlátozódik, az Európai Unió Bíróságának ellenőrzése mellett. A Tisztelt Képviselő által nyújtott információk alapján nem tűnik úgy, hogy az említett ügyben az érintett tagállam az Unió jogát végrehajtva vagy annak hatályán belül járt volna el.

Ami közelebbről a Tisztelt Képviselő által felvetett alapjogi kérdéseket illeti, a Bizottság emlékeztetni kíván arra, hogy az Alapjogi Charta 51. cikkének (1) bekezdésével összhangban a Charta rendelkezései csak abban az esetben vonatkoznak a tagállamokra, ha azok uniós jogszabályokat hajtanak végre. A Fransson-ügyben 2013. február 26-án hozott ítéletben (C-617/10. sz. ügy 21. pontja) adott értelmezés szerint ez a rendelkezés azt jelenti, hogy „ha valamely nemzeti szabályozás az uniós jog alkalmazási körébe tartozik, a Charta által biztosított alapvető jogokat tiszteletben kell tartani". Így a Tisztelt Képviselő által említett ügyben a tagállamok feladata biztosítani az alapvető jogok tekintetében fennálló – nemzetközi megállapodásokból és nemzeti jogszabályaikból eredő – kötelezettségeik tiszteletben tartását. A fenti okok miatt a Bizottságnak nem áll módjában a Tisztelt Képviselő által feltett kérdést tovább tárgyalni.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004850/13
to the Commission
Kinga Göncz (S&D)
(30 April 2013)

Subject: Nationalisation of the Archives of the Hungarian Institute of Political History

The 2012 amendment of Act LXVI of 1995 on Public Records, Public Archives, and the Protection of Private Archives provides for the nationalisation of the private records owned and/or managed by Politikatörténeti Intézet Közhasznú Nonprofit Kft. (Institute of Political History Public Benefit Nonprofit Company) and the private archives operated and made available to the public by the same company, which is the only left-wing academic workshop in Hungary and the only private archive nationalised by the aforementioned act. The Institute has turned to the Constitutional Court, because it is of the view that the objected legislation conflicts with Article XIII(2) and Article VI(2) of the Fundamental Law of Hungary, which provide for the three joint criteria of expropriation and the right of all persons to the protection of personal data, respectively. Moreover, the amendment conflicts with Articles 14 and 17 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.

However, the fate of the filed complaint is made uncertain by the Fourth Amendment of the Fundamental Law and in particular Article U thereof, which unprecedentedly provides for the nationalisation of specific private archives. The Fourth Amendment is inconsistent with Article 17 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights: no one may be deprived of his or her possessions, except in the public interest and in the cases and under the conditions provided for by law, subject to fair compensation — in several respects. The deprivation of possession in question is not justified by the public interest, and neither the conditions, nor the compensation is provided for in the regulation and the Fourth Amendment. This act of nationalisation clearly reflects political discrimination, because the sole subject of this nationalisation is the archives operated by the left-wing Institute of Political History, which also represents a violation of Article 21 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights. The basic norms of the European Union are also violated by the amendment of the Fundamental Law, which contains regulation of a specific case. As a mode of regulation, this is contrary to the legal principles of adopting a constitution.

The Commission may want to consider that the abovementioned amendment of legislation and amendment of the Fundamental Law are contrary to the law of the European Union, in particular the above referenced provisions of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union. Is the Commission of the view that the method of dealing with a specific case at constitutional level by the legislator — before even the Constitutional Court had expressed its position on the related submission — conflicts with the norms of the EU? Does the Commission intend to investigate these infringements?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(16 August 2013)

As a matter of principle, the Commission's powers regarding acts and omissions by Member States are limited to overseeing the application of Union law, under the control of the Court of Justice. On the basis of the information provided by the Honourable Member, it does not appear that in the matter referred to the Member State concerned did act in the course of implementation or within the scope of Union law.

Regarding more particularly the fundamental rights issues raised by the Honourable Member, the Commission would recall that, according to Article 51 (1) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights, the provisions of the Charter are addressed to the Member States only when they are implementing Union law. As interpreted in the Fransson judgment of 26 February 2013 (Case C-617/10, paragraph 21), this provision means that 'the fundamental rights guaranteed by the Charter must […] be complied with where national legislation falls within the scope of European Union law'. In the matter referred to by the Honourable Member, it is thus for Member States to ensure that their obligations regarding fundamental rights — as resulting from international agreements and from their internal legislation — are respected. For those reasons, the Commission is not in a position to comment further on the question asked by the Honourable Member.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-004851/13
do Komisji
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(30 kwietnia 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Ataki FEMENU na kościół katolicki i wiarę chrześcijańską

Członkinie FEMENu oblały wodą święconą André-Josepha Léonarda arcybiskupa Mechelen-Brukseli i prymasa Królestwa Belgii. Sytuacja miała miejsce, gdy duchowny udzielał wykładu na tematy związane z ochroną życia poczętego. Kilka miesięcy temu aktywistki tej samej organizacji wywołały ogólne oburzenie niszcząc krzyż. Sama organizacja w ostatnim czasie rozpoczęła serie ataków na kościół katolicki.

Czy Komisja wie o sprawie znieważenia biskupa oraz niszczenia krzyży?

Czy Komisja potępi działania organizacji FEMEN wymierzone w kościół katolicki?

Czy FEMEN, jako organizacja pozarządowa, otrzymuje z Komisji, jakiekolwiek fundusze lub bierze udział w programach unijnych?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Viviane Reding w imieniu Komisji
(28 czerwca 2013 r.)

Służby Komisji zostały poinformowane o ataku na arcybiskupa za pomocą doniesień medialnych.

Traktaty, na których opiera się UE, przewidują, że Komisja Europejska może interweniować w państwie członkowskim jedynie w sprawach dotyczących prawa UE, co nie ma miejsca w tym przypadku. Badanie konkretnych spraw i ocenianie, czy stanowią one podżeganie do przemocy lub nienawiści na tle religijnym należy do organów krajowych, między innymi sądownictwa.

FEMEN nie jest beneficjentem funduszy unijnych.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004851/13
to the Commission
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(30 April 2013)

Subject: FEMEN attacks on the Catholic Church and the Christian faith

Members of FEMEN have poured holy water over André-Joseph Léonard, Archbishop of Mechelen-Brussels and Primate of Belgium. The incident happened during a lecture given by the Archbishop on issues connected with the protection of life from the moment of conception. Several months ago, activists belonging to the same organisation caused widespread outrage by destroying a crucifix. The organisation has recently initiated a series of attacks on the Catholic Church.

Is the Commission aware of the attack on the Archbishop and the destruction of the crucifix?

Will the Commission condemn the actions of the FEMEN organisation that target the Catholic Church?

Does FEMEN, as an NGO, receive any funding from the Commission or participate in any EU programmes?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(28 June 2013)

The services of the Commission are aware of the attack on the Archibishop through media reports.

Under the Treaties on which the EU is based, the European Commission can only intervene in the Member State when EC law is involved, which is not presently the case. It is for national authorities, including the courts, to look into individual cases and to determine whether they represent incitement to violence or hatred based on religion.

FEMEN is not among the beneficiaries of the EU funding.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-004852/13
do Komisji
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(30 kwietnia 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Problem szczepień u dzieci w UE

Jak informują media, niedawno w Belgii wyciekły tajne dokumenty z Belgijskiej Agencji Medycznej dotyczące bezpieczeństwa stosowania dwóch szczepionek Prevnar oraz Infanrix hexa. Z dokumentów wynika, że w ciągu ostatnich 2 lat po zastosowaniu szczepionki Prevnar zmarło 22 niemowląt, a po zastosowaniu Infanrix hexa zmarło 36 niemowląt. Ponadto dokumenty te ujawniły, że liczba powikłań po tych szczepieniach wielokrotnie przekracza w UE liczbę powikłań po naturalnych chorobach, przeciw którym szczepi się dzieci.

W związku z powyższym uprzejmie proszę Komisję o odpowiedź na następujące pytania:

1. Czy Komisja dysponuje danymi, ile dzieci co roku umiera lub ma powikłania na skutek zastosowania u nich szczepionek?

2. Jakie działania zamierza podjąć Komisja, aby ograniczyć zastosowanie szczepionek, które powodują śmierć lub poważne skutki uboczne u dzieci?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Tonia Borga w imieniu Komisji
(24 czerwca 2013 r.)

Szczepionki mogą być wprowadzane do obrotu tylko po udzieleniu pozwolenia na dopuszczenie do obrotu zgodnie z prawodawstwem UE ([1]), kiedy dokonano oceny ich jakości, bezpieczeństwa i skuteczności oraz gdy stwierdzono, że korzyści wynikające z ich stosowania przeważają nad ryzykiem. Po wprowadzeniu do obrotu bezpieczeństwo leków jest stale monitorowane.

Po uzyskaniu pozwolenia na dopuszczenie do obrotu leki podlegają ścisłemu nadzorowi po wprowadzeniu do obrotu. Pracowników służby zdrowia i pacjentów zachęca się do zgłaszania niepożądanych zdarzeń związanych ze stosowaniem leków, w tym szczepionek, do zajmujących się tym krajowych systemów.

Zgłoszenia dotyczące pacjentów, którzy zachorowali lub u których wystąpiły działania niepożądane po zastosowaniu leku, są zbierane i monitorowane przez Europejską Agencję Leków (EMA), a sygnały o nowych zdarzeniach niepożądanych są badane. Nie gromadzi się danych dotyczących ogólnie szczepionek, ale bezpieczeństwo poszczególnych szczepionek jest regularnie weryfikowane poprzez dotyczące ich okresowe raporty o bezpieczeństwie.

W odniesieniu do stosowania szczepionek: jeżeli działania z zakresu nadzoru nad bezpieczeństwem farmakoterapii wykażą nowy problem z bezpieczeństwem, władze oceniają nowe dane i ustalają, czy potrzebne są dalsze kroki. W takich przypadkach Komisja zwraca się o opinię do EMA. Komitet EMA ds. Oceny Ryzyka w ramach Nadzoru nad Bezpieczeństwem Farmakoterapii jest odpowiedzialny za wykrywanie, ocenę, minimalizację ryzyka i informowanie o nim w odniesieniu do niepożądanych działań leków. Gdy niezbędne jest zminimalizowanie zidentyfikowanego zagrożenia, komitet ten zaleca odpowiednie działania.

Komisja uprzejmie prosi szanownego Pana Posła o zapoznanie się również z odpowiedzią udzieloną na pytanie nr E-003985/2013 wymagające odpowiedzi na piśmie ([2]).

([1]) Rozporządzenie (WE) nr 726/2004 ustanawiające wspólnotowe procedury wydawania pozwoleń dla produktów leczniczych stosowanych u ludzi i do celów weterynaryjnych i nadzoru nad nimi oraz ustanawiające Europejską Agencję Leków (Dz.U. L 136 z 30.4.2004) oraz dyrektywa 2001/83/WE w sprawie wspólnotowego kodeksu odnoszącego się do produktów leczniczych stosowanych u ludzi (Dz.U. L 311 z 28.11.2001).

([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/pl/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004852/13
to the Commission
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(30 April 2013)

Subject: Vaccinations for children in the EU

According to recent media reports in Belgium, secret documents concerning the safety of two vaccines, Prevnar and Infanrix Hexa, were leaked from the Belgian Medicines Agency. These documents show that, over the past two years, 22 babies have died after being vaccinated with Prevnar, and 36 babies have died after being vaccinated with Infanrix Hexa. Moreover, they show that the number of cases in which complications have occurred in the EU after these vaccinations have been administered is many times higher than the number of cases in which complications have occurred as a consequence of the diseases against which children are being vaccinated.

In connection with the above, would the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Does the Commission have data on the number of children who die each year or who suffer complications as a consequence of vaccines?

2. What steps does the Commission intend to take in order to limit the use of vaccines that cause death or serious side-effects in children?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(24 June 2013)

A vaccine can be placed on the market only after a marketing authorisation has been granted in accordance with the EU legislation ([1]), when its quality, safety and efficacy have been evaluated and a positive benefit-risk balance related to its use has been concluded. Once placed on the market, the safety of a medicine is continuously monitored.

After its authorisation, a medicine is subject to strict post-marketing surveillance. Healthcare professionals and patients are encouraged to report adverse events associated with the use of medicines, including vaccines, to the national reporting system.

Reports of patients who fall ill or are subject to adverse reactions following the use of a medicine are collected and monitored by the European Medicines Agency (EMA) and signals of new adverse events are investigated. Data is not collected in relation to vaccines as a whole, but the safety of individual vaccines is regularly reviewed through their periodic safety update reports.

Regarding the use of the vaccines, if a new safety issue is identified through pharmacovigilance activities, the authorities will assess the new data and determine whether any action is needed. In such cases the Commission seeks the advice of the EMA. EMA's Pharmacovigilance Risk Assessment Committee is responsible for the detection, assessment, minimisation and communication relating to the risk of adverse reactions of medicines. The Committee makes recommendations for action when it is necessary to minimise the identified risk.

The Commission would also refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-003985/2013 ([2]).

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 laying down Community procedures for the authorisation and supervision of medicinal products for human and veterinary use and establishing a European Medicines Agency (OJ L 136, 30.4.2004) and Directive 2001/83/EC on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use (OJ L 311, 28.11.2001).

([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-004853/13
do Komisji
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(30 kwietnia 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Import mięsa drobiowego w UE

Zgodnie z ostatnimi doniesieniami medialnymi 5 ton drobiu zarażonego salmonellą trafiło ze Słowacji do jednego z zakładów przetwórczych w Polsce.

Kury zostały dostarczone do warmińsko-mazurskiego zakładu około 8 kwietnia 2013 r., gdzie przeprowadzono badania weterynaryjne, które wykazały obecność w mięsie chorobotwórczych dla ludzi bakterii salmonelli.

W związku z powyższym uprzejmie proszę Komisję o odpowiedź na następujące pytania:

1. Czy zapewniona jest odpowiednia kontrola jakości mięsa, które trafia na rynek UE ze Słowacji?

2. Czy Komisja śledzi, z jakich rynków to mięso przebywa i na jakie rynki trafia?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Tonia Borga w imieniu Komisji
(20 czerwca 2013 r.)

Zgodnie z unijnymi przepisami dotyczącymi higieny żywności ([1]) odpowiedzialność za bezpieczeństwo żywności spoczywa w pierwszym rzędzie na podmiotach prowadzących przedsiębiorstwa spożywcze. Muszą one stosować procedury higieniczne gwarantujące, że żywność jest bezpieczna. W szczególności podmioty te muszą na wszystkich etapach produkcji, przetwarzania i dystrybucji zapewniać ochronę żywności przed wszelkimi zanieczyszczeniami. Ponadto wymogi dotyczące identyfikowalności umożliwiają śledzenie drogi żywności na wszystkich etapach łańcucha produkcji. Państwa członkowskie mają za zadanie dopilnowywać, by podmioty przestrzegały stosownych wymogów prawnych w miejscu produkcji żywności, a także mają sprawdzać, czy tak jest w istocie. Takie kontrole urzędowe są oparte na ryzyku i na krajowych planach kontroli.

Jeżeli kontrola przeprowadzona w miejscu przeznaczenia wykaże, że istnieje ryzyko dla zdrowia, właściwe organy powiadamiają organy państwa pochodzenia, pozostałe państwa członkowskie oraz Komisję za pośrednictwem systemu wczesnego ostrzegania o niebezpiecznej żywności i paszach (RASFF), aby ograniczyć szkody i rozpocząć odpowiednie działania naprawcze.

Służba kontrolna Dyrekcji Generalnej Komisji ds. Zdrowia i Konsumentów, DG SANCO (FVO – Biuro ds. Żywności i Weterynarii) regularnie kontroluje postępowanie właściwych organów państw członkowskich oraz przestrzeganie przepisów UE. Wyniki tych kontroli są publicznie dostępne ([2]).

Kontrole te stanowią system monitorowania bezpieczeństwa żywności w całej Unii Europejskiej, dzięki któremu Komisja może właściwie postępować w przypadku potencjalnych zagrożeń na tym polu.

([1]) Rozporządzenie (WE) nr 852/2004 Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady z dnia 29 kwietnia 2004 r. w sprawie higieny środków spożywczych (Dz.U. L 139 z 30.4.2004, s. 1), rozporządzenie (WE) nr 853/2004 Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady z dnia 29 kwietnia 2004 r. ustanawiające szczególne przepisy dotyczące higieny w odniesieniu do żywności pochodzenia zwierzęcego (Dz.U. L 139 z 30.4.2004, s. 55) oraz rozporządzenie (WE) nr 854/2004 Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady z dnia 29 kwietnia 2004 r. ustanawiające szczególne przepisy dotyczące organizacji urzędowych kontroli w odniesieniu do produktów pochodzenia zwierzęcego przeznaczonych do spożycia przez ludzi (Dz.U. L 139 z 30.4.2004, s. 206).

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/what_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004853/13
to the Commission
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(30 April 2013)

Subject: Poultry meat imports in the EU

According to the latest media reports, five tonnes of poultry infected with Salmonella have been transported from Slovakia to a processing plant in Poland.

The chickens were delivered to the plant in Warmińsko-Mazurskie province around 8 April 2013. Veterinary inspections were then carried out which revealed the presence of the bacterial pathogen Salmonella.

In connection with the above, would the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Are appropriate checks being made on the quality of poultry meat entering the EU market from Slovakia?

2. Is the Commission monitoring where this meat is coming from and where it is ending up?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2013)

EU legislation on food hygiene ([1]) provides that food business operators have the primary responsibility for food safety and clearly establishes that food business operators must apply the hygienic procedures necessary to ensure that food is safe. In particular, the operators must, at all stages of production, processing and distribution, ensure that food is protected against any contamination. In addition traceability requirements allow food to be tracked back at all stages of the production chain. It is the responsibility of the Member States to verify and ensure that operators comply with the relevant legal requirements where food in produced. These official controls are risk based and based on national control plans.

When controls at destination identify a health risk, these authorities shall inform the authorities of the country of origin, the other Member States and the Commission through the rapid alert system for feed and food (RASFF) in order to limit the damage and to trigger the relevant corrective actions.

The Commission inspection service of the Health and Consumers Directorate General, DG SANCO (FVO — Food and Veterinary Office), carries out regular audits in order to verify the performance of competent authorities of Member States and compliance with EU legislation. The outcome of those audits is publicly available ([2]).

Through these controls, the Commission has a system in place to monitor food safety across the European Union and to manage potential food safety hazards in the appropriate manner.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 852/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the hygiene of foodstuffs (OJ L 139, 30.4.2004, p. 1), Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 laying down specific hygiene rules for food of animal origin (OJ L 139, 30.4.2004, p. 55) and Regulation (EC) No 854/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 laying down specific rules for the organisation of official controls on products of animal origin intended for human consumption (OJ L 139, 30.4.2004, p. 206).

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/what_en.htm

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-004854/13
do Komisji
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(30 kwietnia 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Zasady dotyczące wydatkowania środków otrzymanych z UE

Jak donoszą media, zgodnie z zasadami dotyczącymi inwestycji finansowanych z UE przekraczającymi 50%, Państwowa Szkoła Wyższa w Tarnowie nie może udostępniać mieszkańcom nowego basenu i hali. Z obiektów mogą korzystać wyłącznie studenci. Jest to spowodowane tym, że otrzymana dotacja z UE na basen i halę pokryła koszty podatku VAT. Natomiast uczelnia występowała jako podmiot nieprowadzący działalności komercyjnej. W związku z tym dzisiaj PWSZ w Tarnowie nie może sprzedawać biletów wstępu na basen wraz z obowiązkowym podatkiem VAT przez okres do 5 lat.

Gdyby uczelnia złamała powyższe zasady, to wówczas musiałaby zwrócić część dotacji unijnej, a w tym przypadku mogłaby być to kwota dochodząca do kilkunastu milionów złotych.

W związku z powyższym uprzejmie proszę Komisję o odpowiedź na następujące pytania:

1. Czy Komisja dostrzega przedmiotowy problem?

2. Czy Komisja ma zamiar zmienić zasady dotyczące inwestycji finansowanych z funduszy UE przekraczających 50%, tak aby nie doprowadzać w przyszłości do sytuacji, w której nowo wybudowane obiekty nie są w pełni wykorzystane przez mieszkańców poszczególnych państw UE?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Johannesa Hahna w imieniu Komisji
(27 czerwca 2013 r.)

1. Przepisy regulujące politykę spójności nie przewidują ograniczeń w zakresie wykorzystania nowo wybudowanych obiektów przez mieszkańców. Jednakże to beneficjenci odpowiadają za wybór modelu biznesowego, według którego planują prowadzić swoją działalność gospodarczą. Wybrany model może mieć wpływ na mające zastosowanie przepisy dotyczące kwalifikowalności VAT, zasady pomocy państwa lub generowania dochodów.

2. Jeśli chodzi o kwalifikowalność VAT, ogólna zasada mówi, że VAT jest kwalifikowalny, jeśli nie jest odzyskiwalny. Zgodnie z dyrektywą VAT ([1]) podmioty prawa publicznego nie są uważane za podatników w związku z działalnością, którą podejmują lub transakcjami, których dokonują jako organy władzy publicznej. Ponadto, do celów określania kwalifikowalności VAT na roboty budowlane, budowę i eksploatację infrastruktury należy rozpatrywać łącznie (stanowisko potwierdzone przez Sąd w sprawie T-89/10).

3. Wydaje się, że w przedmiotowej sprawie beneficjent – Państwowa Szkoła Wyższa w Tarnowie, wybrał opcję najbardziej korzystną finansowo, przewidującą maksymalny poziom współfinansowania oraz kwalifikowalność VAT na roboty budowlane, która nie jest jednak opcją najbardziej korzystną dla społeczności lokalnej.

4. Zważywszy na fakt, że przepisy nie wykluczają możliwości wykorzystania infrastruktury przez mieszkańców, Komisja pragnie odesłać Szanownego Pana Posła do konkluzji Rady Europejskiej z dnia 7-8 lutego 2013 r. w sprawie wieloletnich ram finansowych ([2]), których pkt 92 stanowi, że „VAT nie kwalifikuje się do wkładu z funduszy objętych zakresem wspólnych ram strategicznych ani z kwoty 10 000 mln EUR przesuniętych z Funduszu Spójności do instrumentu »Łącząc Europę«. Niemniej jednak kwoty VAT będą się kwalifikować, gdy nie podlegają one odzyskaniu na mocy krajowego ustawodawstwa dotyczącego VAT".

([1]) Dyrektywa Rady 2006/112/WE z dnia 28 listopada 2006 r. w sprawie wspólnego systemu podatku od wartości dodanej.
([2]) EUCO 37/13.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004854/13
to the Commission
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(30 April 2013)

Subject: Rules on the spending of EU funds

According to media reports, pursuant to rules on EU financial investments exceeding 50%, the State Higher Vocational School in Tarnów is unable to offer residents access to its new swimming pool and sports hall. The facilities are to be used exclusively by students. The reason for this is that the subsidy received from the EU for the pool and the sports hall covered the costs of VAT. The State Higher Vocational School was classified as a non-commercial entity; therefore, it may not sell tickets to the pool that include compulsory VAT for up to five years.

If the school were to violate the aforementioned rules, it would have to repay part of the EU subsidy, possibly amounting to more than PLN 10 million.

In connection with the above, would the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Does the Commission acknowledge this problem?

2. Does the Commission intend to change the rules on EU financial investments exceeding 50% in order to prevent situations arising in the future in which newly constructed facilities in the Member States cannot be used by residents?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2013)

1. The rules governing cohesion policy do not restrict the use of newly constructed infrastructure by residents. However, each beneficiary is responsible for choosing the business model by which it intends to run its business activities. This model may have an impact on the applicability of provisions regarding the eligibility of VAT as well as rules on state aid or generating revenue.

2. As far as eligibility of VAT is concerned, the general rule is that the VAT may be eligible when it is not recoverable. According to the VAT Directive ([1]), bodies governed by public law shall not be considered taxable persons in respect of activities or transactions in which they engage as public authorities. Furthermore, the construction and the operation of infrastructure should be considered together for the purpose of determining the eligibility of VAT on the construction (a position confirmed by the General Court in case T-89/10).

3. In the case of the State Higher Vocational School in Tarnów it therefore seems that the beneficiary has chosen the most financially advantageous option allowing for the maximum co-financing rate and assuring eligibility of VAT on construction, but not in terms of the benefits for the local community.

4. As the rules do not prevent the use of infrastructure by residents, the Commission would like to refer to the conclusions of the European Council of 7/8 February 2013 on the Multiannual Financial Framework ([2]) (point 92) which state that 'VAT shall not be eligible for a contribution from the CSF (ESI) funds and from the EUR 10 000 million transferred from the Cohesion fund to the Connecting Europe Facility. However, VAT amounts shall be eligible where they are not recoverable under national VAT legislation'.

([1]) Council Directive 2006/112/EC of 28 November 2006 on the common system of value added tax.
([2]) EUCO 37/13.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-004856/13
do Komisji
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(30 kwietnia 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Osoby starsze w UE

Przewiduje się, że do roku 2050 liczba osób w wieku ponad 65 lat wzrośnie o 70%, a osób powyżej 80 r. życia o 170%. Dlatego przed poszczególnymi krajami UE stoi wyzwanie, aby dostosować system opieki zdrowotnej do potrzeb starzejącego się społeczeństwa i jednocześnie zagwarantować społeczeństwu, by mimo kurczącej się siły roboczej mogły one normalnie funkcjonować.

W związku z powyższym proszę Komisję o odpowiedź na następujące pytania:

1. Czy Komisja dostrzega powyższy problem?

2. Jakie działania podejmuje i zamierza podjąć Komisja, aby ułatwić poszczególnym krajom UE sprostanie powyższym problemom?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Tonia Borga w imieniu Komisji
(14 czerwca 2013 r.)

1. Komisja chce przyczynić się do rozwiązania problemu starzenia się społeczeństwa. Aby wnieść wkład w rozwiązanie różnorodnych kwestii związanych ze starzeniem się, Komisja opracowała w ostatnich latach szereg strategii politycznych i inicjatyw w różnych dziedzinach, takich jak zdrowie publiczne, zatrudnienie, integracja społeczna, emerytury i ochrona socjalna, polityka fiskalna i gospodarcza.

2. Współpracując w kwestiach starzenia się społeczeństwa, Komisja i państwa członkowskie wypracowały wspólne poglądy na temat problemów, które wywierają presję na systemy opieki zdrowotnej, a zwłaszcza ich równowagę i wydajność. Państwa członkowskie w całej UE są świadome pilnego charakteru i znaczenia wspólnych wysiłków na rzecz znalezienia skutecznych sposobów inwestowania w zdrowie, aby stworzyć nowoczesne, elastyczne i zrównoważone systemy opieki zdrowotnej. UE może wnieść wartość dodaną w działania na szczeblu krajowym np. poprzez wspieranie innowacyjnych rozwiązań w zakresie opieki zdrowotnej w odpowiedzi na potrzeby osób starszych, tworzenie puli rzadkiej wiedzy specjalistycznej, tworzenie wspólnej metodyki oceny technologii medycznych, a także poprzez identyfikowanie i analizowanie dobrych praktyk w zakresie poprawy równowagi systemów opieki zdrowotnej.

Niektóre przykłady działań UE w tym kontekście: europejskie partnerstwo na rzecz innowacji sprzyjającej aktywnemu starzeniu się w dobrym zdrowiu ([1]); włączenie reformy systemów opieki zdrowotnej do krajowych programów reform oraz do rocznej analizy wzrostu gospodarczego; plan działań dotyczący pracowników opieki zdrowotnej w UE ([2]); plan działania w dziedzinie e-zdrowia – Innowacyjna opieka zdrowotna w XXI wieku ([3]); europejskie fundusze strukturalne i inwestycyjne oraz program „Horyzont 2020" (które można wykorzystać odpowiednio na inwestycje w zdrowie oraz badania na temat równowagi systemów opieki zdrowotnej), a także pakiet dotyczący inwestycji społecznych – inwestowanie w zdrowie ([4]).

([1]) COM(2012) 83 final z 28.2.2012 r.: komunikat Komisji pt. „Działania w ramach Strategicznego planu realizacji Europejskiego partnerstwa na rzecz innowacji sprzyjającej aktywnemu starzeniu się w dobrym zdrowiu".

([2]) SWD(2012) 93 final z 18.4.2012 r.: dokument roboczy służb Komisji pt. „Plan działań dotyczący pracowników opieki zdrowotnej w UE" towarzyszący komunikatowi Komisji pt.: „W kierunku odnowy gospodarczej sprzyjającej zatrudnieniu".

([3]) COM(2012) 736 final z 6.12.2012 r.: komunikat Komisji pt. „Plan działania w dziedzinie e-zdrowia na lata 2012-2020 – Innowacyjna opieka zdrowotna w XXI wieku".

([4]) SWD(2013) 43 final z 22.2.2013 r.: pakiet dotyczący inwestycji społecznych: dokument roboczy służb Komisji w sprawie inwestowania w zdrowie towarzyszący komunikatowi Komisji pt. „Inwestycje społeczne na rzecz wzrostu i spójności, w tym wdrażanie Europejskiego Funduszu Społecznego na lata 2014-2020".

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004856/13
to the Commission
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(30 April 2013)

Subject: Elderly people in the EU

According to estimates, by 2050 the number of people over 65 will increase by 70% and the number of people over 80 by 170%. Certain EU Member States therefore face the challenge of adapting their healthcare systems to meet the needs of an ageing population while assuring the public that healthcare can continue to function normally, in spite of a shrinking labour force.

In connection with the above, would the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Does the Commission acknowledge this problem?

2. What steps is the Commission taking — and what steps does it intend to take — to help individual Member States to overcome these problems?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(14 June 2013)

1. The Commission is keen to contribute to addressing the ageing challenge. This is why the Commission has developed in the past years a number of policies and initiatives in different areas — public health, employment, social inclusion, pensions and social protection, fiscal and economic policy — to address a wide range of ageing related issues.

2. In the context of ageing, the collaboration between the Commission and Member States has led to a common understanding of the challenges putting healthcare systems under pressure in terms of their sustainability and efficiency. Member States across the EU are aware of the urgency and importance of collective efforts towards effective ways of investing in health, in order to bring about modern, responsive and sustainable health systems. The EU can bring added value to such national efforts for example by fostering healthcare innovation responding to the needs of older people, by pooling rare expertise and common methodologies for assessing health technologies; by mapping good practices in improving the sustainability of health systems.

Some examples of EU action in this context are: the European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing ([1]); the inclusion of health system reforms in the National Reform Programmes and the Annual Growth Survey; the EU health workforce Action Plan ([2]); the eHealth Action Plan Innovative healthcare for the 21st century ([3]); the European Structural and Investment Funds and Horizon 2020 (which can be used respectively for investments in health and research on health systems sustainability) and the Social Investment Package — Investing in Health ([4]).

([1]) COM(2012) 83 final from 28.2.2012: Commission Communication Taking forward the Strategic Implementation Plan of the European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing.

([2]) SWD(2012) 93 final from 18.4.2012: Commission Staff Working Document on an Action Plan for the EU Health Workforce. Accompanying Commission Communication on Towards a job-rich recovery.

([3]) COM(2012) 736 final from 6.12.2012: Commission Communication on eHealth Action Plan 2012-2020 — Innovative healthcare for the 21st century.

([4]) SWD(2013) 43 final from 22.2.2013: Social Investment Package: Commission Staff Working Document on Investing In Health. Accompanying Commission Communication Towards Social Investment for Growth and Cohesion — including implementing the European Social Fund 2014-2020.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-004857/13
à la Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(30 avril 2013)

Objet: Phases finales du championnat d'Europe 2013 des moins de 21 ans en Israël

L'Union européenne de football d'association (UEFA) a l'intention de jouer la coupe d'Europe de football 2013 des moins de 21 ans en Israël. Nombreux sont les joueurs de ce sport qui ont réagi avec émotion concernant le lieu choisi pour les phases finales du championnat.

Israël maintient son refus d'accorder des laissez-passer à l'intérieur et à l'extérieur des territoires palestiniens pour des athlètes palestiniens, les empêchant ainsi de pouvoir participer à des compétitions, mais aussi en procédant fréquemment à des arrestations et à des emprisonnements de nombreux sportifs. De telles pratiques à l'encontre de sportifs et du droit de l'exercice du sport dans un pays sont incompatibles avec les valeurs du sport qui doivent être portées lors de l'organisation d'une grande compétition internationale.

L'article 165 du Traité de Lisbonne dispose que «L'Union contribue à la promotion des enjeux européens du sport, tout en tenant compte de ses spécificités, de ses structures fondées sur le volontariat ainsi que de sa fonction sociale et éducative». À cette fin, son action vise à «développer la dimension européenne du sport, en promouvant l'équité et l'ouverture dans les compétitions sportives et la coopération entre les organismes responsables du sport, ainsi qu'en protégeant l'intégrité physique et morale des sportifs, hommes ou femmes, notamment les plus jeunes d'entre eux».

1. Quelles sont les aides octroyées par l'Union européenne à l'UEFA?

2. De quelle manière l'Union peut-elle faire valoir les valeurs du sport européen face à l'attitude d'Israël vis-à-vis des sportifs palestiniens?

3. Quelle est, selon la Commission, la compatibilité de l'élection de l'État d'Israël pour accueillir le championnat d'Europe 2013 des moins de 21 ans avec la violation des droits humains que cet État pratique de manière constante en s'attaquant à des sportifs palestiniens et à leur intégrité?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Vassiliou au nom de la Commission
(12 juin 2013)

1. La Commission n'apporte aucun appui financier à l'UEFA. Elle coopère avec l'UEFA dans le cadre de son dialogue structuré avec le mouvement sportif. Ces activités sont menées conformément à l'article 165, paragraphe 1, du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne, relatif à l'action de l'UE dans le domaine du sport.

2. L'UE soutient des projets qui promeuvent les valeurs du sport européen chez les joueurs israéliens et palestiniens. Elle finance actuellement un projet appelé «Neighbours United: Peace Leaders for Today and Tomorrow». L'objectif de ce projet est de se servir de leur passion commune pour le football dans le but de favoriser des possibilités de coopération directe, au travers de l'éducation à la paix et d'activités de consolidation de la paix entre les jeunes Israéliens et Palestiniens. De tels échanges peuvent changer les mentalités et promouvoir la paix, la coexistence pacifique, le respect mutuel et la tolérance.

3. La désignation du pays qui accueillera le championnat d'Europe 2013 des moins de 21 ans est une question d'ordre interne qui regarde l'UEFA. La Commission respecte l'autonomie des organisations sportives en la matière.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004857/13
to the Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(30 April 2013)

Subject: Finals of the 2013 European Under-21 Championships in Israel

The Union of European Football Associations (UEFA) is planning to hold the finals of the 2013 European Under-21 Championships in Israel. Many footballers have reacted strongly to the decision to stage such an event in that country.

Israel is still refusing to grant Palestinian athletes permission to travel freely inside and outside the Palestinian territories, thereby preventing them from taking part in competitions, and frequently arrests and imprisons Palestinian sportsmen and women. Such practices, which disregard the right of the individuals concerned to participate in sporting events, are contrary to the sporting values which must underpin the organisation of a major international competition.

Article 165(1) TFEU provides that 'the Union shall contribute to the promotion of European sporting issues, while taking account of the specific nature of sport, its structures based on voluntary activity and its social and educational function'. With that aim in view, Union action should be aimed at 'developing the European dimension in sport, by promoting fairness and openness in sporting competitions and cooperation between bodies responsible for sports, and by protecting the physical and moral integrity of sportsmen and sportswomen, especially the youngest sportsmen and sportswomen'.

1. What support does UEFA receive from the EU?

2. What can the EU do to promote the values of European sport in the face of Israel's attitude towards Palestinian sportsmen and women?

3. What view does the Commission take of Israel's suitability to host the 2013 European Under-21 Championships, given that country's consistent record of violating human rights by attacking Palestinian sportsmen and women and their physical and moral integrity?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2013)

1. The Commission is not providing any financial support to UEFA. The Commission cooperates with UEFA in the framework of its structured dialogue with the sport movement. These activities are carried out in line with Article 165(1) TFEU for the action of the EU in the field of sport.

2. The EU supports projects which promote the values of European sport for Israeli and Palestinian players. The EU is currently funding a project called 'Neighbours United: Peace Leaders for Today and Tomorrow'. The objective of this project is to use the common love of football to promote opportunities for face to face cooperation between Israelis and Palestinians via peace education and piece-building activities between Israeli and Palestinian youth. Such interaction can change perceptions and promote peace, coexistence, mutual respect and tolerance.

3. The selection of the host country for the 2013 European Under-21 Championships is an internal matter that concerns UEFA. The Commission respects the autonomy of sporting organisations in this respect.

EUR-Lex (http://new.eur-lex.europa.eu) offre un accesso diretto e gratuito al diritto dell'Unione europea. Il sito consente di consultare la *Gazzetta ufficiale dell'Unione europea* nonché i trattati, la legislazione, la giurisprudenza e gli atti preparatori.

Per ulteriori informazioni sull'Unione europea, consultare il sito: http://europa.eu



Ufficio delle pubblicazioni dell'Unione europea
2985 Lussemburgo
LUSSEMBURGO

IT