

Il-Ġurnal Uffiċjali

C 12 E

tal-Unjoni Ewropea



Edizzjoni bil-Malti

Informazzjoni u Avviżi

Volum 57

16 ta' Jannar 2014

Avviż Nru

Werrej

Pàgna

IV Informazzjoni

INFORMAZZJONI MINN ISTITUZZJONIJIET, KORPI, UFFIĊĊJI U AĠENZJI TAL-UNJONI EWROPEA

Parlament Ewropew

MISTOQSJIET BIL-MIKTUB U TWEĠBIET

2014/C 12 E/01

Mistoqsijiet bil-miktub magħmula mill-Membri tal-Parlament Ewropew u t-tweġibiet mogħtija minn istituzzjoni tal-Unjoni Ewropea

1

(Ara l-avviż lill-qarrej)

MT

Avviż lill-qarrej

Din il-pubblikazzjoni tinkludi mistoqsijiet bil-miktub maghmula mill-Membri tal-Parlament Ewropew u t-tweġibiet mogħtija minn istituzzjoni tal-Unjoni Ewropea.

Għal kull mistoqsija u tweġiba, il-verżjoni tal-lingwa oriġinali hija ppreżentata qabel traduzzjoni possibbli.

F'xi każijiet, jista' jkun li r-risposta tingħata b'lingwa differenti minn dik tal-mistoqsija. Dan jiddependi mil-lingwa li jahdem biha l-kumitat li jkun intalab jagħti tweġiba.

Dawn il-mistoqsijiet u tweġibiet huma ppubblikati skont l-Artikoli 117 u 118 tar-Regoli tal-Proċedura tal-Parlament Ewropew.

Il-mistoqsijiet u t-tweġibiet kollha jistgħu jinqraw fis-sit elettroniku tal-Parlament Ewropew (Europarl) taħt l-intestatura "Mistoqsijiet Parlamentari":

<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/mt/parliamentary-questions.html>

ABBREVIJAZZJONIJIET UŻATI GĦALL-GRUPPI POLITIĊI

PPE Grupp tal-Partit Popolari Ewropew (Demokristjani)

S&D Grupp tal-Alleanza Progressiva tas-Socjalisti u d-Demokratiċi fil-Parlament Ewropew

ALDE Grupp tal-Alleanza tal-Liberali u d-Demokratiċi għall-Ewropa

ECR Grupp tal-Konservattivi u Riformisti Ewropej

Vers/ALE Grupp tal-Hodor/Alleanza Hielsa Ewropea

GUE/NGL Grupp Konfederali tax-Xellug Magħqud Ewropew - Xellug Ahdar Nordiku

EFD Grupp għall-Ewropa Hielsa u Demokratika

NI Membri mhux Affiljati



IV

(Informazzjoni)

INFORMAZZJONI MINN ISTITUZZJONIJIET, KORPI, UFFIĊĊJI U AĠENZIJI
TAL-UNJONI EWROPEA

PARLAMENT EWROPEW

MISTOQSJIET BIL-MIKTUB U TWEĠIBIET

Mistoqsijiet bil-miktub magħmula mill-Membri tal-Parlament Ewropew u t-tweġibiet
mogħtija minn istituzzjoni tal-Unjoni Ewropea

(2014/C 12 E/01)

Werrej	Pagna
E-003263/13 by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Combating racism and xenophobia	
Slovenské znenie	25
English version	26
E-003264/13 by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Impact of austerity measures on the living conditions of disabled persons	
Slovenské znenie	27
English version	28
E-003265/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Protecting birds in the Llobregat Delta (Catalonia, Spain)	
Versión española	29
English version	30
E-003266/13 by Martin Kastler to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Combating and recording of religious hate crimes in Europe	
Deutsche Fassung	31
English version	32
E-003267/13 by Martin Kastler to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Reductions in confessional religious education at European Schools	
Deutsche Fassung	33
English version	34
P-003412/13 by Bernd Posselt to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Religious education at the European Schools	
Deutsche Fassung	33
English version	34

E-003268/13 by David Martin to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Situation regarding constitutional change in Hungary	
English version	35
E-003269/13 by Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Restrictions on tobacco imports from other Member States	
Version française	36
English version	37
E-003271/13 by Daniël van der Stoep to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Access for women to the Athos peninsula	
Nederlandse versie	38
English version	39
E-003272/13 by Philip Claeys to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Complaints about the quality of meals at the Commission	
Nederlandse versie	40
English version	41
E-003273/13 by Philip Claeys to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Commissioner De Gucht's participation in Rabat mission	
Nederlandse versie	42
English version	43
E-003274/13 by Iosif Matula and Iuliu Winkler to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Removal of obstacles hindering the exploitation of geothermal energy	
Magyar változat	44
Versiunea în limba română	45
English version	46
E-003275/13 by Jens Rohde to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Untethered sows	
Dansk udgave	47
English version	48
E-003276/13 by Erik Bánki, Alajos Mészáros, Csaba Sógor, Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska and Petru Constantin Luhan to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> 'A Better Internet for Kids' Programme	
Magyar változat	49
Wersja polska	50
Versiunea în limba română	51
English version	52
E-003277/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Future revision of Regulation (EC) No 1072/2009 on access to the road haulage market	
Versiunea în limba română	53
English version	54
E-003278/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> New type of drug-resistant swine flu	
Versiunea în limba română	55
English version	56
E-003279/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Compensation for losses for Romanian milk producers following the aflatoxin crisis	
Versiunea în limba română	57
English version	58
E-003283/13 by James Nicholson to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Consumer Classroom programme	
English version	59
E-003284/13 by James Nicholson to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> European Day for the Remembrance of Victims of Terrorism	
English version	60

E-003285/13 by James Nicholson to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Farmers' markets and diversification of high street shopping	
English version	61
E-003286/13 by James Nicholson to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Fuel laundering	
English version	62
E-003287/13 by James Nicholson to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Human rights abuses in China	
English version	63
E-003288/13 by James Nicholson to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Large denomination banknotes	
English version	64
E-003289/13 by James Nicholson to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Poverty in Romania	
English version	65
E-003290/13 by James Nicholson to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Progress of EU in reducing greenhouse gas emissions	
English version	66
E-003291/13 by Jürgen Creutzmann to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Promotion of company split-ups by structural funds in Rhineland-Palatinate	
Deutsche Fassung	67
English version	68
E-003292/13 by Alyn Smith to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Homelessness and Europe 2020 strategy	
English version	69
E-003293/13 by Alyn Smith to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Homelessness statistics in the EU	
English version	70
E-003294/13 by Andrea Zaroni, Nadja Hirsch, Raúl Romeva i Rueda, David Martin, Dan Jørgensen, Pavel Poc, Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu and Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Joint Management Committee of the International Agreement on Humane Trapping Standards (IAHTS) (follow-up to Written Question E-010289/2012)	
Versión española	71
České znění	73
Dansk udgave	75
Deutsche Fassung	77
Versione italiana	79
Nederlandse versie	81
Versiunea în limba română	83
English version	85
P-003295/13 by Niki Tzavela to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Energy poverty	
Ελληνική έκδοση	87
English version	88
P-003296/13 by Monica Luisa Macovei to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Privatisation of Croatian state-owned shipyards	
Versiunea în limba română	89
English version	90
P-003297/13 by Carlo Casini to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> European development cooperation funding	
Versione italiana	91
English version	92

E-003298/13 by María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora, José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra and Pablo Zalba Bidegain to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Revision of Tobacco Products Directive (2001/37/EC) — impact on international trade	
Versión española	93
English version	94
E-003299/13 by Horst Schnellhardt to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Implementation of Directive 2008/50/EC on ambient air quality and cleaner air for Europe	
Deutsche Fassung	95
English version	96
E-003300/13 by Martina Anderson to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Fairness and transparency in programmes between Member States	
English version	97
E-003301/13 by Carl Schlyter, Eva Lichtenberger, Christian Engström, Amelia Andersdotter, Malika Benarab-Attou, Judith Sargentini and Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> EU-US trade agreement and obligations under the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR)	
Versión española	98
Deutsche Fassung	99
Version française	100
Nederlandse versie	101
Svensk version	102
English version	103
E-003302/13 by Martina Anderson to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Funding to tackle transgender discrimination	
English version	104
E-003303/13 by Roger Helmer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> EU aid to Palestine	
English version	105
E-003304/13 by Liam Aylward to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Nutrition and healthy eating in hospitals and nursing homes	
English version	106
E-003305/13 by Monica Luisa Macovei to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Establishment of a public register for the 8th, 9th and 10th European Development Funds	
Versiunea în limba română	107
English version	108
E-003306/13 by Monica Luisa Macovei to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Increasing the transparency of OLAF's website with regard to public procurement	
Versiunea în limba română	109
English version	110
E-003307/13 by Fiona Hall to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> National policies regarding electromagnetic field (EMF) exposure across the EU	
English version	111
E-003308/13 by Lambert van Nistelrooij and Esther de Lange to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Achievements of the Geriatric Expert Group in keeping medicines safe for older people	
Nederlandse versie	112
English version	113
E-003309/13 by Aldo Patriciello to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> SOA certification	
Versione italiana	114
English version	115

E-003310/13 by Andrea Zanoni to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Possible further infringement by Italy of the procedures laid down in Directive 2004/18/EC in relation to the Pedemontana Veneta expressway, currently under construction	
Versione italiana	116
English version	117
E-003311/13 by Andrea Zanoni to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Possible breach of Regulation (EC) No 1007/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council and Regulation (EU) No 737/2010 of the Commission	
Versione italiana	118
English version	119
E-003312/13 by Marek Henryk Migalski to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Polish woman unlawfully held in Belarus	
Wersja polska	120
English version	121
P-003313/13 by Julie Girling to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Delay in signing off shark finning ban	
English version	122
E-003314/13 by Rosa Estaràs Ferragut to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Maritime tourism — Application of IEDMT in Spain	
Versión española	123
English version	124
E-003315/13 by Werner Langen to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Inquiry into potential aid for large electricity consumers exempted from network charges in Germany	
Deutsche Fassung	125
English version	126
E-003316/13 by Malika Benarab-Attou to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> U-Multirank	
Version française	127
English version	128
E-003317/13 by Andrea Cozzolino to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Implementation in Italy of Directive 89/391/EEC on the introduction of measures to encourage improvements in the safety and health of workers at work	
Versione italiana	129
English version	130
E-003318/13 by Eleni Theocharous and Niki Tzavela to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Action via the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) to address the impact of the economic crisis in Cyprus	
Ελληνική έκδοση	131
English version	132
E-003319/13 by Niki Tzavela to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Worker reintegration programme	
Ελληνική έκδοση	133
English version	134
P-003321/13 by Richard Seeber to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Interpretation of Directive 2009/43/EC with regard to optical weapon sights	
Deutsche Fassung	135
English version	136
E-003322/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission <i>Subject:</i> Forest management	
Versión española	137
English version	138

E-003323/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Deposit limits	
Versión española	139
English version	140
E-003324/13 by Jens Rohde to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Approval of Danish aid for biogas	
Dansk udgave	141
English version	142
E-003325/13 by Norbert Neuser to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> EU State aid procedure — 'Nürburgring' race track	
Deutsche Fassung	143
English version	144
E-003326/13 by Catherine Stihler to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Avoidance of EU tax duty	
English version	145
E-003328/13 by Syed Kamall to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Increase of registration fee by Antwerp City Council	
English version	146
E-003330/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Lack of transparency in EU funding process of NGOs active in Arab-Israeli conflict — limited access to the related documentation	
Versione italiana	147
English version	150
E-003386/13 by Sari Essayah to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Improvements to the transparency of EU funding for certain NGOs	
Suomenkielinen versio	149
English version	150
E-003331/13 by Laima Liucija Andrikienė to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> EU-Armenia cooperation	
Tekstas lietuvių kalba	152
English version	153
E-003332/13 by Arlene McCarthy to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Non-bank finance	
English version	154
E-003334/13 by Marietje Schaake to the Council	
<i>Subject:</i> NATO cyber warfare manual and the EU's cybersecurity strategy	
Nederlandse versie	155
English version	157
E-003335/13 by Marietje Schaake to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> NATO cyber warfare manual and the EU's cybersecurity strategy	
Nederlandse versie	159
English version	161
E-003336/13 by Philippe Boulland to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Draft EU-US bilateral agreement	
Version française	163
English version	164
E-003337/13 by Philippe Boulland to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Exportability of social security benefits across EU Member States	
Version française	165
English version	166

E-003338/13 by Philippe Boulland to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Standard charger for mobile phones	
Version française	167
English version	168
E-003339/13 by Philippe Boulland to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Penalties for outlets that fail to recover waste electrical and electronic equipment	
Version française	169
English version	170
E-003341/13 by Philippe Boulland to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> European legislation to establish a minimum distance between aeroplane seats	
Version française	171
English version	172
E-003343/13 by Philippe Boulland to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Reference to mark-ups on the labels of pre-packaged foodstuffs	
Version française	173
English version	174
E-003344/13 by Philippe Boulland to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Standardising electrical plugs and sockets in Europe	
Version française	175
English version	176
E-003345/13 by Philippe Boulland to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Future of the United Kingdom in Europe	
Version française	177
English version	178
E-003347/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Exposure to electromagnetic fields in European countries — what measures should be taken?	
Versione italiana	179
English version	180
E-003348/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Diplomatic clash between Italy and India — EU position in the case of the Italian marines and legal protection from the EU with regard to compliance with the Vienna Convention	
Versione italiana	181
English version	182
E-003349/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> New additions and mental health at times of crisis — what measures are being taken at EU level?	
Versione italiana	183
English version	185
E-003350/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> What does the future hold for producing and using artificial retinas?	
Versione italiana	187
English version	189
E-003351/13 by Bastiaan Belder to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Tackling unfair trade practices in the food chain	
Nederlandse versie	191
English version	192
E-003352/13 by Bart Staes to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Arms exports from the EU to Israel	
Nederlandse versie	193
English version	194
E-003353/13 by Bart Staes to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Cooperation with Israel within FP7	
Nederlandse versie	195
English version	196

E-003355/13 by Daciana Octavia Sârbu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Agreement with the Republic of Moldova on the protection of geographical markings on agricultural products and foodstuffs	
Versiunea în limba română	197
English version	198
E-003356/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> TTIP negotiations and their impact on agriculture	
Versiunea în limba română	199
English version	200
E-003358/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells and Izaskun Bilbao Barandica to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> New competition authority	
Versión española	201
English version	202
E-003359/13 by Pablo Zalba Bidegain to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Trade facilitation	
Versión española	203
English version	205
P-003808/13 by Antolín Sánchez Presedo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Development of a trade facilitation programme (TFP)	
Versión española	203
English version	205
E-003360/13 by Andreas Mölzer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Free trade area China-Japan-South Korea	
Deutsche Fassung	207
English version	208
E-003361/13 by Andreas Mölzer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Bankruptcy of the banks in Cyprus despite passing the bank stress tests with flying colours	
Deutsche Fassung	209
English version	210
E-003362/13 by Andreas Mölzer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Bank tax — violation of democratic principles	
Deutsche Fassung	211
English version	213
E-003363/13 by Andreas Mölzer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Deposit guarantee scheme — protection for savers	
Deutsche Fassung	214
English version	215
E-003364/13 by Andreas Mölzer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Particulate matter pollution from printers and photocopiers	
Deutsche Fassung	216
English version	217
E-003365/13 by Bart Staes to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Planned oil drilling in the waters between Morocco and the Canary Islands	
Nederlandse versie	218
English version	220
E-003366/13 by Peter van Dalen to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> EU staff cuts	
Nederlandse versie	222
English version	223
E-003367/13 by Lucas Hartong and Auke Zijlstra to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Discrimination during the Dutch broadcasters' 'networking day'	
Nederlandse versie	224
English version	225

E-003368/13 by Filip Kaczmarek to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Expansion of the market for e-cigarettes in the European Union	
Wersja polska	226
English version	227
E-003369/13 by Minodora Cliveti to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Inclusion of paid internships in the calculation of pensions	
Versiunea în limba română	228
English version	229
P-003370/13 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Follow-up to Question E-000750/2013 of 21 March 2013	
Deutsche Fassung	230
English version	231
E-003371/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Unequal treatment regarding preferred shares	
Versión española	232
English version	233
E-003373/13 by Aldo Patriciello to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The case of the Italian marines	
Versione italiana	234
English version	235
E-003375/13 by Inês Cristina Zuber to the Council	
<i>Subject:</i> Speech by Shimon Peres — Iran and Syria	
Versão portuguesa	236
English version	237
E-003376/13 by Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Speech by Israeli President Shimon Peres	
Versão portuguesa	238
English version	239
E-003377/13 by Inês Cristina Zuber and Elisa Ferreira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Situation at Açomonta	
Versão portuguesa	240
English version	242
E-003423/13 by Edite Estrela to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Exploitation of Portuguese workers in Luxembourg	
Versão portuguesa	240
English version	242
E-003378/13 by Inês Cristina Zuber to the Council	
<i>Subject:</i> MEPs denied entry to Morocco	
Versão portuguesa	244
English version	245
E-003379/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Legal regulations for the drug Avastin	
Versiunea în limba română	246
English version	247
E-003380/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Level of bacterial contamination in packaged unprocessed vegetables	
Versiunea în limba română	248
English version	249
E-003381/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> 'Biometric residence permits' for Romanian and Bulgarian immigrants in the UK	
Versiunea în limba română	250
English version	251

E-003382/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Contracting rate and status of payments actually made to Romania	
Versiunea în limba română	252
English version	253
E-003383/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Cypriot banking sector	
Versión española	254
English version	255
E-003384/13 by Francisco Sosa Wagner to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Defibrillators in the EU institutions	
Versión española	256
English version	257
E-003385/13 by Jutta Steinruck to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Disposal of animal carcasses	
Deutsche Fassung	258
English version	259
P-003387/13 by Jürgen Klute to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Clarifications regarding the EU's commitment to concluding an association agreement with Mercosur, and democracy in Paraguay	
Deutsche Fassung	260
English version	261
P-003388/13 by Nessa Childers to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Liquidation of Anglo Irish Bank and credit unions	
English version	262
P-003389/13 by Martina Anderson to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> FLAG (fisheries local action groups) funding	
English version	263
P-003390/13 by João Ferreira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Abolition of milk quotas: study on the consequences	
Versão portuguesa	264
English version	265
E-003391/13 by Charles Tannock to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Property rights of the Catholic community in Sevastopol	
English version	266
E-003392/13 by Charles Tannock to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Property rights of the Catholic community in Sevastopol	
English version	266
E-003393/13 by Charles Tannock to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Persecution of Christians in Pakistan	
English version	268
E-003395/13 by Fiorello Provera to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Increase in violence against women in Sweden	
Versione italiana	269
English version	270
E-003396/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Allegations of increasing press censorship in Argentina	
Versione italiana	271
English version	272
E-003397/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Application of Sharia law in rebel-held Syrian territory	
Versione italiana	273
English version	274

E-003398/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Restoration of sovereignty in Mali	
Versione italiana	275
English version	276
E-003399/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — French Jewish writer allegedly barred from Libya	
Versione italiana	277
English version	278
E-003400/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> One year since Toulouse killings	
Versione italiana	279
English version	280
E-003401/13 by Fiorello Provera and Charles Tannock to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — President Obama calls for designation of Hezbollah as a terrorist organisation	
Versione italiana	281
English version	282
E-003402/13 by Jim Higgins to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Text alert initiatives	
English version	283
E-003403/13 by Jim Higgins to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Processed foods in hospitals and nursing homes	
English version	284
E-003404/13 by Bas Eickhout to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> EIB energy policy review and the Commission's position	
Nederlandse versie	285
English version	286
E-003405/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Football club owned by a nationalised bank	
Versión española	287
English version	288
E-003406/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells and Izaskun Bilbao Barandica to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Respect for fundamental values in the EU	
Versión española	289
English version	290
E-003407/13 by Marietta Giannakou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Forced marriages and education of minors	
Ελληνική έκδοση	291
English version	292
E-003408/13 by Georgios Toussas to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Direct threat to public health and the environment from landfill site in Stavros-Kladema Didymon in the Municipality of Ermionida	
Ελληνική έκδοση	293
English version	294
E-003409/13 by Françoise Grossetête to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Implementing regulations of the Ecodesign Directive	
Version française	295
English version	296
E-003410/13 by Matteo Salvini to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Excessive cost of school books in Italy compared with other EU countries	
Versione italiana	297
English version	298

E-003411/13 by Andrea Zanoni to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Possible infringements of EC law and interference in the authorisation procedures for a projected regasification plant at Zaule, in the port of Trieste	
Versione italiana	299
English version	300
E-003413/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Gender stereotyping by the Princelandia franchise	
Versión española	301
English version	302
E-003414/13 by Kriton Arsenis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> New plans for Venizelou station on Thessaloniki metro and European financing	
Ελληνική έκδοση	303
English version	304
E-003415/13 by Jürgen Klute to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Follow-up to the Curuguaty case	
Deutsche Fassung	305
English version	306
E-003416/13 by Georgios Stavrakakis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Recoveries relating to the financial year 2010 by DG AGRI	
Ελληνική έκδοση	307
English version	308
E-003417/13 by Georgios Stavrakakis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Recoveries relating to the financial year 2011 by DG AGRI	
Ελληνική έκδοση	307
English version	308
E-003418/13 by Nessa Childers to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Transparency of Commission expert groups	
English version	309
E-003419/13 by Marietje Schaake to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Conflicting statements by Commissioner Füle and EU Special Representative León on ‘more for more’ and Egypt	
Nederlandse versie	310
English version	312
E-003420/13 by Sven Giegold and Helga Trüpel to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Level of cohesion policy and Erasmus disbursements	
Deutsche Fassung	314
English version	316
E-003421/13 by Michael Cramer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Co-financing of the new line between Wendlingen and Ulm	
Deutsche Fassung	318
English version	319
E-003422/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Request for the EU to take action on the security of payments made with credit or debit cards in countries outside the EU	
Versione italiana	320
English version	321
E-003424/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Embargo on imports of seed potatoes from the EU	
Versiunea în limba română	322
English version	323

E-003425/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Restoring confidence in European food products	
Versiunea în limba română	324
English version	325
E-003426/13 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Risk of death through using Azithromycin	
Versiunea în limba română	326
English version	327
P-003427/13 by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Adoption of the bill to set up a National Commission for Markets and Competition	
Versión española	328
English version	329
E-003428/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Digital Agenda for Europe	
Versión española	330
English version	331
E-003429/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Smart Cities	
Versión española	332
English version	333
E-003430/13 by Petru Constantin Luhan to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Compatibility of media freedom with EU fundamental rights	
Versiunea în limba română	334
English version	335
E-003431/13 by Christine De Veyrac to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The principle of gender equality called into question	
Version française	336
English version	337
E-003432/13 by Christine De Veyrac to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> External costs of motor vehicles in the EU	
Version française	338
English version	339
E-003433/13 by Raimon Obiols to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Conflict in Western Sahara	
Versión española	340
English version	341
E-003434/13 by Ana Miranda to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — EU-Mercosur negotiations	
Versión española	342
English version	343
E-003435/13 by Jutta Steinruck to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Triangular taxation	
Deutsche Fassung	344
English version	345
E-003436/13 by Kriton Arsenis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> New nuclear power plant in Akkuyu (Turkey)	
Ελληνική έκδοση	346
English version	347
E-003437/13 by Kathleen Van Brempt to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Quality standards for materials used in 3D printing	
Nederlandse versie	348
English version	350

E-003438/13 by Kathleen Van Brempt to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Importation of US 3D printers into the European market	
Nederlandse versie	348
English version	350
E-003439/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Request for the Commission to take action over the lack of blood in Greece	
Versione italiana	352
English version	353
E-003440/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Request for the Commission to monitor the toxicity of furs	
Versione italiana	354
English version	355
E-003441/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Request for the EU to take action to defend consumers	
Versione italiana	356
English version	357
E-003443/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Forestry law in Spain	
Versión española	358
English version	359
E-003444/13 by Ádám Kósa to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The subject matter of point 104 of the INI report in relation to the difficulties encountered by visually impaired people in using products with digital displays	
Magyar változat	360
English version	361
E-003445/13 by Ádám Kósa to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The subject matter of point 98 of the INI report in relation to navigation-based applications supporting visually impaired people	
Magyar változat	362
English version	363
E-003446/13 by Ádám Kósa to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The subject matter of point 73 of the INI report in relation to the participation of organisations representing people with disabilities in the decision-making process	
Magyar változat	364
English version	365
E-003447/13 by Ádám Kósa to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The subject matter of point 71 of the INI report in relation to compassionate leave for parents of children with disabilities	
Magyar változat	366
English version	367
E-003449/13 by Ádám Kósa to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The subject matter of point 65 of the INI report in relation to sustainable rehabilitation services	
Magyar változat	368
English version	369
E-003450/13 by Ádám Kósa to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The subject matter of point 64 of the INI report in relation to the accessibility of lifelong learning programmes to people with disabilities	
Magyar változat	370
English version	371
E-003451/13 by Ádám Kósa to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The subject matter of point 59 of the INI report in relation to actively promoting inclusive education for people with disabilities	
Magyar változat	372
English version	373

E-003452/13 by Ádám Kósa to the Commission

Subject: The subject matter of point 56 of the INI report in relation to subtitling on television and the availability of sign language

Magyar változat	374
English version	375

E-003453/13 by Ádám Kósa to the Commission

Subject: The subject matter of points 48 and 49 of the INI report in relation to providing flexible and individually tailored forms of employment for people with disabilities

Magyar változat	376
English version	377

E-003454/13 by Ádám Kósa to the Commission

Subject: The subject matter of point 39 of the INI report in relation to the access of people with disabilities to healthcare services

Magyar változat	378
English version	379

E-003455/13 by Ádám Kósa to the Commission

Subject: The subject matter of point 35 of the INI report in relation to the European Mobility Card for people with disabilities

Magyar változat	380
English version	381

E-003456/13 by Ádám Kósa to the Commission

Subject: The subject matter of point 34 of the INI report in relation to the possibility of including involvement in caring for people with disabilities in the pension calculation

Magyar változat	382
English version	383

E-003457/13 by Ádám Kósa to the Commission

Subject: The subject matter of point 18 of the INI report in relation to the transition to community care as part of deinstitutionalising people with disabilities resident in institutions

Magyar változat	384
English version	385

E-003458/13 by Ádám Kósa to the Council

Subject: The subject matter of point 105 of the INI report in relation to the possibility of using sign language in dealing with administrative matters

Magyar változat	386
English version	387

E-003461/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission

Subject: VP/HR — Afghanistan — state of play

Versão portuguesa	388
English version	389

E-003462/13 by Diogo Feio to the Council

Subject: Afghanistan — state of play

Versão portuguesa	390
English version	391

E-003463/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission

Subject: Cross-border venture capital funds — state of play

Versão portuguesa	392
English version	393

E-003464/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission

Subject: VAT — support for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs)

Versão portuguesa	394
English version	396

E-003465/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Energy taxation — state of play	
Versão portuguesa	397
English version	398
E-003466/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> EU Joint Transfer Pricing Forum (JTPF)	
Versão portuguesa	399
English version	400
E-003467/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Enhancing cooperation with Brazil in the field of energy	
Versão portuguesa	401
English version	402
E-003468/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Common Consolidated Corporate Tax Base (CCCTB) — state of play	
Versão portuguesa	403
English version	404
E-003469/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> New European enterprise culture	
Versão portuguesa	405
English version	406
E-003470/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Savings Taxation Directive and administrative cooperation in the field of taxation	
Versão portuguesa	407
English version	408
E-003471/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Drought in Europe	
Versão portuguesa	409
English version	410
E-003472/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> European Public Prosecutor's Office — proposal	
Versão portuguesa	411
English version	412
E-003473/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Environmental impact of pharmaceuticals	
Versão portuguesa	413
English version	414
E-003474/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> The Azores — game resources for tourism purposes	
Versão portuguesa	415
English version	416
E-003475/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Assistance for Mercosur SMEs	
Versão portuguesa	417
English version	418
E-003476/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Active European Remembrance — totalitarianism	
Versão portuguesa	419
English version	420
P-003477/13 by Matthias Groote to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Real-life tests of 1234yf coolant in vehicles, MAC Directive 2006/40	
Deutsche Fassung	421
English version	422

P-003478/13 by Bogusław Liberadzki to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Creating jobs by investing in rail infrastructure	
Wersja polska	423
English version	424
P-003479/13 by Frédéric Daerden to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Social dumping between Member States at the expense of workers	
Version française	425
English version	426
P-003480/13 by Francesco De Angelis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Late payment and the Italian situation	
Versione italiana	427
English version	429
P-003651/13 by Patrizia Toia to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Debts of public authorities	
Versione italiana	427
English version	429
P-003481/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Commission confirms that 'tax on deposits' could cover several Member States	
Versão portuguesa	431
English version	432
E-003482/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> EU legislation	
Versión española	433
English version	434
E-003483/13 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Transposition of directives in the Kingdom of Spain	
Versión española	435
English version	436
E-003484/13 by Ivailo Kalfin to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> EU investigation into an energy grid access charge in Bulgaria	
българска версия	437
English version	438
E-003485/13 by Hynek Fajmon to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Using EU funds to revitalise railway buildings in Central Bohemia, Czech Republic	
České znění	439
English version	440
E-003486/13 by Michael Cramer and Bogusław Liberadzki to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Closure of lines on the Polish rail network	
Deutsche Fassung	441
Wersja polska	442
English version	443
E-003487/13 by Ismail Ertug to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Impact assessment: fourth Railway Package	
Deutsche Fassung	444
English version	445
E-003488/13 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Position paper by the European Chamber of Commerce Taiwan (ECCT) on EU-Taiwan trade	
Wersja polska	446
English version	447
E-003489/13 by Michel Dantin to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> European photovoltaic panel industry	
Version française	448
English version	449

E-003491/13 by Astrid Lulling to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Application of Directive 2010/41/EU	
Version française	450
English version	451
E-003492/13 by Giuseppe Gargani to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Request for a timetable for the presentation of a draft law on the labelling of leather products	
Versione italiana	452
English version	453
E-003493/13 by Claudio Morganti to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Bank rescue in Cyprus	
Versione italiana	454
English version	455
E-003494/13 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Fight against piracy	
Versione italiana	456
English version	457
E-003495/13 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Need for the Commission to protect the portability of mobile telephone numbers	
Versione italiana	458
English version	459
E-003496/13 by Ivo Belet to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Video games — status of the pan-European code of conduct and age verification	
Nederlandse versie	460
English version	461
E-003497/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Innovative financing	
Versão portuguesa	462
English version	463
E-003498/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Professional traineeships — role and quality	
Versão portuguesa	464
English version	465
E-003499/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Contactless payments — pilot projects	
Versão portuguesa	466
English version	467
E-003500/13 by João Ferreira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Support for engine reconditioning	
Versão portuguesa	468
English version	469
E-003501/13 by João Ferreira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> EU support for shipbuilding	
Versão portuguesa	470
English version	471
E-003502/13 by João Ferreira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Execution of Axis 4 of the Portuguese Fisheries Operational Programme (PROMAR) and the reprogramming of this programme	
Versão portuguesa	472
English version	473
E-003503/13 by João Ferreira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Facility for Infrastructure Development (ORIO)	
Versão portuguesa	474
English version	475

E-003504/13 by João Ferreira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Public tenders in the field of shipbuilding published in the Official Journal	
Versão portuguesa	476
English version	477
E-003505/13 by João Ferreira and Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> 'Water is a human right' — European Federation of Public Service Unions initiative	
Versão portuguesa	478
English version	479
E-003506/13 by João Ferreira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Coastal Action Groups and Local Action Groups	
Versão portuguesa	480
English version	481
E-003507/13 by João Ferreira and Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Working conditions at ESIP (Portugal) and discrimination against female workers	
Versão portuguesa	482
English version	484
E-003508/13 by João Ferreira and Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> ECB official's statements on the privatisation programme in Cyprus	
Versão portuguesa	486
English version	487
E-003509/13 by João Ferreira and Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Eurostat study on electricity prices in the EU — Band IG	
Versão portuguesa	488
English version	489
E-003510/13 by João Ferreira and Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Aid and guarantees to the financial sector	
Versão portuguesa	490
English version	491
E-003511/13 by João Ferreira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Mar Vivo Sudoeste project — minimising bycatch	
Versão portuguesa	492
English version	493
E-003512/13 by João Ferreira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Projects and actions in the field of balneology and health	
Versão portuguesa	494
English version	495
E-003513/13 by João Ferreira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Situation of the western railway line (Portugal) and required investment	
Versão portuguesa	496
English version	497
E-003514/13 by João Ferreira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Renovation works on the thermal treatment hospital in Caldas da Rainha	
Versão portuguesa	498
English version	499
E-003515/13 by Antolín Sánchez Presedo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Exploitation of the Corcoesto gold mine	
Versión española	500
English version	501
E-003516/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — EU-Morocco Fisheries Agreement	
Versión española	502
English version	503

E-003517/13 by Willy Meyer to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Exploration for the exploitation of shale gas in Cádiz (Spain)	
Versión española	504
English version	505
E-003518/13 by Alain Cadec to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Collecting data on the seal population	
Version française	506
English version	507
E-003519/13 by Crescenzo Rivellini to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Extending the 'Erasmus' project to maritime and hospitality colleges	
Versione italiana	508
English version	509
E-003520/13 by Zigmantas Balčytis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Linking of the ban on foreigners acquiring agricultural land and forests in Lithuania with direct payments	
Tekstas lietuvių kalba	510
English version	511
E-003521/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Tourists kidnapped in Sinai	
Versão portuguesa	512
English version	513
E-003522/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Iran threatens Israel	
Versão portuguesa	514
English version	515
E-003523/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Comments by Dmitry Medvedev	
Versão portuguesa	516
English version	517
E-003524/13 by Nuno Melo to the Council	
<i>Subject:</i> Chemical weapons in Syria	
Versão portuguesa	518
English version	519
E-003525/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Chemical weapons in Syria	
Versão portuguesa	520
English version	521
E-003526/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Cyber-attack on South Korea	
Versão portuguesa	522
English version	523
E-003527/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Plan to combat possible attacks from North Korea	
Versão portuguesa	524
English version	525
E-003529/13 by Jürgen Creutzmann to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Consumer protection in connection with the cross-border provision of online gambling services	
Deutsche Fassung	526
English version	527
E-003530/13 by Niki Tzavela to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Statements by Bağış	
Ελληνική έκδοση	528
English version	529

E-003531/13 by Niki Tzavela to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Bank deposits in Europe	
Ελληνική έκδοση	530
English version	531
E-003532/13 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> New European bail-in mechanism for banks	
Ελληνική έκδοση	532
English version	533
E-003533/13 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Problem loans by German banks to the shipbuilding industry	
Ελληνική έκδοση	534
English version	535
E-003534/13 by Konstantinos Poupakis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Significant increase in poverty in Greece and urgent need to support vulnerable social groups	
Ελληνική έκδοση	536
English version	537
E-003535/13 by Barbara Lochbihler and Satu Hassi to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Thailand: the case of Andy Hall	
Deutsche Fassung	538
Suomenkielinen versio	539
English version	540
E-003536/13 by Robert Sturdy to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> EU-US trade statistics	
English version	541
E-003537/13 by Syed Kamall to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Communications Capabilities Development Programme (CCPD)	
English version	542
E-003538/13 by Syed Kamall to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Re-opening of Khojaly Airport in Nagorno-Karabakh	
English version	543
E-003539/13 by Syed Kamall to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Employee engagement initiatives	
English version	544
E-003541/13 by James Nicholson to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Double funding within the context of CAP reform	
English version	545
E-003542/13 by Zbigniew Ziobro to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Climate package cost estimates for Poland	
Wersja polska	546
English version	547
E-003543/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> European exports to Angola	
Versão portuguesa	548
English version	549
E-003544/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Discovery of liquefied natural gas in Mozambique and the European market	
Versão portuguesa	550
English version	551
E-003545/13 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Indicators in cohesion policy post-2020	
Versão portuguesa	552
English version	553

E-003546/13 by Edite Estrela to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Gender equality in the European Public Administration selection procedure	
Versão portuguesa	554
English version	555
E-003547/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Aflatoxins: what are the risks connected with, and controls on, maize derivatives — particularly those originating outside the EU — contained in products used for medical or pharmacological purposes?	
Versione italiana	556
English version	558
E-003549/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> New drugs: what are their effects on the human body, and how can we eradicate illegal trafficking?	
Versione italiana	560
English version	562
E-003550/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Abandoned fishing nets: what urgent measures can be taken to reduce the problem?	
Versione italiana	563
English version	564
E-003551/13 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Banning the use of neonicotinoid pesticides to protect bees — what are the future prospects in the EU?	
Versione italiana	565
English version	566
E-003552/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Active remembrance — defining moments in modern European history	
Versão portuguesa	567
English version	568
E-003553/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> European Heritage Label	
Versão portuguesa	569
English version	570
E-003554/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Joint Africa-EU Strategy	
Versão portuguesa	571
English version	572
E-003555/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Damage caused by bad weather in the Azores	
Versão portuguesa	573
English version	574
E-003556/13 by Sirpa Pietikäinen to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Research funding to Israeli settlement companies	
Suomenkielinen versio	575
English version	576
E-003557/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> European fight against violent extremism	
Versão portuguesa	577
English version	578
E-003558/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> End of milk quotas — impact study	
Versão portuguesa	579
English version	580
E-003559/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Traditional descriptions — port wine	
Versão portuguesa	581
English version	582

E-003560/13 by Diogo Feio to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Great books of European culture	
Versão portuguesa	583
English version	584
P-003561/13 by Spyros Danellis to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Practices followed in applying for the Single Direct Farm Payment	
Ελληνική έκδοση	585
English version	586
E-003562/13 by Gay Mitchell to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Credit union deposits with the Irish Banking Resolution Corporation (IBRC)	
English version	587
E-003563/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Iraq's Camp Liberty	
Ελληνική έκδοση	588
English version	589
E-003564/13 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> VP/HR — Human rights violations: the sentencing of journalist Avaz Zeynalli in Azerbaijan	
Ελληνική έκδοση	590
English version	591
E-003565/13 by Véronique Mathieu Houillon to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Durability of marine ecosystems and increase in seal populations	
Version française	592
English version	593
E-003566/13 by Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Wildlife crime	
Nederlandse versie	594
English version	596
E-003567/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Cypriot banking sector	
Versão portuguesa	598
English version	599
E-003568/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Restrictions on capital movements in Cyprus	
Versão portuguesa	600
English version	601
E-003569/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Portugal's state-owned companies	
Versão portuguesa	602
English version	603
E-003570/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Portuguese Constitutional Court analysing 2013 budget items	
Versão portuguesa	604
English version	605
E-003571/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Energy and telecommunications costs in Portugal	
Versão portuguesa	606
English version	607
E-003572/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission	
<i>Subject:</i> Unemployment and fall in GDP	
Versão portuguesa	608
English version	609

E-003573/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission*Subject:* Consequences of the steps being taken in Cyprus

Versão portuguesa	610
English version	611

E-003574/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission*Subject:* Foreign-owned companies operating in Cyprus

Versão portuguesa	612
English version	613

E-003575/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission*Subject:* Fatal bicycle-related accidents

Versão portuguesa	614
English version	615

E-003576/13 by Nuno Melo to the Commission*Subject:* New rules for combating Alzheimer's disease

Versão portuguesa	616
English version	617

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-003263/13

Komisii

Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)

(21. marca 2013)

Vec: Boj proti rasizmu a xenofóbie

Rasistické incidenty, zločiny nenávisťi a prejavy neznášanlivosti sú v Európskej únii na vzostupe. Extrémistické strany s diskriminačnými postojmi získali vo viacerých členských štátoch parlamentné zastúpenie. To veľmi nepriaznivo ovplyvňuje proces tvorby politik Európskej únie. V Európskom parlamente sme už viackrát žiadali revíziu rámcového rozhodnutia 2008/913/SVV o boji proti niektorým formám a prejavom rasizmu a xenofóbie.

Aké konkrétne opatrenia zamerané na boj proti rasizmu a xenofóbie prijala Komisia v poslednej dobe a aké opatrenia plánuje prijať v blízkej budúcnosti?

Odpoveď pani Redingovej v mene Komisie

(15. mája 2013)

Európska komisia opakovane odmietla a odsúdila všetky prejavy rasizmu a xenofóbie, pretože sú nezlučiteľné s hodnotami a zásadami, na základe ktorých je Európska únia založená.

Komisia je odhodlaná bojovať proti týmto javom, pričom využíva všetky právomoci, ktoré má k dispozícii na základe zmlúv, vrátane dôkladného monitorovania vykonávania právnych predpisov EÚ zakazujúcich nenávisťné prejavy a trestné činy motivované nenávisťou. Konkrétne možno uviesť monitorovanie vykonávania rámcového rozhodnutia o boji proti rasizmu a xenofóbie, ktorým sa zakazujú rasistické alebo xenofóbne prejavy a trestné činy motivované rasizmom a xenofóbiou, ako aj smernice o audiovizuálnych mediálnych službách, ktorou sa zakazujú rasistické prejavy v audiovizuálnych mediálnych službách, napríklad v televíznych vysielaniach a v rámci služieb videa na požiadanie.

Komisia v súčasnosti posudzuje transpozíciu a vykonávanie uvedeného rámcového rozhodnutia členskými štátmi. Hodnotenie jeho dodržiavania členskými štátmi predloží v správe koncom roku 2013.

Komisia nie je do 1. decembra 2014 oprávnená začať konanie vo veci porušenia právnych predpisov na základe rámcových rozhodnutí.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003263/13
to the Commission**

Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)

(21 March 2013)

Subject: Combating racism and xenophobia

Racist incidents, hate crimes and expressions of intolerance are becoming more common in the EU. Extremist parties with discriminatory positions have gained parliamentary seats in several Member States. This has a detrimental influence on the process of creating EU policy. Parliament has, on many occasions, called for a review of Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia.

What specific steps has the Commission taken recently with a view to combating racism and xenophobia, and what steps does it plan to take in this regard in the near future?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission

(15 May 2013)

The European Commission has repeatedly rejected and condemned all manifestations of racism and xenophobia as these phenomena are incompatible with the values and principles the EU is founded on.

The Commission is committed to fighting against these phenomena by making use of all powers available under the Treaties, including by monitoring closely the implementation of EU legislation on hate speech and hate crime, namely the framework Decision on racism and xenophobia prohibiting racist or xenophobic speech and crime, and the Audiovisual Media Services Directive banning racist speech in audiovisual media services, such as TV broadcasts and video-on-demand services.

The Commission is currently examining the transposition and implementation of the framework Decision by Member States, and will present its assessment of Member States' compliance in a report at the end of 2013.

The Commission is not authorised to launch infringement proceedings on the basis of framework decisions until 1 December 2014.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-003264/13

Komisií

Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)

(21. marca 2013)

Vec: Vplyv úsporných opatrení na životné podmienky osôb so zdravotným postihnutím

Negatívny vplyv úsporných opatrení na životné podmienky obyvateľov Európskej únie so zdravotným postihnutím sú obrovské. Znižovaním verejných výdavkov prichádzajú tieto osoby o podporné služby, ako je osobná pomoc a priame platby, ktoré sú však nevyhnutné, ak nám záleží na tom, aby život osôb so zdravotným postihnutím nebol závislý od pomoci spoločnosti. Úsporné opatrenia preukázateľne vedú k nárastu počtu osôb, ktoré dlhodobo žijú v zariadeniach ústavnej starostlivosti, a k ďalšiemu sociálnemu vylúčeniu osôb so zdravotným postihnutím. Európska únia sa zaviazala zabráňovať diskriminácii, pokiaľ ide o prístup k zamestnaniu, a podporovať sociálne začleňovanie. Tieto záväzky sa však neplnia.

Akým spôsobom sa Komisia snaží eliminovať negatívne dôsledky úsporných opatrení na životné podmienky osôb so zdravotným postihnutím?

Odpoveď pani Redingovej v mene Komisie

(14. mája 2013)

Európska komisia venuje situácii ľudí so zdravotným postihnutím náležitú pozornosť a sleduje aj sociálny dosah rozpočtovej konsolidácie v krajinách EÚ.

Sociálne služby a politiky patria primárne do právomoci členských štátov EÚ. Komisia však podporuje ich úsilie o vykonávanie sociálnych programov, ktoré sú účinne zacielené na najzraniteľnejšie skupiny. Koná tak cez presadzovanie sociálneho začleňovania, zamestnateľnosti a vzdelávania, ktoré tvoria súčasť európskej stratégie pre oblasť zdravotného postihnutia na roky 2010 – 2020 ⁽¹⁾, stratégie Európa 2020, európskeho semestra, ako aj nedávno prijatého balíka o sociálnych investíciách.

V súlade s týmto prístupom sa v návrhu Komisie na nové nariadenie o Európskom sociálnom fonde ⁽²⁾ považuje „prístup k cenovo prístupným, trvalo udržateľným a kvalitným službám vrátane zdravotnej starostlivosti a sociálnych služieb všeobecného záujmu“ za jednu zo šiestich investičných priorít na dosiahnutie cieľa sociálneho začlenenia a boja proti chudobe. Súčasťou tohto úsilia je prístup k integrovaným a prístupným sociálnym a zdravotníckym službám, ako aj podpora prechodu z inštitucionálnych na komunitné služby.

Komisia by chcela odkázať váženú pani poslankyňu aj na svoje odpovede na písomné otázky E-008559/2012 a E-002656/2013.

⁽¹⁾ KOM(2010) 636 v konečnom znení <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636:en:NOT>

⁽²⁾ COM(2011) 607.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003264/13
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(21 March 2013)**

Subject: Impact of austerity measures on the living conditions of disabled persons

The negative impact of austerity measures on the living conditions of disabled persons in the EU is significant. As a result of reductions in public expenditure, disabled persons are losing access to support services, such as personal assistance and direct payments. These services are vital if we consider it important to ensure that disabled persons can live independently from social assistance. It is clear that austerity measures are leading to an increase in the number of people living in long-term institutionalised care facilities and to disabled persons suffering to an even greater extent from social exclusion. The EU has committed itself to preventing discrimination in access to employment and supporting social inclusion. However, these commitments are not being met.

How does the Commission intend to alleviate the negative impact of austerity measures on the living conditions of disabled persons?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(14 May 2013)**

The European Commission pays due attention to the situation of people with disabilities and more generally to the social impact of budgetary consolidation measures in EU countries.

While social services and policies are primarily the competence of EU Member States, the Commission supports their efforts to implement social programmes that effectively target the most vulnerable by promoting social inclusion, employability and education through the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 ⁽¹⁾, the Europe 2020 strategy, the European Semester and the recently adopted Social Investment Package.

In line with this policy approach, the Commission proposal for the new European Social Fund Regulation ⁽²⁾ identifies 'access to affordable, sustainable and high quality services including healthcare and social services of general interest' as one of the six investment priorities for achieving the objective of social inclusion and combating poverty. This includes the enhanced access to integrated and accessible social and healthcare services as well as support to the transition from institutional to community based care services

The Commission would also refer the Honourable Member to its answer to written questions E-008559/2012 and E-002656/2013.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2010) 636 final: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636:en:NOT>

⁽²⁾ COM(2011) 607.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003265/13
a la Comisión**

Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(21 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Protección de aves en el Delta del Llobregat (Cataluña, España)

El Delta del Llobregat, situado al sur de la ciudad de Barcelona, ha sufrido la presión urbanística del desarrollo de esta metrópoli a lo largo de todo el siglo XX. No obstante, una parte importante del mismo se ha conservado y está catalogado como un humedal de importancia internacional. En la actualidad, las últimas zonas naturales y agrícolas, refugio de fauna amenazada de extinción, siguen estando amenazadas por las actuaciones del aeropuerto del Prat, el puerto de Barcelona y numerosos proyectos urbanísticos previstos sobre zonas de alto valor ecológico reconocidas internacionalmente, en un contexto mediterráneo de escasez extrema de humedales de vital importancia para las migraciones en el continente.

La localización estratégica del humedal lo convierte en una parada imprescindible para las aves migratorias europeas, valor biológico que no se ha correspondido con el trato dado durante el proceso de desarrollo urbanístico del área metropolitana de Barcelona. Sin embargo, la zona conserva importantes poblaciones nidificantes de avetorillo, cigüeñuela, charrancito, gaviota de Audouin y 66 especies más de aves citadas en la zona, incluidas en el anexo I de la Directiva de aves (2009/147/CE), que, en muchos casos están fuera de las zonas protegidas y son afectadas por estos proyectos.

El Gobierno de España ha incumplido la Directiva de aves en diversos artículos, al no tomar medidas suficientes para mantener y adaptar las poblaciones que viven en el Delta y que están contempladas en dicho anexo, así como al no declarar suficientes zonas de reproducción y descanso para dichas especies. El Govern de la Generalitat de Catalunya, sobre el que recaen estas competencias, ha incumplido también la citada Directiva 2009/147/CE al primar los criterios urbanísticos sobre los científicos a la hora de delimitar las zonas que deben protegerse. Igualmente, las autoridades españolas han incumplido la Directiva de hábitats (92/43/CEE), al no establecerse el Plan especial para la ordenación de los recursos naturales de la zona, pese al compromiso adquirido ante la Comisión en la Declaración de Impacto Ambiental para la ampliación del aeropuerto del Prat, de la que ya han transcurrido más de diez años.

¿Ha estudiado la Comisión si las autoridades estatales competentes han cumplido los compromisos adquiridos en la DIA de la ampliación del aeropuerto?

¿Considera la Comisión que en este espacio natural se han cumplido los artículos 2, 3 y 4 de la Directiva 2009/147/CE, así como la Directiva 92/43/CEE?

¿Se plantea la Comisión abrir un procedimiento de infracción contra España por el caso presentado?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočník en nombre de la Comisión

(24 de abril de 2013)

La Comisión está ya analizando los hechos planteados por Su Señoría en el contexto de una denuncia sobre la protección de las aves en el Delta del Llobregat (nº de referencia: CHAP(2013)01037). Ese procedimiento de denuncia se incoó para comprobar el cumplimiento de los compromisos adquiridos por las autoridades españolas en la declaración de impacto ambiental de la ampliación del aeropuerto del Prat, así como el cumplimiento de lo dispuesto en la Directiva sobre aves ⁽¹⁾ en el Delta del Llobregat.

La Comisión decidirá si es preciso tomar más medidas cuando disponga de las conclusiones de dicho análisis.

⁽¹⁾ Directiva 2009/147/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 30 de noviembre de 2009, relativa a la conservación de las aves silvestres (DO L 20 de 26.1.2010, p. 7).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003265/13
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(21 March 2013)**

Subject: Protecting birds in the Llobregat Delta (Catalonia, Spain)

The Llobregat Delta, situated to the south of the city of Barcelona, has suffered the pressure of the development of this metropolis throughout the 20th century. Nevertheless, a significant area of the Delta has been preserved and it is listed as a wetland of national importance. Currently, the most remote natural and agricultural areas providing shelter to fauna threatened with extinction continue to be threatened by the actions of the Barcelona El Prat airport, the port of Barcelona and numerous urban projects planned in areas of great and internationally recognised ecological value. This is within the context of the Mediterranean, where wetlands are extremely scarce and of vital importance for migrating birds on the continent.

The strategic siting of the wetland has made it an essential stop for migrating birds in Europe, although the biological value of the area has not been reflected in the way it has been treated during the urban development of the Barcelona metropolitan area. However, the area is home to important populations of Little Bitterns, Storks, Little Terns, Audouin's Gulls and 66 other species of bird included in Annex I to the Birds Directive (2009/147/EC), which in many cases are outside protected areas and are affected by these projects.

The Spanish Government has failed to comply with various articles of the Birds Directive by not taking sufficient measures to preserve the populations that live in the Delta and are listed in the aforementioned Annex, and enable them to adapt, as well as not designating sufficient areas for reproduction and rest for these species. The Catalanian Government, to whom these competencies fall, has also contravened Directive 2009/147/EC by giving precedence to urban criteria over scientific criteria when it comes to demarcating the areas to be protected. The Spanish authorities have also contravened the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC) by not establishing a specific plan for the area's natural resources, despite the commitment made to the Commission in the Environmental Impact Statement for the expansion of the Barcelona El Prat airport over 10 years ago.

Has the Commission investigated whether the competent state authorities have complied with the commitments made in the Environmental Impact Statement for the expansion of the airport?

Does the Commission believe that Articles 2, 3 and 4 of Directive 2009/147/EC, as well as Directive 92/43/EEC, have been complied with in this natural area?

Has the Commission considered initiating an infringement procedure against Spain in relation to this case?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission
(24 April 2013)**

The Commission is currently assessing the facts raised by the Honorable Member within the framework of a complaint concerning the protection of birds in the Llobregat Delta (reference n° CHAP(2013)01037). This complaint procedure was opened in order to verify compliance with the commitments made by the Spanish authorities in the Environmental Impact Statement for the expansion of the airport Barcelona El Prat, as well as compliance with the provisions of the Birds Directive ⁽¹⁾ for the Llobregat Delta.

In light of the conclusions of the current assessment, the Commission will decide if further action is needed.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council, of 30 November 2009, on the conservation of wild birds (OJ L 20/7, 26.1.2010).

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003266/13
an die Kommission
Martin Kastler (PPE)
(21. März 2013)

Betrifft: Bekämpfung und Erfassung von religiösen Hassverbrechen in Europa

Im März 2013 hat das Europäische Parlament in Straßburg mit großer Mehrheit eine fraktionsübergreifende „Entschließung zur verstärkten Bekämpfung von Rassismus, Fremdenfeindlichkeit und Hassverbrechen“ (P7_TA(2013)0090) angenommen.

In Ziffer 13 der Entschließung fordert das Europäische Parlament die Mitgliedstaaten auf, „dass umfassendere, zuverlässige Daten über Hassverbrechen erhoben (...) von den Behörden erfasst werden“.

1. Teilt die Kommission die Position des Parlaments, dass die Mitgliedstaaten Nachholbedarf in der detaillierten und verwertbaren Erfassung sogenannter „*hate-crime*“-Tatbestände haben?
2. Gibt es Pläne, die Erfassung von Hassverbrechen auf europäischer oder nationaler Ebene zu optimieren?
3. Hat die Kommission Zahlen über Hassverbrechen an Christen und christlichen Einrichtungen in Europa? Sind diese flächendeckend verfügbar?
4. Hat die Kommission Zahlen über Hassverbrechen an Juden und Muslimen sowie deren Einrichtungen in Europa? Sind diese flächendeckend verfügbar?

Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission
(3. Mai 2013)

Die Vizepräsidentin und Kommissarin für Justiz, Grundrechte und Bürgerschaft hat am 12. März 2013 in der Plenarsitzung des Europäischen Parlaments darauf hingewiesen, dass auf der Ebene der Mitgliedstaaten die systematische Datensammlung zu Hassverbrechen nicht so weit fortgeschritten ist wie sie sollte. Einem aktuellen Bericht der Agentur für Grundrechte ist zu entnehmen, dass nur vier Mitgliedstaaten umfassende Daten zu diesem Thema erheben ⁽¹⁾.

Die Kommission will die Erhebung von nationalen Daten über Hassverbrechen verbessern helfen, indem sie durch Finanzierungsprogramme die Tätigkeiten der Interessenträger in diesem Bereich unterstützt. Die Kommission fördert auch die Agentur der Europäischen Union für Grundrechte bei der Erhebung von Daten über Erfahrungen mit Hassverbrechen. Das Thema der Datenerhebung wurde auch in der Gruppe der Regierungssachverständigen thematisiert, die eingerichtet wurde, um die Mitgliedstaaten bei der Umsetzung des Rahmenbeschlusses zur Bekämpfung von Rassismus und Fremdenfeindlichkeit ⁽²⁾ zu unterstützen.

Der Kommission liegen keine Informationen zu der Anzahl der Hassverbrechen vor, auf die sich der Herr Abgeordnete bezieht. Bisher hat die Agentur der Europäischen Union für Grundrechte Daten zu den Erfahrungen von Immigranten und ethnischen Minderheiten mit krimineller Viktimisierung, einschließlich Hassverbrechen, erhoben und veröffentlicht ⁽³⁾.

⁽¹⁾ http://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra-2012_hate-crime.pdf

⁽²⁾ Rahmenbeschluss 2008/913/JI des Rates vom 28. November 2008 zur strafrechtlichen Bekämpfung bestimmter Formen und Ausdrucksweisen von Rassismus und Fremdenfeindlichkeit, ABl. L 328 vom 6.12.2008, S. 55-58.

⁽³⁾ Die Ergebnisse der Erhebung EU-MIDIS und die Daten im Focus Report zu Hassverbrechen sind unter folgender Internetseite abrufbar: <http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2012/eu-midis-data-focus-report-6-minorities-victims-crime>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003266/13
to the Commission
Martin Kastler (PPE)
(21 March 2013)**

Subject: Combating and recording of religious hate crimes in Europe

In March 2013, the European Parliament in Strasbourg adopted, with a large majority, a cross-group 'resolution on strengthening the fight against racism, xenophobia and hate crime' (P7_TA(2013)0090).

In paragraph 13 of the resolution, Parliament calls on the Member States to ensure 'the collection of broader, reliable data on hate crime' and the recording of this data by the authorities.

1. Does the Commission share Parliament's view that the Member States still have some catching up to do with regard to the recording of detailed and useable data on hate crimes?
2. Are there any plans to optimise the recording of hate crimes at European or national level?
3. Does the Commission have any figures on hate crimes against Christians and Christian institutions in Europe? Are these universally available?
4. Does the Commission have any figures on hate crimes against Jews and Muslims and their institutions in Europe? Are these universally available?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(3 May 2013)**

As the Vice-President and Member of the Commission responsible for Justice, Fundamental Rights and Citizenship stated at the plenary of the European Parliament on 12 March 2013, the systematic collection of data on hate crime at the level of Member States is not as well developed as it should be. A recent report by the Fundamental Rights Agency shows that only four Member States collect such data in a comprehensive manner ⁽¹⁾.

The Commission aims to support the efforts to improve the collection of national hate crime data by providing assistance through its financing programmes to stakeholders' activities in this area. The Commission is also supporting the collection of data on experiences of hate crime by the EU Fundamental Rights Agency. The issue of data collection has also been addressed in the group of governmental experts set up to assist Member States in the implementation of the framework Decision on combating racism and xenophobia ⁽²⁾.

The Commission does not have information on the number of hate crimes referred to by the Honourable Member. To date the EU Agency for Fundamental Rights has collected and published data on immigrants and ethnic minorities' experiences of criminal victimisation, including hate crime ⁽³⁾.

⁽¹⁾ http://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra-2012_hate-crime.pdf

⁽²⁾ Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA of 28 November 2008 on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law, OJ L 328, 6.12.2008, pp. 55-58.

⁽³⁾ The results of the EU-MIDIS survey, in particular the Data in Focus Report concerning hate crimes, are available at <http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2012/eu-midis-data-focus-report-6-minorities-victims-crime>

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003267/13
an die Kommission
Martin Kastler (PPE)
 (21. März 2013)

Betrifft: Kürzungen beim konfessionellen Religionsunterricht an den Europäischen Schulen

Die Europäische Union stützt sich „im Bewusstsein ihres geistig-religiösen und sittlichen Erbes“ auf die „Grundlage gemeinsamer Werte“. So steht es in der Europäischen Charta der Grundrechte, die darüber hinaus in Artikel 10 jeder Person „das Recht auf Gedanken-, Gewissens- und Religionsfreiheit zuspricht und die Freiheit, seine Religion oder Weltanschauung (...) durch Gottesdienst, Unterricht, Bräuche und Riten zu bekennen“ garantiert.

Entsprechend sieht die Schulordnung für die 14 bestehenden Europäischen Schulen den konfessionellen Religionsunterricht als ordentliches Lehrfach vor, der in Inhalt und Personalrekrutierung in Absprache mit den „religiösen Autoritäten“ der Kirchen und Religionsgemeinschaften in der Muttersprache garantiert wird.

1. Stimmt es, dass der Oberste Rat für die Europäischen Schulen im Rahmen der Sekundär-Reform eine Reduzierung des Religionsunterrichts um 50 % in den Klassen 1-3 sowie eine komplette Streichung in den Klassen 6 und 7 vorschlägt?
2. Sind diese Planungen den zuständigen Stellen der Kommission bekannt? Wird ein solches Vorgehen unterstützt?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-003412/13
an die Kommission
Bernd Posselt (PPE)
 (26. März 2013)

Betrifft: Religionsunterricht an den Europäischen Schulen

Wie beurteilt die Kommission Bestrebungen im Obersten Rat für die Europäischen Schulen, den Religionsunterricht in den Klassen 1 bis 3 von zwei auf eine Stunde zu reduzieren und diesen wichtigen Unterricht in den Klassen 6 und 7 ganz zu streichen, wenn im Geschichtsunterricht Unterrichtseinheiten über die Weltreligionen erteilt werden?

Wäre dies nicht eine gefährliche Reduzierung des Bildungsniveaus ebenso wie der Wertebasis der Europäischen Schulen, die die Kommission rechtzeitig stoppen muss?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Herrn Šeřčovič im Namen der Kommission
 (2. Mai 2013)

Der Oberste Rat der Europäischen Schulen hat das Generalsekretariat beauftragt, die Lehrpläne für die Sekundarstufe zu überarbeiten, um bestimmte Schwachstellen des Systems der Europäischen Schulen wie die Schulabbrecherquote, vor allem in den Klassen 4-5 der Sekundarstufe, zu verbessern und die vorhandenen Ressourcen effizienter zu nutzen.

Ein erster Vorschlag zur Reform der Klassen 1-3 der Sekundarstufe wurde im pädagogischen und im Haushaltsausschuss⁽¹⁾ der Europäischen Schulen erörtert und dem Obersten Rat der Europäischen Schulen im April 2013 vorgelegt⁽²⁾.

Vorgeschlagen wurde beispielsweise, die dritte Sprache ein Jahr früher einzuführen (in S1 statt in S2) und den Sprachunterricht für kleine Schülergruppen sowie den Unterricht in der ersten Sprache und im Fach Religion/Ethik straffer zu organisieren.

Im Nachgang zu den konstruktiven Diskussionen im Obersten Rat bemühen sich das Generalsekretariat und die Arbeitsgruppe um die Fortsetzung des Dialogs mit den Religionsgemeinschaften und legen zur nächsten Sitzung des Obersten Rates der Europäischen Schulen im Dezember 2013 einen vollständigen Reformvorschlag für die Klassen 1-7 der Sekundarstufe vor, der sämtliche vorbereitenden Ausschüsse durchlaufen hat.

⁽¹⁾ Pädagogischer Ausschuss (7.-8.2.2013) und Haushaltsausschuss (19.-20.3.2013) der Europäischen Schulen.

⁽²⁾ Dem Obersten Rat der Europäischen Schulen gehören Vertreter der 27 Mitgliedstaaten, der Kommission sowie Lehrer- und Elternvertreter an.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003267/13
to the Commission
Martin Kastler (PPE)
(21 March 2013)**

Subject: Reductions in confessional religious education at European Schools

The European Union, 'conscious of its spiritual and moral heritage', is 'based on common values'. That is what is stated in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, which also, in Article 10, guarantees everyone 'the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion' and 'freedom ... to manifest religion or belief, in worship, teaching, practice and observance'.

Accordingly, the rules of the 14 existing European Schools provide for confessional religious education as a proper subject, for which there is a guarantee that the content is provided in the mother tongue and mother tongue staff are recruited, in agreement with the 'religious authorities' of the churches and religious communities.

1. Is it true that, in the context of the secondary reform, the Board of Governors of the European Schools has proposed a 50% reduction in religious education in years 1-3 and its complete removal in years 6 and 7?
2. Are the competent bodies of the Commission aware of these plans? Is there support for such an undertaking?

**Question for written answer P-003412/13
to the Commission
Bernd Posselt (PPE)
(26 March 2013)**

Subject: Religious education at the European Schools

What does the Commission think about the moves by the European Schools' Board of Governors to halve the time devoted to religious education in classes 1 to 3, from two hours to one hour, and to do away with this important subject altogether in classes 6 and 7 if the world religions are taught in history lessons?

Would this not lead to a dangerous decline in educational standards and erode the values on which the European Schools have been built? Should not the Commission, therefore, act promptly to avert such an outcome?

**Joint answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(2 May 2013)**

The Board of Governors of the European Schools has given a mandate to the Secretary General to prepare a revision of the organisation of studies in the secondary cycle in order to improve certain weak points of the European School system (ESS), including the drop-out rate, especially in the secondary years 4-5, and also to use resources more efficiently.

A first proposal covering a revision of the secondary years 1 to 3 has been discussed in the pedagogical and budgetary committees ⁽¹⁾ of the ESS and was presented to the Board of Governors (BoG) in April 2013 ⁽²⁾.

The proposal included pedagogical improvements, for example the introduction of the third language a year earlier (in S1 instead of S2), and suggestions for more rational organisation of language courses for groups with a limited number of pupils, as well as of language 1 and religion/ethics classes.

The discussion in the BoG was constructive. As a result, the SG and the working group will find suitable means for a further dialogue with the religious authorities and will work on the presentation of a complete project for the revision covering S1 to S7 for the next BoG meeting in December 2013, after having gone through all the different preparatory committees.

⁽¹⁾ Pedagogical Committee (7-8/2/2013) and the Budgetary Committee (19-20/3/2013) of the ES.

⁽²⁾ The Board of Governors consist of representatives of the 27 Member States, The Commission as well as representatives of teachers and representatives of parents.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003268/13
to the Commission
David Martin (S&D)
(21 March 2013)**

Subject: Situation regarding constitutional change in Hungary

There is extreme concern about the Hungarian government's push for renewed changes to the country's Constitution, with the Hungarian parliament set to vote on a fourth round of constitutional changes that will pose a severe threat to the fundamental European values of the rule of law, the independence of the judiciary, and freedom of speech and of the media. I am aware of deep concerns both within and outside Hungary at the lack of challenge from the EU on many of the policies that are seen as breaking agreements and running counter to quite basic principles.

Should Mr Orbán decide not to take the Council's advice and cease with these measures, what actions will the Commission then consider necessary?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(29 May 2013)**

The Commission is currently conducting a detailed legal analysis of the Fourth amendment to the Fundamental Law of Hungary, in an objective, non-partisan and fair manner.

Based on a first legal analysis, and as explained during the plenary debate on 17 April 2013, President Barroso wrote to PM Orbán, on 12 April 2013, expressing the Commission's serious concerns about the conformity of these amendments with EC law. The Commission's concerns relate in particular to the conformity with EC law of the clause on ECJ judgments entailing payment obligations, of the powers given to the President of the National Office for the Judiciary to transfer cases and of the restrictions on the publication of political advertisements. On 2 May 2013, the Commission's services sent three administrative letters to the Hungarian authorities seeking further clarifications on these matters. Once its legal analysis is finalised, the Commission will take the necessary steps to start infringement procedures, where appropriate.

The Commission has also serious concerns with respect to the compatibility of these amendments with the principle of the rule of law and is closely working with the Council of Europe and the Venice Commission, which will prepare an opinion on 15-16 June 2013 on the compatibility of the amendments with the principles of the rule of law and Council of Europe standards. The Commission expects the Hungarian authorities to take due account of this opinion and address it in full accordance with EU and Council of Europe principles, rules and values.

The Commission also asked the Hungarian authorities to engage in a political dialogue with the European Parliament in the preparation of a political resolution ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ On 'the situation of Fundamental Rights in Hungary: standards and practices'.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003269/13
à la Commission
Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE)
(21 mars 2013)

Objet: Limite de l'importation de tabac en provenance d'un autre État membre

Le tabac tue 700 000 Européens par an. La Commission européenne a publié en décembre 2012 une directive (COM(2012)0788 final) qui vise à réduire l'attrait des produits du tabac et de leur consommation. Des millions de citoyens de l'Union européenne souffrent de maladies provoquées par le tabagisme auxquelles les systèmes publics de santé peinent à faire face en raison de l'assèchement des investissements publics.

Pour lutter contre le tabagisme, en particulier des jeunes, certains États membres ont augmenté de plus de 80 % leurs taxes sur les produits du tabac. Cependant, les consommateurs et les réseaux criminels utilisent les différentiels de prix entre pays européens pour faire des économies ou de la contrebande. D'après les estimations, la contrebande du tabac à l'intérieur de l'Union européenne est deux fois plus importante que la contrebande en provenance des pays tiers.

Cette contrebande touche particulièrement les zones frontalières. Une étude d'octobre 2012 montre qu'à Perpignan, ville française à la frontière de l'Espagne, 55 % de paquets vides ramassés étaient étrangers. Outre l'aspect criminel de la contrebande, les conséquences sont désastreuses pour les buralistes frontaliers, qui subissent cette concurrence déloyale de plein fouet.

Pour lutter contre ce marché parallèle, la France fixait le seuil maximal d'importation de tabac de l'étranger pour un particulier, à cinq cartouches de cigarettes. Or, par la décision du 14 mars 2013 sur l'affaire C-216/11, la Cour de justice a estimé que le code général des impôts qui limitait cette importation de tabac n'était pas conforme au droit communautaire et qu'il devait être modifié. Dans son argumentaire, la Commission accuse la France de rendre plus difficile l'achat de tabac dans d'autres États membres et, par conséquent, de restreindre la libre circulation des marchandises. Cependant, n'est-il pas contreproductif d'encourager l'achat de tabac dans d'autres États membres, là où les taxes sont moins élevées, pour des raisons de libre circulation des marchandises?

— Quelles mesures la Commission envisage-t-elle pour lutter contre ce «tourisme fiscal» transfrontalier qui annihile les efforts nationaux en matière de lutte contre l'attrait du tabac?

— La Commission envisage-t-elle une uniformisation de la fiscalité européenne sur les produits du tabac qui réduirait enfin cette concurrence entre États membres et entre buralistes transfrontaliers?

Réponse donnée par M. Šemeta au nom de la Commission
(8 mai 2013)

La Commission est fortement engagée dans la lutte contre le commerce illicite des produits du tabac et met actuellement en œuvre son plan d'action ⁽¹⁾ conçu à cet effet. La Commission est également en train d'élaborer une stratégie globale de l'UE visant à combattre le trafic de cigarettes. En outre, le protocole de la Convention-cadre de l'OMS pour la lutte antitabac destiné à éliminer le commerce illicite des produits du tabac a été adopté et les parties sont invitées à le signer ⁽²⁾.

La Commission n'a pas l'intention de restreindre les droits fondamentaux des citoyens de l'UE en matière de mouvement à des fins non commerciales de produits pouvant être soumis à des droits d'accise. La directive 2008/118 ⁽³⁾ distingue les biens soumis à des droits d'accise détenus par des particuliers pour leur propre usage et les biens soumis à des droits d'accise détenus à des fins commerciales. L'affaire C-216/11 ⁽⁴⁾ portait sur les critères à appliquer au moment de déterminer à quelle fin les biens soumis à des droits d'accise sont détenus. La directive 2008/118/CE ne fixe pas de limites pour les biens soumis à des droits d'accise destinés à un usage privé. Ceux-ci peuvent, en principe, circuler librement à l'intérieur de l'UE ⁽⁵⁾. Les États membres s'appuient sur des recommandations pour estimer si des produits du tabac sont destinés à un usage privé.

La réglementation fiscale de l'UE est soumise à l'unanimité, ce qui rend difficile une harmonisation totale dans ce domaine. Un certain degré d'harmonisation a été atteint pour les taux d'accise et la structure fiscale. La directive 2011/64/UE fixe des taux minimaux pour le tabac. La Commission est en train d'analyser le fonctionnement et les effets de la réglementation afin d'évaluer la nécessité de procéder à une réforme législative.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/anti_fraud/documents/preventing-fraud-documents/eastern_border_action_plan_en.pdf

⁽²⁾ L'UE se prépare à le signer.

⁽³⁾ Directive 2008/118/CE du Conseil du 16 décembre 2008 relative au régime général d'accise et abrogeant la directive 92/12/CEE.

⁽⁴⁾ Jugement du 14 mars 2013, Commission/France.

⁽⁵⁾ Article 38, paragraphes 2 et 3, de la directive 2008/118/CE.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003269/13
to the Commission
Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE)
(21 March 2013)**

Subject: Restrictions on tobacco imports from other Member States

Tobacco kills 700 000 Europeans a year. The European Commission published a directive in December 2012 (COM(2012) 0788 final) intended to reduce the attraction and consumption of tobacco products. Millions of EU citizens suffer from diseases caused by tobacco use, which public health systems are struggling to deal with due to cutbacks in public spending.

In order to combat tobacco use, especially by young people, certain Member States have increased duty on tobacco products by over 80%. However, consumers and criminal networks exploit price differentials between European countries in order to save money or smuggle products. The quantity of tobacco smuggled within the European Union is estimated to be twice the quantity smuggled from third countries.

Smuggling affects border areas in particular. According to a study prepared in October 2012, 55% of empty packets collected in the French town of Perpignan on the Spanish border were from abroad. Apart from the criminal aspect of smuggling, it has catastrophic consequences on cross-border tobacconists, who bear the full brunt of this unfair competition.

In order to combat this parallel market, France has restricted tobacco imported from abroad by private individuals to five cartons of cigarettes. However, in the judgment which it passed in case C-216/11 on 14 March 2013, the Court of Justice found that the General Tax Code restricting tobacco imports was in breach of EC law and should be amended. The Commission argued that France is making it difficult to buy tobacco in other Member States and is therefore restricting the free circulation of goods. Surely, however, it is counterproductive to encourage purchases of tobacco in other Member States which have lower duty on the grounds of the free circulation of goods?

— What measures does the Commission intend to take to combat this cross-border 'fiscal tourism' which is totally negating national efforts to combat the attraction of tobacco?

— Does the Commission plan to harmonise duty on tobacco products in Europe, thereby reducing this competition between Member States and between tobacconists in border areas?

**Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(8 May 2013)**

The Commission is strongly committed to combat illicit trade in tobacco products and is currently implementing its Action plan ⁽¹⁾ to this effect. The Commission is also working on a comprehensive EU strategy with a view to fight cigarette smuggling. Moreover, the Protocol to eliminate illicit trade in tobacco products of the WHO FCTC has been adopted and is open for signature by the Parties ⁽²⁾.

The Commission does not intend to narrow the basic rights of EU citizens in non-commercial movements of excisable products. Directive 2008/118 ⁽³⁾ distinguishes between excise goods held by private individuals for their own use and excise goods held for commercial purposes. Case C-216/11 ⁽⁴⁾ concerned the criteria to be applied when establishing for which purpose excise goods are held. Directive 2008/118/EC does not lay down limits for excise goods intended for own use which in principle can be moved freely within the EU ⁽⁵⁾. Member States refer to guidelines when assessing whether tobacco products are for personal use.

EU tax legislation is subject to unanimity which renders full harmonisation in this area difficult. A certain level of harmonisation has been achieved for excise duty rates and tax structure. Directive 2011/64/EU sets minimum rates for tobacco. The Commission is currently analysing the functioning and effects of the rules with a view to assess whether legislative reform is required.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/anti_fraud/documents/preventing-fraud-documents/eastern_border_action_plan_en.pdf

⁽²⁾ Signature by the EU is under preparation.

⁽³⁾ Council Directive 2008/118/EC of 16 December 2008 concerning the general arrangements for excise duty and repealing Directive 92/12/EEC.

⁽⁴⁾ Judgment of 14 March 2013, *Commission v France*.

⁽⁵⁾ Article 38(2) and (3) of Directive 2008/118/EC.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003271/13
aan de Commissie
Daniël van der Stoep (NI)
(21 maart 2013)

Betreft: Toegang voor vrouwen tot het schiereiland Athos

Het schiereiland Athos in Griekenland is een gebied waar vrouwen en zelfs vrouwelijke dieren al eeuwenlang niet mogen komen, kennelijk om het celibataire leven van de daar wonende monniken makkelijker te maken ⁽¹⁾.

In artikel 23 van het Handvest van de Grondrechten van de EU staat vermeld:

„De gelijkheid van mannen en vrouwen moet worden gewaarborgd op alle gebieden, met inbegrip van werkgelegenheid, beroep en beloning.”

Is de Commissie het met mij eens dat de gang van zaken op Athos een inbreuk maakt op dit grondrecht, in weerwil van de door Griekenland bedongen speciale status van Athos in het Schengen-aquis? Zo niet waarom, niet?

Is de Commissie bereid deze misstand op te heffen door Griekenland ter verantwoording te roepen? Zo niet, waarom niet?

Antwoord van mevrouw Reding namens de Commissie
(14 mei 2013)

De Berg Athos is een autonome monastieke regio van Griekenland met een eeuwenoude bijzondere juridische status. Overeenkomstig de gemeenschappelijke verklaring inzake de Berg Athos, waarin wordt erkend dat het aan de Berg Athos verleende bijzondere statuut uitsluitend wordt gerechtvaardigd door motieven van geestelijke en religieuze aard, verzekert de EU dat er met deze status rekening wordt gehouden bij de toepassing en verdere uitwerking van EU-wetgevingsbepalingen. De verklaring is een bijlage bij de slotakte van de conferentie die het Verdrag betreffende de toetreding van de Helleense Republiek tot de Europese Gemeenschappen ⁽²⁾ heeft vastgesteld. Bij de ondertekening van de Overeenkomst betreffende de toetreding van de Helleense Republiek tot de Overeenkomst ter uitvoering van het Schengenakkoord hebben de partijen bij deze overeenkomst een soortgelijke verklaring aangenomen. Deze overeenkomst maakt deel uit van het Schengenacquis, dat in de EU-wetgeving is opgenomen ⁽³⁾.

Deze verklaringen zijn nog steeds geldig en relevant voor de interpretatie en toepassing van het recht van de Unie.

⁽¹⁾ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mount_Athos.

⁽²⁾ PB L 291 van 19.11.1979, blz. 186.

⁽³⁾ Besluit 1999/435/EG van de Raad van 20 mei 1999 (PB L 176 van 10.7.1999 en PB L 239 van 22.9.2000, in het bijzonder blz. 89).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003271/13
to the Commission
Daniël van der Stoep (NI)
(21 March 2013)**

Subject: Access for women to the Athos peninsula

The Athos peninsula in Greece has been out of bounds for women and even female animals for centuries, apparently to make it easier for the resident monks to live in celibacy ⁽¹⁾.

Article 23 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union says:

'Equality between men and women must be ensured in all areas, including employment, work and pay.'

Does the Commission agree with me that the state of affairs on Athos constitutes an infringement of this fundamental right, despite the special status of Mount Athos in the Schengen Acquis negotiated by Greece? If not, why not?

Is the Commission prepared to call Greece to account? If not, why not?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(14 May 2013)**

Mount Athos is an autonomous monastic region of Greece which is based on a centuries-old special legal status. In accordance with the Joint Declaration concerning Mount Athos, annexed to the Final Act of the Conference that established the Treaty of accession of the Hellenic Republic to the European Communities ⁽²⁾, which recognised that the special status granted to Mount Athos is justified exclusively on spiritual and religious grounds, the EU ensures that this status is taken into account in the application and subsequent preparation of provisions of EC law. At the time of the signing of the Accession Agreement of the Hellenic Republic to the Convention implementing the Schengen Agreement, the Contracting Parties to that agreement made a similar Declaration; this Agreement is part of the Schengen *acquis* which has been integrated into European Union law ⁽³⁾.

These Declarations are still valid and relevant for the interpretation and application of Union law.

⁽¹⁾ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mount_Athos.

⁽²⁾ OJ L 291, 19.11.1979, p. 186.

⁽³⁾ Council Decision 1999/435/EC of 20 May 1999 (OJ L 176, 10.7.1999 and OJ L 239, 22.9.2000, in particular p. 89).

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003272/13
aan de Commissie
Philip Claeys (NI)
(21 maart 2013)

Betreft: Klachten over de kwaliteit van de maaltijden bij de Commissie

Nogal wat ambtenaren gaan 's middags eten in de cafetaria van het Europees Parlement, hoewel de Commissie over eigen cafetaria's beschikt. Er bestaan naar verluidt veel klachten over de kwaliteit van de maaltijden bij de Commissie. Het heen-en-weergeloopt leidt tot tijdverlies voor de Commissie-ambtenaren zelf, maar ook voor de ambtenaren van het Parlement, de leden en hun medewerkers die geconfronteerd worden met wachtrijen.

Heeft de Commissie al in kaart gebracht hoeveel ambtenaren 's middags in het Parlement gaan eten? Over hoeveel personen gaat het gemiddeld?

Het parlement financiert een deel van de kosten van de maaltijden die er geserveerd worden. Wordt dit verrekend met de Commissie? Zo ja, over welk bedrag gaat het op jaarbasis?

Welke stappen werden al ondernomen om dit probleem tegen te gaan? Werd er met de cateringfirma overlegd hoe de kwaliteit van de maaltijden bij de Commissie kan worden verbeterd?

Hoe lang loopt het contract met de betrokken firma?

Antwoord van de heer Šefčovič namens de Commissie
(13 mei 2013)

De ambtenaren van de Commissie hebben slechts vanaf 13.30 uur toegang tot de kantine van het Parlement. Zo worden de bezoekers beter gespreid.

De Commissie beschikt niet over gegevens met betrekking tot het aantal personen dat in de kantine van het Parlement gaat eten. Desalniettemin wil de Commissie eraan herinneren dat een deel van de personeelsleden van het Parlement ook in de restaurants van de Commissie gaat eten.

Elke instelling beheert op onafhankelijke wijze haar eigen cateringdiensten. De Commissie kent geen rechtstreekse subsidies toe aan de contractanten. Op basis van een openbare aanbesteding in 2002 heeft de Commissie gekozen voor het bedrijf Eurest om haar cateringdiensten te verzorgen. Het contract loopt tot 8 januari 2014.

Elk jaar wordt bij de klanten van de kantines van de Commissie een tevredenheidsenquête gehouden. Bij de meest recente enquête van 2012 bedroeg de algemene tevredenheid 82 %.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003272/13
to the Commission
Philip Claeys (NI)
(21 March 2013)**

Subject: Complaints about the quality of meals at the Commission

Quite a few officials take their midday meals at the European Parliament's cafeteria, even though the Commission has its own cafeterias. There seem to be many complaints about the quality of meals at the Commission. Walking there and back means that not only the Commission's officials lose time but also the Parliament's officials, MEPs and their employees because they have to wait in queues.

Has the Commission already established how many of its officials take their midday meals at the Parliament? What is the average number?

The Parliament pays part of the cost of the meals served at its cafeteria. Has this amount been settled with the Commission? If so, how much does it amount to on an annual basis?

What steps have been taken to solve this problem? Has the catering company been consulted on ways to improve the quality of meals at the Commission?

What is the duration of the contract with the company?

(Version française)

**Réponse donnée par M. Šefčovič au nom de la Commission
(13 mai 2013)**

L'accès à la cantine du Parlement n'est pas autorisé aux fonctionnaires de la Commission avant 13 h 30 en vue d'éviter des pointes de fréquentation.

La Commission ne dispose pas d'informations concernant le nombre de personnes qui fréquentent la cantine du Parlement. Néanmoins, la Commission rappelle qu'une partie du personnel du Parlement fréquente les exploitations de restauration de la Commission.

Chaque Institution gère son service de restauration de façon indépendante. La Commission n'octroie aucune subvention directe aux contractants. Sur base d'un appel d'offre réalisé en 2002, c'est la société Eurest qui assure les services de restauration auprès de la Commission. Le contrat court jusqu'au 8 janvier 2014.

Chaque année, une enquête de satisfaction est réalisée parmi les clients des cantines de la Commission. Le taux de satisfaction générale de la dernière enquête réalisée en 2012 est de 82 %.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003273/13
aan de Commissie
Philip Claeys (NI)
(21 maart 2013)

Betreft: Aanwezigheid van commissaris De Gucht op missie in Rabat

Op 1 en 2 maart jongstleden bracht Commissievoorzitter Barroso een officieel bezoek aan Rabat. De Commissievoorzitter hield er besprekingen over binnenlandse zaken, bilaterale relaties en de geopolitieke toestand in de regio. Ook werd het opstarten van onderhandelingen over een vrijhandelsakkoord vermeld.

Om welke reden was commissaris De Gucht aanwezig op deze missie? Zijn naam wordt in dat verband nergens vermeld op de website van de Commissie.

Antwoord van de heer De Gucht namens de Commissie
(13 mei 2013)

Commissaris De Gucht nam niet deel aan de missie van Commissievoorzitter Barroso naar Rabat op 1 en 2 maart 2013 omdat hij in de Verenigde Staten was. Zijn missie naar Rabat, die aanvankelijk plaats zou vinden op 27 en 28 februari 2013, is uitgesteld tot een nader te bepalen datum.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003273/13
to the Commission
Philip Claeys (NI)
(21 March 2013)**

Subject: Commissioner De Gucht's participation in Rabat mission

On 1-2 March, President Barroso paid an official visit to Rabat. The President held discussions there on domestic affairs, bilateral relations and the geopolitical situation in the region. The launch of negotiations on a free trade agreement was also announced.

What was the reason for Commissioner De Gucht's participation in this mission? His name is not mentioned in this context anywhere on the Commission's website.

**Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(13 May 2013)**

Commissioner De Gucht did not participate in President Barroso's mission to Rabat on 1/2 March 2013 because he was in the United States. His mission to Rabat, that was initially foreseen to take place on 27/28 February 2013, has been postponed to a date to be determined later.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-003274/13
a Bizottság számára
Iosif Matula (PPE) és Winkler Gyula (PPE)
(2013. március 21.)

Tárgy: A geotermikus energia felhasználását nehezítő akadályok felszámolása

A Bizottság „2050-ig szóló energiaügyi ütemterv” című közleménye szerint a megújuló energiaforrásokon alapuló fűtés és hűtés meghatározó szerepet játszik a szén-dioxid-mentesítési folyamatban.

A közlemény szerint a helyi és megújuló energiaforrások, köztük a távfűtési rendszerek alkalmazása révén el kell mozdulni az alacsony szén-dioxid-kibocsátással járó energiafogyasztás irányába.

A Bizottság nemrégiben kijelentette, hogy a geotermikus energia különleges szerepet játszik az uniós energiapolitikában. Európában jelenleg a megújuló energiamennyiség csupán 1%-a származik geotermikus energiaforrásból, és a geotermikus energiaforrásokon alapuló fűtés a teljes megújuló energiamennyiségnek mindössze 3%-a.

Ugyanakkor Románia nyugati régiójában számos termálvízű tó és tucatnyi 30 évvel ezelőtt fúrt termelőkút található, amelyeket adminisztratív és bürokratikus okok miatt jelenleg nem hasznosítanak.

1. Hogyan tudna segíteni a Bizottság a geotermikus energia felhasználását nehezítő akadályok felszámolásában?
2. Mit javasol a Bizottság az illetékes román miniszternek, valamint a helyi és regionális hatóságoknak annak érdekében, hogy hatékonyabbá váljon Románia nyugati régiójában a geotermikus energiában rejlő lehetőségek kihasználása?
3. Milyen intézkedésekkel lehet optimalizálni a geotermikus energia előállítását és a fűtést szolgáló technológiákat?
4. Tervezi-e a Bizottság a geotermikus energiában rejlő lehetőségekkel kapcsolatos kérdéseknek a jövőbeli partnerségi szerződésekbe való bevonását?

Günther Oettinger válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. május 8.)

A megújuló energiaforrásokról szóló irányelv⁽¹⁾ rögzíti a megújuló energiaforrásokból előállított energia támogatásának jogi kereteit. A szóban forgó irányelv azonban technológiasemleges, azaz a tagállamok saját belátására bízta, melyik megújulóenergia-technológiának nyújtanak pénzügyi támogatást. A jelenleg hatályos román megújuló energia támogatási rendszer kétféle zöld tanúsítványt állít ki a geotermikus forrásból előállított és a hálózatba betáplált megújuló villamos energia minden egyes MW-ja után. A megújuló energiára vonatkozó román nemzeti cselekvési terv becslése szerint ez a technológia 2020-ra a fűtési és hűtési szektorban 80 ktöe energiát fog előállítani.

Az irányelv megköveteli a tagállamoktól, hogy a megújulóenergia-projektek esetében javítsák, korszerűsítsék és gyorsítsák fel közigazgatási eljárásaikat. Ez Románia esetében is fontos lépést jelentene a geotermikus energia jövőbeli elterjedése felé.

A geotermikus alkalmazások szélesebb körű használatának támogatása érdekében a Bizottság az Intelligens Energia Európának program keretében számos, e technológia szempontjából releváns projektet finanszírozott⁽²⁾, egyebek között a nem technikai jellegű akadályok, a geotermikus energiába történő beruházásokra ösztönző megoldások és a finanszírozási eszközök témájában.

⁽¹⁾ 2009/28/EK irányelv a megújuló energiaforrásból előállított energia támogatásáról, HL L 140., 2009.6.5., 16–64. o.

⁽²⁾ A projektek felsorolása az adatbázis honlapján található meg: <http://www.eaci-projects.eu/jee/page/Page.jsp?op=home>

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-003274/13
adresată Comisiei
Iosif Matula (PPE) și Iuliu Winkler (PPE)
(21 martie 2013)

Subiect: Eliminarea blocajelor în exploatarea energiei geotermale

În Comunicarea Comisiei „Perspectiva energetică 2050”, încălzirea și răcirea regenerabilă este considerată esențială în procesul de decarbonizare.

Conform comunicării, se impune o schimbare în consumul de energie înspre emisii scăzute de carbon prin valorificarea resurselor de energie la nivel local și a energiei regenerabile, inclusiv prin sisteme de încălzire urbană.

În urmă cu puțin timp, ați declarat că energia geotermală ocupă un loc special în politica de energie a Uniunii. În prezent, în Europa, doar 1% din energia regenerabilă provine din surse geotermale, iar încălzirea cu surse geotermale reprezintă doar 3% din totalul energiei regenerabile.

În același timp, în regiunea Vest din România, există numeroase bazine de ape geotermale și inclusiv zeci de sonde forate în urmă cu 30 de ani care în prezent sunt neutilizate, din cauza unor blocaje administrative și birocratice.

1. Cum poate Comisia să contribuie la deblocarea obstacolelor ce stau în calea dezvoltării capacităților de exploatare a energiei geotermale?
2. Ce recomandă Comisia ministerului român de resort și autorităților regionale și locale în vederea eficientizării exploatării potențialului de energie geotermală din Regiunea Vest?
3. Ce măsuri pot fi luate pentru eficientizarea tehnologiilor pentru producerea energiei și încălzirii geotermale?
4. Are Comisia în vedere aspecte ce țin de valorificarea potențialului de energie geotermală în viitoarele contracte de parteneriat?

Răspuns dat de dl Oettinger în numele Comisiei
(8 mai 2013)

Directiva privind energia din surse regenerabile ⁽¹⁾ stabilește cadrul juridic pentru promovarea utilizării energiei din surse regenerabile. Directiva este însă neutră din punct de vedere tehnologic, și anume statele membre decid cu privire la ce tehnologii legate de energia din surse regenerabile să primească sprijin financiar. În temeiul schemei de sprijin aflate actualmente în vigoare în România pentru energia din surse regenerabile, se acordă două certificate verzi pentru fiecare MW de energie electrică din surse regenerabile produs din energie geotermală și exportat în rețea. În plus, Planul național al României de acțiune în domeniul energiei din surse regenerabile estimează că această tehnologie va oferi 80 ktep în sectorul încălzirii și în cel al răcirii în 2020.

De asemenea, directiva prevede obligația statelor membre de a-și îmbunătăți, raționaliza și accelera procedurile administrative atunci când este vorba despre proiecte din domeniul energiei din surse regenerabile. Ar fi important să se procedeze astfel, inclusiv în România, pentru exploatarea viitoare a energiei geotermale.

Pentru a promova o utilizare pe scară mai largă a aplicațiilor în materie de energie geotermală, Comisia, prin intermediul programului său *Energie inteligentă — Europa*, a finanțat până în prezent o serie de proiecte importante pentru această tehnologie ⁽²⁾, care s-au axat, printre altele, pe bariere fără caracter tehnic, pe soluții pentru creșterea investițiilor în energia geotermală sau pe instrumente de finanțare.

⁽¹⁾ Directiva 2009/28/CE privind promovarea utilizării energiei din surse regenerabile, JO L 140, 5.6.2009, p. 16-64.

⁽²⁾ Proiectele pot fi găsite pe pagina de internet ce cuprinde bazele de date : <http://www.eaci-projects.eu/iee/page/Page.jsp?op=home>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003274/13
to the Commission
Iosif Matula (PPE) and Iuliu Winkler (PPE)
(21 March 2013)**

Subject: Removal of obstacles hindering the exploitation of geothermal energy

In the Commission Communication 'Energy Roadmap 2050', renewable heating and cooling are considered essential in the decarbonisation process.

According to the communication, a shift is required in energy consumption towards low carbon emissions through the utilization of local energy sources and renewable energy, including through district heating systems.

You have recently stated that geothermal energy has a special place in EU energy policy. In Europe only 1% of renewable energy comes from geothermal sources at present, and heating with geothermal sources represents just 3% of all renewable energy.

At the same time, in the Western Region of Romania there are numerous pools of geothermal water and dozens of boreholes drilled 30 years ago that are currently unused due to administrative and bureaucratic bottlenecks.

1. How can the Commission help remove the obstacles hindering the development of geothermal energy exploitation capacities?
2. What does the Commission recommend for the competent Romanian minister and the local and regional authorities in order to make the exploitation of geothermal energy potential in the Western Region more efficient?
3. What measures can be taken to optimise the technologies for producing geothermal energy and heating?
4. Does the Commission have in mind issues relating to the exploitation of geothermal energy potential in future partnership contracts?

**Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(8 May 2013)**

The Renewable Energy Directive ⁽¹⁾ lays down the legal framework for the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources. However, the directive is technology neutral, meaning that Member States decide on the renewable energy technologies to be granted financial support. The Romanian support scheme for renewable energy currently in place gives two green certificates for each MW of renewable electricity produced from geothermal energy and fed into the grid. Moreover, the Romanian National Renewable Energy Action Plan estimates that this technology will provide 80 ktoe in the heating and cooling sector in 2020.

The directive also requires Member States to improve, streamline and expedite their administrative procedures when renewable energy projects are concerned. Doing so, including in Romania, would be important for the future deployment of geothermal energy.

In order to promote a wider use of geothermal applications, the Commission, through its Intelligent Energy Europe programme, has so far financed a number of projects relevant for this technology ⁽²⁾, which focused *inter alia* on non-technical barriers, solutions for increasing investments in geothermal energy or financing instruments.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 2009/28/EC on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources, OJ L 140, 5.6.2009, p.16-64.

⁽²⁾ Projects can be found on the database homepage: <http://www.eaci-projects.eu/iee/page/Page.jsp?op=home>

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-003275/13
til Kommissionen
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(21. marts 2013)

Om: Løsgående søer

I Rådets direktiv 2008/120/EF er det bestemt, at alle søer skal være løsgående fra 2013 ⁽¹⁾.

Kommissionen har i et svar på spørgsmål H-0332/2010 ⁽²⁾ oplyst, at »udsættelse af tidsfristen den 1. januar 2013 som fastlagt i Rådets direktiv 2008/120/EF med hensyn til sammensætning af flokke af søer og gylte vil stille producenter, der har investeret for at nå fristen, i en konkurrencemæssigt ufordelagtig position« ⁽³⁾.

Det er kun i ti medlemsstater, at alle svineproducenter opfylder Rådets direktiv til fulde. I Holland lever 98 pct. af producenterne op til kravene, i Danmarks lever 94 % op til kravene, mens kun 74 % af svineproducenterne i Frankrig lever op til kravene ⁽⁴⁾.

Det må på baggrund af ovenstående antages, at Kommissionen er enig i, at de svineproducenter, som overholder kravene i Rådets direktiv 2008/120/EF, står i en konkurrencemæssigt ufordelagtig position i forhold til producenter, der ikke overholder kravene i Rådets direktiv 2008/120/EF.

Kommissionen bedes på baggrund af ovenstående oplyse, om den har indledt overtrædelsesprocedurer mod enkelte medlemsstater for manglende gennemførelse af Rådets direktiv 2008/120/EF, og i så fald, hvilke lande?

Kommissionen bedes endvidere oplyse, hvordan den vil sikre, at svineproducenter i alle medlemsstater overholder Rådets direktiv 2008/120/EF?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Tonio Borg
(15. maj 2013)

For så vidt angår kravet om flokoptaldning af drægtige søer og gylte, er der i øjeblikket tolv medlemsstater, som opfylder kravet. Kommissionen indledte den 21. januar traktatbrudsprocedurer mod følgende medlemsstater: Belgien, Cypern, Danmark, Frankrig, Tyskland, Grækenland, Irland, Polen og Portugal. For seks medlemsstater er spørgsmålet stadig åbent, mens Kommissionen vurderer deres sager.

Det er endvidere medlemsstaternes ansvar at iværksætte de nødvendige håndhævelsesforanstaltninger og/eller sanktioner, jf. artikel 54 og 55 i forordning (EF) nr. 882/2004 ⁽⁵⁾ om offentlig kontrol, for at rette op på situationen. Sådanne nationale foranstaltninger kan omfatte delvis lukning af avlssteder samt begrænsning af adgangen til markederne for dyr eller produkter fra enkelte erhvervsdrivende, som ikke overholder reglerne.

⁽¹⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:047:0005:0013:DA:PDF>.

⁽²⁾ Skriftlig forespørgsel af 6.7.2010, <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=QT&reference=H-2010-0332&language=DA>.

⁽³⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=CRE&reference=20100708&secondRef=ANN-01&language=DA&detail=H-2010-0332&query=QUESTION>.

⁽⁴⁾ <http://www.pigprogress.net/Growing-Finishing/Environment/2013/2/Inexcusable-Non-compliance-with-sow-stall-ban-in-EU-1165881W/>.

⁽⁵⁾ EUT L 191 af 28.5.2004.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003275/13
to the Commission
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(21 March 2013)**

Subject: Untethered sows

Council Directive 2008/120/EC establishes that all sows shall be untethered from 2013 ⁽¹⁾.

In its answer to Question H-0332/2010 ⁽²⁾ the Commission stated that 'postponing the deadline of 1 January 2013 laid down in Council Directive 2008/120/EC(3) for the grouping of sows and gilts would put producers who have invested to meet this deadline at a competitive disadvantage' ⁽³⁾.

The Council Directive is complied with in full by all pig farmers in only 10 Member States. In the Netherlands, 98% of producers meet the requirements, in Denmark the figure is 94%, while in France only 74% of pig farmers meet the requirements ⁽⁴⁾.

In view of the above, it has to be assumed that the Commission would agree that those pig farmers that meet the requirements of Council Directive 2008/120/EC are at a competitive disadvantage in relation to producers that do not meet the requirements of said Directive.

In view of the above, can the Commission state whether it has initiated infringement proceedings against individual Member States for failing to implement Council Directive 2008/120/EC, and, if so, which Member States?

Can the Commission also state how it intends to ensure that pig farmers in all Member States comply with Council Directive 2008/120/EC?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(15 May 2013)**

With regard to the requirement for group housing of pregnant sows and gilts currently twelve Member States comply. The Commission on 21 February launched infringement procedures against the following Member States: Belgium, Cyprus, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Poland and Portugal. For six Member States the issue is still pending while the Commission assesses their cases.

It is furthermore the responsibility of the Member States to take all the necessary enforcement measures and/or sanctions as laid down in Articles 54 and 55 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 ⁽⁵⁾ on official controls to correct the situation. Such national measures may include partial closure of breeding sites as well as restriction of access to the markets of animals or products coming from individual non-compliant operators.

⁽¹⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:047:0005:0013:EN:PDF>

⁽²⁾ Written answer of 6.7.2010, <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=QT&reference=H-2010-0332&language=EN>

⁽³⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=CRE&reference=20100708&secondRef=ANN-01&language=EN&detail=H-2010-0332&query=QUESTION>

⁽⁴⁾ <http://www.pigprogress.net/Growing-Finishing/Environment/2013/2/Inexcusable-Non-compliance-with-sow-stall-ban-in-EU-1165881W/>

⁽⁵⁾ OJ L 191, 28.5.2004.

(Magyar változat)

**Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-003276/13
a Bizottság számára**

Bánki Erik (PPE), Mészáros Alajos (PPE), Sógor Csaba (PPE), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE) és Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE)
(2013. március 21.)

Tárgy: A Gyermekbarát internet program

Az EU által javasolt – a Biztonságosabb internet program részét képező – Gyermekbarát internet program jövője komoly veszélybe került. Az Európai Hálózatfinanszírozási Eszközzel szülő rendelet elsősorban a műszaki megoldásokat és az infrastruktúra létrehozását érinti. Mindazonáltal úgy véljük, hogy kiemelkedő fontosságú a gyermekeket, fiatalokat, szülőket és tanárokat célzó, a biztonságos internetezéssel kapcsolatos képzés és tájékoztatás folytatása. Sajnálatos módon azonban az Európai Hálózatfinanszírozási Eszköz keretében csak minimális költségvetés áll rendelkezésre a Biztonságosabb internet program folytatására. A többmilliárdos beruházások ellenére a fiatalok továbbra sem fognak tudni biztonságosan internetezni.

Ennél fogva kulcsfontosságú lenne az évi 30 millió eurós költségvetési keret biztosítása a Biztonságosabb internet program mind a 27 tagállamban, valamint a csatlakozásra váró országokban való folytatása és kibővítése érdekében, ami összesen 210 millió eurót jelentene a 2014–2020 pénzügyi időszakban. Különösen fontos a gyermekek és fiatalok digitális jártasságának fokozása. Az EU-nak továbbra is működtetnie kell a forródrótokat és a segélyvonalakat a bajban lévő gyermekek és fiatalok segítése érdekében.

A fentiek fényében mekkora költségvetést javasolnak a Biztonságosabb internet program és a Gyermekbarát internet program folytatására?

Igaz-e, hogy a Bizottság a költségek jelenlegi 75%-áról 50%-ra kívánja csökkenteni a Biztonságosabb internet központok támogatását?

Igaz-e, hogy a program csak 2014. októbertől részesül támogatásban, amely a támogatások több hónapra való felfüggesztését eredményezi?

Igaz-e, hogy a 27 tagállam által aláírt, 2013-tól 2014 elejéig tartó időszakra vonatkozó szerződést az EU nem tudja maradéktalanul teljesíteni, mivel a költségvetési keret részben kimerült?

A Bizottság szerint lehetséges lenne-e a hardverre, a hálózati eszközökre és szoftverekre fordítandó tervezett összeg 10%-ának átcsoportosítása az oktatás és a figyelemfelkeltés, valamint a forródrótok és segélyvonalak működtetésének finanszírozására?

Neelie Kroes válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. május 7.)

A gyermekek számára megfelelőbb internet kialakításával foglalkozó közleményében a Bizottság elismerte, hogy a Biztonságosabb internet központok fontos szerepet játszanak a gyermekek védelme és felelős internethasználata terén.

A Bizottság rendkívül csalódott, amiért az Európai Tanács döntése nyomán 1 milliárd EUR-ra csökken az Európai Hálózatfinanszírozási Eszköz távközlési részére fordítható, 2014–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó költségvetés. Ez a lépés nehéz döntések meghozatalát vonja maga után a digitális szolgáltatási infrastruktúrák kiválasztása és finanszírozása terén.

Bármilyen döntések is születnek, a jelenleg javasolt szűkös költségvetési keret mellett a Bizottságnak nem lesz lehetősége valamennyi eredetileg javasolt beruházás és fejlesztés támogatására vagy a Bizottság által javasolt pénzügyi szinthez hasonló mértékű támogatására.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-003276/13
do Komisji**

**Erik Bánki (PPE), Alajos Mészáros (PPE), Csaba Sógor (PPE), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE) oraz
Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE)**
(21 marca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Program „Lepszy Internet dla dzieci”

Planowany unijny program „Lepszy Internet dla dzieci” (stanowiący część programu „Bezpieczniejszy Internet”) jest obecnie bardzo zagrożony. Rozporządzenie w sprawie instrumentu „Łącząc Europę” dotyczy głównie rozwiązań technicznych i utworzenia infrastruktury. Uważamy jednak, że jest niezwykle ważne, aby utrzymać szkolenia i działania podnoszące świadomość w zakresie bezpiecznego korzystania z Internetu skierowane do dzieci, młodzieży, rodziców i nauczycieli. Niestety w rozporządzeniu w sprawie instrumentu „Łącząc Europę” przewidziano minimalny budżet na kontynuowanie programu „Bezpieczniejszy Internet”. Wielomiliardowe inwestycje mogą więc spełznąć na niczym, a młodzież nadal nie będzie umiała bezpiecznie korzystać z Internetu.

Dlatego też niezwykle ważne jest, aby przeznaczyć budżet w wysokości 30 mln EUR rocznie, czyli ogółem 210 mln EUR w okresie finansowania 2014–2020, na kontynuację i upowszechnianie programu „Bezpieczniejszy Internet” we wszystkich 27 państwach członkowskich oraz w krajach, które czekają na przyjęcie do UE. Podnoszenie umiejętności cyfrowych wśród dzieci i młodzieży ma szczególne znaczenie. Unijne gorące linie i telefony zaufania powinny nadal działać, aby nieść pomoc cierpiącym dzieciom i młodym ludziom.

W świetle powyższego, ile wynosi budżet proponowany na kontynuację programu „Bezpieczniejszy Internet” i przyszłego programu „Lepszy Internet dla dzieci”?

Czy jest prawdą, że Komisja zamierza zmniejszyć z 75 % do 50 % fundusze przeznaczone na centra bezpiecznego Internetu?

Czy jest prawdą, że program będzie finansowany dopiero od października 2014 r., co oznacza zawieszenie wsparcia przez wiele miesięcy?

Czy jest prawdą, że umowy podpisane przez 27 państw członkowskich na okres od 2013 r. do początku 2014 r. nie będą mogły zostać w pełni zrealizowane, ponieważ budżet został częściowo wyczerpany?

Czy według Komisji istnieje możliwość ponownego przeznaczenia 10 % kwot, które planowano przeznaczyć na sprzęt komputerowy, urządzenia sieciowe i programy, na finansowanie edukacji i podnoszenia świadomości, a także na operacje związane z gorącymi liniami i telefonami zaufania?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wiceprzewodniczącą Neelie Kroes w imieniu Komisji

(7 maja 2013 r.)

W komunikacie dotyczącym lepszego Internetu dla dzieci uznano ważną rolę, jaką pełnią centra bezpiecznego Internetu pod względem ochrony dzieci i wzmacniania ich praw.

Komisja jest głęboko rozczarowana faktem, że Rada Europejska postanowiła ograniczyć środki budżetowe na część instrumentu „Łącząc Europę” przeznaczoną na telekomunikację do 1 mld EUR w latach 2014–2020. Będzie to oznaczało konieczność podejmowania trudnych decyzji dotyczących wyboru i finansowania przyszłej infrastruktury usług cyfrowych.

Bez względu to, jakie zostaną podjęte decyzje, dostępne środki budżetowe zaproponowane na tym etapie są ograniczone i nie pozwolą Komisji na wsparcie wszystkich planowanych inwestycji i projektów rozwojowych lub nie pozwolą na udzielenie im wsparcia finansowego Komisji na podobnym poziomie.

(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-003276/13
adresată Comisiei**

**Erik Bánki (PPE), Alajos Mészáros (PPE), Csaba Sógor (PPE), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE) și Petru
Constantin Luhan (PPE)**
(21 martie 2013)

Subiect: Programul „Un internet mai bun pentru copii”

Viitorul programului UE propus „Un internet mai bun pentru copii” (parte a Programului pentru un internet mai sigur sau SIP) este, în acest moment, foarte incert. Regulamentul de instituire a mecanismului „Conectarea Europei” (CEF) vizează în special soluții tehnice și crearea unor infrastructuri. Cu toate acestea, considerăm că este deosebit de important să se mențină formarea și sensibilizarea orientată către copii, tineri, părinți și profesori în ceea ce privește utilizarea în condiții de siguranță a internetului. Din nefericire, nu există decât un buget minim planificat în cadrul CEF pentru continuarea SIP. Astfel, ar putea fi irosite investiții de miliarde, iar tinerii tot nu vor putea să utilizeze internetul în condiții de siguranță.

Prin urmare, ar fi crucial să se prevadă un buget de 30 de milioane EUR pe an, adică o sumă totală de 210 milioane EUR pentru perioada financiară 2014-2020, pentru a continua și extinde SIP în toate cele 27 de state membre și în țările aflate în proces de aderare. Este deosebit de importantă sporirea competențelor digitale în rândul copiilor și al tinerilor. UE ar trebui să opereze în continuare liniile telefonice de urgență (hotlines) și, de asemenea, liniile de asistență (helplines), pentru a sprijini copiii și tinerii aflați în dificultate.

În lumina celor de mai sus, care este bugetul propus pentru continuarea SIP (viitorul program „Un internet mai bun pentru copii”)?

Este adevărat că Comisia intenționează să reducă finanțarea Centrelor pentru un internet mai sigur (SIC), de la nivelul actual de 75 % din costuri, la 50 %?

Este adevărat că programul va beneficia de finanțare doar începând cu luna octombrie 2014, fapt ce presupune suspendarea sprijinului timp de câteva luni?

Este adevărat că contractele semnate de cele 27 de state membre pentru perioada 2013 - începutul anului 2014 nu pot fi respectate pe deplin de către UE deoarece bugetul a fost parțial epuizat?

Consideră Comisia că ar fi fezabilă realocarea a 10 % din sumele planificate a fi cheltuite pe hardware, infrastructura rețelelor și software către finanțarea educației și a sensibilizării, precum și a operării liniilor telefonice de urgență (hotlines) și a liniilor de asistență (helplines)?

Răspuns dat de dna Kroeson în numele Comisiei
(7 mai 2013)

Comunicarea privind crearea unui internet mai bun pentru copii a recunoscut rolul important jucat de centrele pentru un internet mai sigur atât în ceea ce privește protecția, cât și responsabilizarea copiilor.

Este foarte dezamăgitor faptul că s-a convenit de către Consiliul European să se reducă bugetul alocat părții privind telecomunicațiile a mecanismului „Conectarea Europei” la 1 miliard EUR pentru perioada 2014-2020. Acest lucru va presupune luarea unor decizii dificile privind alegerea și finanțarea viitoarelor infrastructuri de servicii digitale.

Indiferent de deciziile luate, bugetul disponibil propus în momentul de față este limitat și nu va permite Comisiei să sprijine toate investițiile și să avanseze în ritmul pe care și l-a propus inițial sau cu un nivel similar de sprijin financiar din partea Comisiei.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003276/13
to the Commission**

Erik Bánki (PPE), Alajos Mészáros (PPE), Csaba Sógor (PPE), Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE) and Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE)

(21 March 2013)

Subject: 'A Better Internet for Kids' Programme

The future of the EU's proposed programme 'A Better Internet for Kids' (part of the Safer Internet Programme or SIP) is now very much at risk. The Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) regulation is primarily about technical solutions and establishment of infrastructures. However, we believe it is extremely important to maintain training and awareness-raising directed at children, young people, parents and teachers concerning the safe use of the Internet. Unfortunately, there is only a minimal budget planned in the framework of the CEF for continuing the SIP. Multi-billion investments could thus be spent in vain, and young people will still not be able to use the Internet safely.

Therefore, it would be crucial to provide a budget of EUR 30 million per annum, i.e. a total of EUR 210 million over the 2014-2020 financial period, in order to continue and expand the SIP in all 27 Member States and in the countries awaiting accession. Increasing the digital literacy of children and young people is particularly important. The EU should continue operating hotlines and helplines as well, in order to help distressed children and young people.

In light of the above, what is the proposed budget for continuing the SIP, the future 'Better Internet for Kids' programme?

Is it true that the Commission intends to reduce funding for the Safer Internet Centres (SICs) from the current 75% of costs to 50%?

Is it true that the programme will be financed only as from October 2014, entailing a suspension of support for several months?

Is it true that the contracts signed by the 27 Member States for the period from 2013 to the beginning of 2014 cannot be fully honoured by the EU because the budget has been partly exhausted?

Would it be feasible according to the Commission to reallocate 10% of the amounts planned to be spent on hardware, network facilities and software to the financing of education and awareness-raising, as well as helpline and hotline operation?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission

(7 May 2013)

The communication on making a better Internet for children recognised the important role played by the Safer Internet Centres, both in protection and in empowering children.

It is a severe disappointment that the European Council agreed to cut the budget for the telecommunications part of the Connecting Europe Facility to EUR 1 billion for the years 2014 to 2020. This will mean taking difficult decisions about the selection and funding of future digital services infrastructures.

Whatever decisions are taken, the available budget proposed at this stage is scarce and it will not allow the Commission to support all investments and advancements originally proposed or with a similar level of Commission financial support.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-003277/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(21 martie 2013)

Subiect: Viitoarea revizuire a Regulamentului (CE) nr. 1072/2009 privind accesul la piața transportului rutier de mărfuri

În cadrul audierii din 17 ianuarie 2013 privind revizuirea Regulamentului (CE) nr. 1071/2009 privind accesul la profesie și a Regulamentului (CE) nr. 1072/2009 privind accesul la piața transportului rutier de mărfuri, Comisia a prezentat o listă de posibile măsuri. Comisia este rugată să precizeze când va publica concluziile acestei audieri și când are intenția de a înainta Parlamentului și Consiliului propuneri legislative în acest domeniu.

De asemenea, atragem atenția asupra următoarelor solicitări ale transportatorilor din România:

1. transparența reglementărilor naționale în sectoarele de transport rutier în toate statele membre, prin publicarea pe site-ul Comisiei a reglementărilor naționale de aplicare a acquis-ului privind transportul rutier în fiecare stat membru, în special a legilor naționale de aplicare ale Regulamentelor (CE) nr. 561/2006, 1071/2009, 1072/2009 și 1073/2009;
2. traducerea în toate limbile oficiale a legislației specifice transportului rutier național din fiecare stat membru, care se aplică transportatorilor non-rezidenți atunci când efectuează operațiuni de cabotaj;
3. publicarea listei de sancțiuni aplicate de autoritatea de aplicare a fiecărui stat membru pentru încălcarea reglementărilor privind transportul rutier din UE.

Comisia este rugată să precizeze ce măsuri ar putea avea în vedere pentru soluționarea acestor solicitări (punctele 1-3).

Răspuns dat de dl Kallas în numele Comisiei
(26 aprilie 2013)

1. și 2. Comisia încurajează cooperarea dintre statele membre în ceea ce privește asigurarea punerii în aplicare a acquis-ului privind transportul rutier de marfă, precum și furnizarea de informații referitoare la transport către transportatorii de marfă. Ar fi însă nevoie de resurse semnificative pentru colectarea, traducerea și publicarea online a volumului mare de informații constituit din legi naționale derivate din acquis-ul privind transportul rutier. Prin urmare, Comisia încurajează statele membre să furnizeze aceste informații transportatorilor de marfă într-o manieră ușor de utilizat.

3. În temeiul articolului 22 alineatul (1) și al articolelor 16 și 27 din Regulamentele (CE) nr. 1071, (CE) nr. 1072 și, respectiv, (CE) nr. 1073, statele membre trebuie să notifice Comisiei sistemele lor naționale de sancțiuni, precum și modificările acestora. Comisia poate decide să publice aceste notificări. De asemenea, Comisia realizează în prezent un studiu privind sistemele naționale de sancțiuni pentru a obține o privire de ansamblu asupra diferitelor sisteme naționale de sancțiuni aplicabile pentru încălcarea legislației din domeniul transportului rutier. Acest studiu ar putea fi publicat în următoarele luni.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003277/13
to the Commission
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(21 March 2013)**

Subject: Future revision of Regulation (EC) No 1072/2009 on access to the road haulage market

At the hearing of 17 January 2013 on the revision of Regulation (EC) No 1071/2009 on access to occupation and Regulation (EC) No 1072/2009 on access to the road haulage market, the Commission presented a list of possible measures. Can the Commission specify when it will publish the conclusions of this hearing and when it intends to submit legislative proposals in this area to the Parliament and the Council?

Similarly, we are drawing your attention to the following requests of hauliers from Romania:

1. Transparency of national regulations in road haulage sectors in all Member States, through the publishing on the Commission's website of national regulations applying the *acquis* on road haulage in each Member State, particularly the national laws applying Regulations (EC) Nos 561/2006, 1071/2009, 1072/2009 and 1073/2009;
2. Translation into all official languages of the legislation specific to national road haulage in each Member State which applies to non-resident hauliers when they carry out cabotage operations;
3. Publication of the list of penalties applied by the authorities of each Member State for breaches of EU road haulage regulations.

Can the Commission state what measures it has in mind to address these requests (points 1-3)?

**Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(26 April 2013)**

1 and 2. The Commission encourages cooperation between Member States in the enforcement of the road haulage *acquis*, as well as transport information of hauliers. However the bulk of information made up by national legislation deriving from the road transport *acquis* would require significant resources to compile, translate and make available online. The Commission therefore encourages Member States to provide this information to hauliers in a user friendly manner.

3. Under Articles 22(1), 16 and 27 of Regulations (EC) No 1071, 1072 and 1073 respectively, Member States must notify their national penalty systems and any amendments thereto to the Commission. The Commission may choose to publish these notifications. The Commission is also carrying out a study on national penalty systems to gain an overview of the different national systems of sanctions applicable to road transport legislation. This study could be published in the coming months.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-003278/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(21 martie 2013)

Subiect: Un nou tip de gripă porcină rezistentă la medicamente

Recent, un grup de experți australieni s-a arătat preocupat de amenințarea pe care o prezintă un nou tip de gripă porcină, rezistentă la medicamente, arătând că populația ar trebui să fie alertată, deși cazurile sunt încă relativ rare. Experții din Marea Britanie au confirmat situații similare. Cercetătorii sunt îngrijorați de riscul ca acest virus să se răspândească la nivel global.

Comisia este rugată să precizeze:

1. dacă există motive de îngrijorare pentru cetățenii europeni;
2. care sunt măsurile avute în vedere pentru întâmpinarea unei eventuale situații de urgență.

Răspuns dat de dl Borg în numele Comisiei
(6 mai 2013)

Comisia este la curent cu situația epidemiologică a gripei porcine și monitorizează îndeaproape situația din Europa, în colaborare cu Centrul European de Prevenire și Control al Bolilor (ECDC), care a publicat o evaluare a riscurilor ⁽¹⁾ privind epidemia de gripă A(H3N2v) din America de Nord.

ECDC cunoaște situația cu care se confruntă Australia și estimează că aceasta nu constituie deocamdată o amenințare pentru cetățenii europeni. În paralel, Autoritatea Europeană pentru Siguranța Alimentară (EFSA), împreună cu experți din domeniul sănătății publice, evaluează în prezent riscurile pe care gripa A(H3N2v) le poate prezenta pentru sănătatea animalelor, precum și efectele acestei boli asupra sănătății oamenilor și animalelor.

Dovezile privind răspândirea virusului de la om la om sunt în număr foarte limitat.

Comisia și statele membre dispun de mecanisme de supraveghere, de monitorizare și de intervenție de urgență în domeniul sănătății umane și animale, care le permit să reacționeze rapid și coordonat în caz de pătrundere a virusului gripei A(H3N2v) pe teritoriul UE.

⁽¹⁾ http://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/Publications/i111129_TER_swine_origin_triple_reassortant_influenza%20A_H3N2_viruses%20in%20North%20America.pdf

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003278/13
to the Commission
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(21 March 2013)**

Subject: New type of drug-resistant swine flu

A group of Australian experts were recently concerned by the threat of a new type of drug-resistant swine flu, stating that the population should be alerted even though cases are still relatively rare. Experts from the United Kingdom confirmed similar situations. Researchers are concerned about the risk of this virus spreading globally.

Can the Commission state:

1. whether European citizens should be concerned, and
2. what measures the Commission is considering to meet a potential emergency situation?

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

The Commission is aware of the epidemiological situation of influenza in swine. It closely monitors the situation in Europe in collaboration with the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC), which has published a risk assessment ⁽¹⁾ regarding the influenza A(H3N2v) outbreak in North America.

The ECDC is aware of the Australian experience and estimates that so far it does not pose a threat to European citizens. The European Food Authority (EFSA), together with public health experts, is currently also assessing the risks that Influenza A (H3N2v) may pose to animal health and the impacts on animal and human health.

Evidence of person-to-person spread of this virus is very limited.

Surveillance, monitoring and emergency response mechanisms in the human and animal health areas are in place in the Commission and Member States allowing a rapid and coordinated reaction should the Influenza A(H3N2v) virus enter the EU territory.

⁽¹⁾ http://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/Publications/i111129_TER_swine_origin_triple_reassortant_influenza%20A_H3N2_viruses%20in%20North%20America.pdf

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-003279/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(21 martie 2013)

Subiect: Compensarea pierderilor producătorilor români de lapte în urma crizei aflatoxinei

În România, vânzările de lapte au scăzut cu aproape 45% în a doua jumătate a lunii martie ca urmare a unor suspiciuni de contaminare cu aflatoxină, care au determinat scăderea încrederii consumatorilor în calitatea produselor. Producătorii au fost obligați să distrugă circa 10 milioane de litri de lapte pe săptămână, conform reprezentanților asociațiilor de crescători de vaci de lapte.

Precizez că o situație similară s-a întâlnit și în Ungaria. Totodată, această criză a afectat și procesatorii din alte state membre, care au fost puși în imposibilitatea de a se aproviziona din România.

Comisia este rugată să răspundă la următoarele întrebări:

1. Dacă ar putea avea în vedere instituirea unui sistem de compensare a pierderilor după modelul plăților compensatorii efectuate în cazul infestării castraveților cu *E.colli*.
2. Dacă ar putea accepta majorarea nivelului maxim permis al ajutorului *de minimis* pentru a permite statului român să intervină în această criză.

Răspuns dat de dl Ciolos în numele Comisiei
(30 aprilie 2013)

Sunt prevăzute măsuri excepționale în caz de restricții comerciale rezultate din aplicarea măsurilor de combatere a răspândirii bolilor animalelor ⁽¹⁾, atunci când prețurile de pe piața Uniunii cresc sau scad semnificativ ⁽²⁾ sau atunci când prețurile de pe piața mondială ating un nivel care perturbă sau riscă să perturbe disponibilul necesar pentru aprovizionarea pieței Uniunii, iar situația este probabil să continue sau să se înrăutățească ⁽³⁾. Cum nu s-au raportat astfel de efecte, Comisia nu poate lua în considerare compensarea pierderilor menționate de distinsul membru, deoarece cazul respectiv nu corespunde niciuneia dintre situațiile în care se pot lua măsuri excepționale în sectorul laptelui.

În alte sectoare, se pot lua măsuri în caz de perturbări grave ale pieței, legate direct de o pierdere a încrederii consumatorilor cauzată de existența unor riscuri pentru sănătatea publică sau pentru sănătatea animală ⁽⁴⁾. În cadrul reformei PAC, Comisia a propus extinderea acestei posibilități la sectorul laptelui ⁽⁵⁾.

În conformitate cu regulamentul Consiliului referitor la ajutoarele de stat ⁽⁶⁾, regulamentele *de minimis* ale Comisiei pot fi modificate dacă se schimbă împrejurările referitoare la un element important care a determinat adoptarea lor sau dacă evoluția progresivă sau funcționarea pieței comune impune acest lucru. Criza aflatoxinei din România nu este suficientă pentru a justifica modificarea regulamentului Comisiei referitor la ajutoarele *de minimis* în sectorul agricol ⁽⁷⁾.

Comisia dorește să îl informeze pe distinsul membru că regulamentul menționat expiră la 31.12.2013. În prezent, Comisia pregătește un nou regulament și culege date pentru a determina la ce nivel poate fi stabilit plafonul *de minimis* fără a se denatura sau fără a risca să se denatureze concurența.

⁽¹⁾ A se vedea articolul 44 din Regulamentul (CE) nr. 1234/2007 (Regulamentul unic OCP).

⁽²⁾ A se vedea articolul 186 din Regulamentul (CE) nr. 1234/2007 (Regulamentul unic OCP).

⁽³⁾ A se vedea articolul 187 din Regulamentul (CE) nr. 1234/2007 (Regulamentul unic OCP).

⁽⁴⁾ A se vedea articolul 45 din Regulamentul (CE) nr. 1234/2007 (Regulamentul unic OCP).

⁽⁵⁾ A se vedea propunerea de articol 155 din COM(2011) 626 final, 19.10.2011.

⁽⁶⁾ A se vedea articolul 4 alineatul (2) din Regulamentul (CE) nr. 994/98 al Consiliului de aplicare a articolelor 92 și 93 din Tratatul de instituire a Comunității Europene anumitor categorii de ajutoare de stat orizontale, JO L 142, 14. 5.1998.

⁽⁷⁾ Regulamentul (CE) nr. 1535/2007 al Comisiei privind aplicarea articolelor 87 și 88 din Tratatul CE ajutoarelor de minimis în sectorul producției de produse agricole, JO L 337, 21.12.2007.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003279/13
to the Commission**

Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)

(21 March 2013)

Subject: Compensation for losses for Romanian milk producers following the aflatoxin crisis

Milk sales fell by almost 45% in Romania in the second half of March following suspicions of contamination with aflatoxin, which led to falling consumer confidence in product quality. According to representatives of dairy farmers' associations, producers were forced to destroy around 10 million litres of milk per week.

A similar situation took place in Hungary. At the same time, the crisis also affected processors in other Member States who were unable to obtain supplies from Romania.

Can the Commission answer the following questions?

1. Can the Commission consider the introduction of a compensation system for the losses, similar to the compensation payments made in the case of the infestation of cucumbers with *E. coli*?
2. Can the Commission accept an increase in the maximum permitted level of *de minimis* aid in order to allow the Romanian state to intervene in this crisis?

Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission

(30 April 2013)

Exceptional measures are foreseen in case of trade restrictions which may result from the application of measures against the spread of diseases in animals ⁽¹⁾, where prices on the Union market rise or fall significantly ⁽²⁾, or where prices on the world market reach a level that disrupts or threatens to disrupt the availability of supply on the Union market and where that situation is likely to continue or to deteriorate ⁽³⁾. Such effects are not reported. Therefore, the Commission cannot consider compensating the losses referred to by the Honourable Member because the case does not match any of the situations in which exceptional measures may be taken in the milk sector.

In other sectors, measures may be taken in case of serious market disturbances directly attributed to a loss in consumer confidence due to public health or animal health risks ⁽⁴⁾. Under the CAP reform, the Commission has proposed to extend this possibility to the milk sector ⁽⁵⁾.

According to the Council Regulation on state aid ⁽⁶⁾, the Commission *de minimis* Regulations may be amended where circumstances have changed with respect to any important element that constituted grounds for its adoption or where the progressive development or the functioning of the common market so requires. The aflatoxin crisis in Romania is insufficient to justify amending the Commission agricultural *de minimis* Regulation ⁽⁷⁾.

The Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that the agricultural *de minimis* Regulation expires on 31.12.2013. The Commission is currently preparing a new Regulation and is collecting data to establish at which level the *de minimis* ceiling can be fixed without distorting, or risking to distort, competition.

⁽¹⁾ See Article 44 of the single CMO Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007.

⁽²⁾ See Article 186 of the single CMO Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007.

⁽³⁾ See Article 187 of the single CMO Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007.

⁽⁴⁾ See Article 45 of the single CMO Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007.

⁽⁵⁾ See proposed Article 155 in COM(2011) 626 final of 19.10.2011.

⁽⁶⁾ See Article 4(2) of Council Regulation (EC) No 994/98 on the application of Articles 92 and 93 of the Treaty establishing the European Community to certain categories of horizontal state aid in OJ L 142, 14.5.1998.

⁽⁷⁾ Commission Regulation (EC) No 1535/2007 on the application of Articles 87 and 88 of the EC Treaty to the *de minimis* aid in the sector of agricultural production in OJ L 337, 21.12.2007.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003283/13
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(21 March 2013)**

Subject: Consumer Classroom programme

The Commission's new Consumer Classroom website for teachers, which provides resources and interactive tools for teaching 12 to 18 year olds a range of subjects and practical consumer skills, is an innovative way to merge technology and education.

Could the Commission outline which Member States will benefit from this programme and the budget that has been set aside to see it through to fruition?

How many participants does the Commission expect to make use of the Consumer Classroom over a defined period of time?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(3 May 2013)**

Teachers, pupils and other interested parties (consumer associations, authorities) in all Member States will have access and benefit from the opportunities for exchanging best practices and teaching materials the Consumer Classroom offers. As it is a collaborative site, it will grow and develop in function of the involvement, demand and input of teachers and other participants.

Consumer Classroom costs from 2011 to date amount to EUR 2.5 million, which includes development, promotion and implementation through February 2014. Further funding as planned for research, promotion, user-requested translations, as well as hosting/maintenance through February 2015, adds up to EUR 0.8 million.

During its start-up phase, the Consumer Classroom aims to recruit a teachers' community of at least 2 000 registered users by the end of 2013; non-registered visitors are expected to increase to 50 000 per month.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003284/13
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(21 March 2013)**

Subject: European Day for the Remembrance of Victims of Terrorism

The European Day for the Remembrance of Victims of Terrorism was marked in Northern Ireland and across Europe on 11 March 2013. In order to move forward from the terrorist atrocities that have taken place throughout Europe it is essential that we are mindful of the past.

As the Commission's action arm for educating EU citizens on terrorism, how will the Radicalisation Awareness Network enable nationals from every Member State to connect, to share experiences and to learn from each other, on the European Day for the Remembrance of Victims of Terrorism and throughout the rest of the year?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(24 April 2013)**

The Commission is very much involved in the commemoration and support of victims of terrorism. As every year since 2005, on 11 March, the Commission took part in the European Day on Remembrance of Victims of Terrorism. This year a photo exhibition called 'Europe against terrorism — the glance of victims', developed by the Spanish association 'Fundación Miguel Ángel Blanco' and financed by the Commission, was presented in the premises of the EU Committee of the Regions. On this occasion, the directive of 25 October 2012 establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime (including victims of terrorism) was presented to victims of terrorism.

In addition to funding of projects, the Commission is in the process of establishing a new European Network of Associations of Victims of Terrorism aimed at enhancing the representation of victims' interests at European Union level, and raise awareness among European citizens in order to strengthen European solidarity with victims of terrorism. This Network will continue the work of the previous Network, the contract for which has recently come to an end.

Victims of terrorism also have an important place in the Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN). The RAN's overall objective is to facilitate preventative cooperation, and to share experience and lessons learned amongst practitioners involved in countering violent extremism. One of the eight subgroups of the RAN is specifically devoted to the 'voices of victims of terrorism' and is mainly composed of associations of victims of terrorism. Within this group, the RAN offer the opportunity to play an active role in prevention of radicalisation leading to terrorism or violent extremism.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003285/13
to the Commission**

James Nicholson (ECR)

(21 March 2013)

Subject: Farmers' markets and diversification of high street shopping

Farmers' markets are a vital and vibrant aspect of local communities. They are a means of supporting and promoting local produce and local industry right across the European Union.

Does the Commission recognise the cultural and economic value of farmers' markets?

How does the Commission support these micro-businesses and help and encourage them to take advantage of the internal market?

Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission

(15 May 2013)

The European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development provides different tools for farmers and micro-businesses to develop, such as investment in processing and marketing, creation of new products and technologies, promotional activities and other non-agricultural activities. Furthermore, transnational cooperation projects under the Leader programme ⁽¹⁾ could also contain support to rural SMEs (common marketing activities, participation at fairs, etc).

The support and encouragement will be maintained in the future Rural Development policy ⁽²⁾, as one of the proposed priorities of the rural development policy involves 'better integrating primary producers into the food chain through quality schemes, promotion in local markets and short supply [chains]....'. The draft Regulation offers a very wide scope with regard to the exact operations which could be supported in connection with short supply chains and local markets. The most relevant measures could be the 'cooperation', the 'quality schemes for agricultural products and foodstuffs' and the 'farm and business development' measures. Under these measures, support can be provided for the setting-up / running of 'farmers' markets' selling local farmers' produce direct to consumers in nearby towns.

In accordance with Article 55 of Regulation (EU) No 1151/2012 on quality schemes for agricultural products and foodstuffs ⁽³⁾, the Commission is preparing a report on local farming and direct sales labelling schemes to assist producers in marketing their produce locally.

⁽¹⁾ Article 65 of the Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005 of 20 September 2005 on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD).

⁽²⁾ Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) (COM(2011) 627 final/2): http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-post-2013/legal-proposals/com627/627_en.pdf

⁽³⁾ OJ L 343 of 14.12.2012, p. 1.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003286/13
to the Commission**

James Nicholson (ECR)

(21 March 2013)

Subject: Fuel laundering

Criminal activity involving fuel crime is a huge problem, particularly on the Northern Ireland/Republic of Ireland border and at many other EU land borders. Fuel laundering costs Member States millions in lost excise duty, takes business away from legitimate organisations, funds organised crime and leaves behind waste that pollutes the environment and scars the countryside.

Does the Commission have an action plan to tackle fuel laundering in the EU?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission

(3 May 2013)

The Commission services are aware of the illegal practices of removing the fiscal marker and of misusing gas oil, generally referred to as 'fuel laundering' in the UK and in Ireland. The Commission is not aware of widespread cases of fuel laundering in other EU Member States.

Collecting taxes and dealing directly with tax fraud and tax evasion fall within the specific competences of individual EU Member States. At this stage the Commission does not envisage an EU action plan dedicated specifically to tackle fuel laundering in the EU as this problem would best be addressed at local level, as illustrated by successful operations on 13 March this year involving substantial cross-border collaboration, and again on 11 April this year within Co Louth.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003287/13
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(21 March 2013)**

Subject: Human rights abuses in China

In light of the election of a new President of the People's Republic of China, does the Commission intend to renew its call for the administration to tackle the widely-reported human rights violations and political oppression within the country?

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

The HR/VP shares the Honourable Member's concern regarding human rights violations and political oppression in China, particularly with regard to freedom of expression and freedom of religion and belief, and has paid particular attention to the deteriorating Tibetan human rights situation throughout 2012. This commitment is maintained in 2013. The EU is certainly intending to use the opportunities of engagement during 2013 — not least at the 16th EU-China Summit — to map out the further course of the relationship and continue to work towards a more effective human rights dialogue. The EU Special Representative for Human Rights is also taking a close interest in these matters.

Following the leadership change in China, the EU is currently in the process of resuming its working relations with the new Chinese administration. For the purpose of a first encounter, the HR/VP travelled to Beijing and Xi'an on 25-28 April. The new Chinese interlocutor for the Human Rights Dialogue, Li Jinghua, has recently assumed office, and the dates of the next session of the EU-China Human Rights Dialogue are presently under discussion.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003288/13
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(21 March 2013)**

Subject: Large denomination banknotes

Money laundering is a huge problem for every region and every currency in the European Union. Northern Ireland and sterling are just as vulnerable despite being outside the eurozone.

It has long been suggested that large denomination bank notes such as the EUR 500 note are particularly attractive to money launderers. Does the Commission have plans to remove this bank note from circulation?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(6 May 2013)**

According to the Treaty, the European Central Bank has the exclusive right to authorise the issue of euro banknotes. Given the ECB's rights with regard to euro banknotes, the Commission cannot decide to change their denomination.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003289/13
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(21 March 2013)**

Subject: Poverty in Romania

Despite accession to the European Union in 2007 many millions of Romanian citizens continue to face conditions of extreme poverty.

Some reports indicate that Romani life expectancy can be as low as 40-45 years and that government support is often as little as EUR 20 per adult and EUR 8 per child. Furthermore, many vulnerable orphaned children do not receive the basic care, protection and support that they are entitled to as a fundamental human right.

Is the Commission aware of this situation, and what is it doing to alleviate this sort of poverty within Romania?

Does the Commission have a plan which would try to ensure that citizens living in poverty in Romania are given immediate assistance and help?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(23 May 2013)**

The Commission shares the Honourable Member's concern with regard to the conditions of extreme poverty in Romania.

As matters related to social field fall primarily under the competence of the Member States, the Commission aims at supporting and facilitating their actions, as well as at promoting the fight against poverty across the EU.

The Europe 2020 strategy aims at reducing poverty by at least 20 million until 2020. In this framework, Romania committed to lift out of poverty 580 000 people. The Commission encourages Member States to take action and monitors progress including via Country Specific Recommendations.

Through the Social Investment Package, the Commission urged EU countries to put more emphasis on social investment, investing in human capital and enhancing people's capacities whilst ensuring an adequate livelihood through income support. Moreover, the recommendation *Investing in children — breaking the cycle of disadvantage* ⁽¹⁾, proposes a common framework through policy guidance and indicators to help the EU and Member States focus on successful social investment towards children.

Financially, there are EU instruments, such as Structural Funds and the upcoming Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived, to invest in actions promoting access to the labour market and social inclusion, thus helping to reduce poverty. For example, the ESF in Romania co-finances projects addressing Roma people, one of the poorest population groups. The latest data show that 102 contracts targeting Roma have been signed for a total value of EUR 253.36 million for 2007-2013. Until end April 2013 approximately 33 000 Roma people had participated in projects co-financed by the ESF.

(1) C(2013) 778 final of 20.2.2013.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003290/13
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(21 March 2013)**

Subject: Progress of EU in reducing greenhouse gas emissions

In 2010, almost three-quarters of all energy consumed in the EU came from fossil fuels, with 35% from oil, 27% from gas and 16% from coal.

Will the Commission outline its current progress in reducing the EU's reliance on fossil fuels in light of its long-term goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by at least 80% by 2015?

**Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(14 May 2013)**

The EU is making continued progress in decreasing its reliance on fossil fuels ⁽¹⁾.

This decreasing trend is projected to continue through the EU's policies to increase the share of renewables and to improve energy efficiency, including the fuel efficiency of vehicles via the regulations on cars and vans ⁽²⁾ and the recently proposed alternative fuels strategy ⁽³⁾. Also the phase-out of fossil fuel subsidies, which was one of the key milestones set for 2020 in the Resource Efficiency Roadmap ⁽⁴⁾, contributes to this end.

The Renewable Energy Directive adopted in 2009 sets binding targets for renewable energy. It focuses on achieving a 20% share of renewable energy in the EU overall energy consumption by 2020. Every Member State has to reach individual targets for the overall share of renewable energy in energy consumption.

According to the recent first Renewable Energy Progress Report ⁽⁵⁾, most Member States experienced significant growth in renewable energy consumption. 2010 figures indicate that the EU as a whole is on its trajectory towards the 2020 targets with a renewable energy share of 12.7%.

The 2050 Low-carbon and Energy Roadmaps ⁽⁶⁾, that explore routes up to 2050 which could enable the EU to deliver greenhouse gas reductions in line with the 80 to 95% target, show that energy efficiency and renewable energy will play a key role also beyond 2020. The recently published Green Paper on a 2030 framework for climate and energy policies ⁽⁷⁾ takes stock of the progress achieved so far.

According to projections by the IEA ⁽⁸⁾, the EU's dependency on imported oil and gas will however increase in the future unless the EU continues a strong policy on energy efficiency and renewable energy also beyond 2020.

⁽¹⁾ share of fossil fuels in gross EU-27 energy consumption reduced from 79% to 76% between 2005 and 2010 and its share in electricity generation from 55.3% to 51.5%.

⁽²⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32009R0443:EN:NOT> and <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONLEG:2011R0510:20120313:en:PDF>.

⁽³⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2013:0017:FIN:EN:PDF>.

⁽⁴⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/environment/resource_efficiency/pdf/com2011_571.pdf

⁽⁵⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/energy/renewables/reports/doc/com_2013_0175_res_en.pdf

⁽⁶⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52011DC0112:EN:NOT> and <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52011DC0885:EN:NOT>.

⁽⁷⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2013:0169:FIN:EN:PDF>.

⁽⁸⁾ International Energy Agency, World Energy Outlook 2012, p. 76.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003291/13
an die Kommission**

Jürgen Creutzmann (ALDE)

(21. März 2013)

Betrifft: Förderung von Betriebsaufspaltungen durch Strukturfonds in Rheinland-Pfalz

Das regionale Landesförderungsprogramm, das in Form einer Verwaltungsvorschrift des rheinland-pfälzischen Ministeriums für Wirtschaft, Klimaschutz, Energie und Landesplanung besteht und die Fördergrundlage für einen Teilbereich der einzelbetrieblichen Investitionsförderung in diesem Bundesland bildet, fördert nur steuerlich anerkannte Betriebsaufspaltungen. Alle anderen Formen einer tatsächlichen Betriebsaufspaltung (wie z. B. wenn die gleichen Gesellschafter an einer GmbH und an einer GmbH & Co. KG beteiligt sind und das wesentliche Betriebsvermögen sich in der GmbH befindet, während das operative Geschäft von der GmbH & Co. KG betrieben wird) werden nicht gefördert.

1. Können aus den Strukturfonds im Zeitraum 2007-2013 nur Unternehmen gefördert werden, wenn die Betriebsaufspaltung auch steuerlich anerkannt wird, oder können auch tatsächliche Betriebsaufspaltungen ohne steuerliche Anerkennung gefördert werden?
2. Steht die rheinland-pfälzische Verwaltungsvorschrift im Widerspruch zum EU-Recht?
3. Vorausgesetzt, die Landesregelung ist mit dem EU-Recht konform: Aus welchem Grund werden steuerlich anerkannte Betriebsaufspaltungen gefördert, wogegen Betriebsaufspaltungen, die steuerlich nicht anerkannt sind, die Förderung versagt wird?

Antwort von Herrn Hahn im Namen der Kommission

(8. Mai 2013)

Auf Nachfrage der Kommission hat die Verwaltungsbehörde mitgeteilt, dass die genannte Verwaltungsvorschrift sich an dem den Bundesländern durch die Gemeinschaftsaufgabe „Verbesserung der regionalen Wirtschaftsstruktur“ vorgegebenen Rahmen orientiert, die eine Förderung nur steuerlich anerkannter Betriebsaufspaltungen vorsieht. Die Gemeinschaftsaufgabe wurde bei der Kommission als Beihilfe notifiziert und fällt seit 2007 unter die Ausnahme nach der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1628/2006 vom 24. Oktober 2006 über die Anwendung der Artikel 87 und 88 EG-Vertrag auf regionale Investitionsbeihilfen der Mitgliedstaaten (ABl. L 302 vom 1.11.2006, S. 29).

Ein Widerspruch zu bestehendem EU-Recht ist nicht erkennbar, insbesondere vor dem Hintergrund, dass die Fördervoraussetzungen im Rahmen der Umsetzung der Strukturfonds entsprechend Art. 56 Abs. 4 der Verordnung 1083/2006 im Wesentlichen auf nationaler Ebene festgelegt werden.

Das Gebiet Rheinland-Pfalz unterliegt der Förderung durch die EU-Strukturfonds im Rahmen des Ziels „Regionale Wettbewerbsfähigkeit und Beschäftigung“ für den Zeitraum 2007-2013.

Die Verantwortung für die Projektauswahl, die Annahme und Prüfung von Anträgen sowie die Durchführung von Maßnahmen des operationellen Programms für den EFRE liegt ausschließlich bei der Verwaltungsbehörde des Programms. Im Falle des Landes Rheinland-Pfalz ist dies das Ministerium für Wirtschaft, Verkehr, Landwirtschaft und Weinbau. Der Ansprechpartner wäre hier Herr Dirk Rosar, der Ihnen für Auskünfte gern zur Verfügung steht:

Herr Rosar

Ministerium für Wirtschaft, Klimaschutz, Energie und Landesplanung Rheinland-Pfalz

Schliffstrasse 9

D-55116 Mainz

Tel.: +49 6131 162249

E-Mail: Dirk.Rosar@mwkel.rlp.de

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003291/13
to the Commission**

Jürgen Creutzmann (ALDE)

(21 March 2013)

Subject: Promotion of company split-ups by structural funds in Rhineland-Palatinate

The regional development programme involves an administrative provision by the State Ministry of Rhineland-Palatinate for Economic Affairs, Climate Protection, Energy and Regional Planning that supports some individual investment in this state, only promoting company split-ups recognised under the tax regime. No other form of actual company split-up is promoted (for example when the same shareholders are involved in both a limited liability company and a limited partnership with a limited liability company as general partner and the greater part of the operating capital is held in the limited liability company, while the operative business is run by the limited partnership with a limited liability company as general partner).

1. Can the structural funds available in the period 2007 to 2013 only be used to promote enterprises if the company split-up is also recognised under the tax regime, or can actual company split-ups not recognised under the tax regime also receive support?
2. Does the Rhineland-Palatinate administrative provision run contrary to EC law?
3. Assuming the state provision conforms to EC law: what is the reason for promoting company split-ups recognised under the tax regime while refusing support for company split-ups that do not have such recognition?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission

(8 May 2013)

Following an enquiry from the Commission, the managing authority has explained that the administrative provision in question is based on the framework imposed on the *Länder* by the joint Federal/*Land* scheme 'Improving regional economic structure' (*Verbesserung der regionalen Wirtschaftsstruktur*), which makes provision only for split-ups recognised under the tax regime. The scheme was notified to the Commission as an aid scheme and since 2007 has been covered by the exemption under Regulation (EC) No 1628/2006 of 24 October 2006 on the application of Articles 87 and 88 of the Treaty to national regional investment aid (OJ L 302, 1.11.2006, p. 29).

There is no obvious incompatibility with EC law, especially as the aid conditions are essentially laid down at national level as part of the implementation of the Structural Funds, in line with Article 56(4) of Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006.

The territory of Rhineland-Palatinate is eligible for aid from the EU Structural Funds under the 'Regional competitiveness and employment' objective for the period 2007-2013.

The responsibility for project selection, acceptance and examination of applications, and implementation of measures under the ERDF Operational Programme lies exclusively with the managing authority for the Programme. In the case of Rhineland-Palatinate, this is the Ministry of Economic Affairs, Transport, Agriculture and Viticulture. The person to contact would be Mr Dirk Rosar, who will be pleased to provide you with any information you require.

Mr Dirk Rosar
Rhineland-Palatinate Ministry of Economic Affairs, Transport, Agriculture and Viticulture
Schliffstrasse 9
D-55116 Mainz
Tel.: +49 6131 162249
E-mail: Dirk.Rosar@mwkel.rlp.de

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003292/13
to the Commission**

Alyn Smith (Verts/ALE)
(21 March 2013)

Subject: Homelessness and Europe 2020 strategy

Homelessness has ranked highly on the EU agenda, becoming a political priority since the European Consensus Conference held in December 2010. It is clear that the only way to eliminate this problem is for all Member States to work together and find a long-term solution.

Therefore, could the Commission outline what progress has been made since 2010 in order to meet the targets set in the Europe 2020 strategy?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(23 May 2013)

While the competence for tackling homelessness lies primarily with the Member States, the EU continues to provide its active support. Homelessness features highly on the SPC ⁽¹⁾'s agenda. In 2010 a landmark Consensus Conference was organised followed by several key events ⁽²⁾. In March 2013 the Irish Presidency took the initiative for an informal ministerial conference to discuss the potential for more EU cooperation on homelessness ⁽³⁾. The event confirmed that there is much interest for this.

The Europe 2020 strategy addresses homelessness through its broader efforts to reduce poverty and social exclusion. Prevention of evictions and provision of adequate and affordable housing are regarded as key areas for intervention. The Social Investment Package ⁽⁴⁾ contains a separate Staff Working Document on homelessness, which analyses the latest trends, identifies the most effective integrated policy responses and explains the EU's role in providing support.

The EU Structural Funds, in particular ESF ⁽⁵⁾, ERDF ⁽⁶⁾ and EAFRD ⁽⁷⁾, the EU's Food Distribution Programme and Progress, its successor Programme for Social Change and Innovation, are all designed to (co)finance policy actions that tackle homelessness in the Member States. The Commission proposes that 20% of the ESF budget in the 2014-2020 programming period is devoted to social inclusion and that integrated housing remains a priority for the ERDF. It has also proposed the establishment of a new Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived. The Commission will also continue to promote social innovation in this field through targeted calls for proposals. The Commission supports EU NGOs that defend the interest of the homeless ⁽⁸⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Social Protection Committee.

⁽²⁾ 11th European Meeting of People Experiencing Poverty in 2012 and the Annual Conventions of the Platform against Poverty and Social Inclusion.

⁽³⁾ <http://eu2013.ie/events/event-items/roundtablediscussionofeuinstitutionswithresponsibilityforhomelessness-20130301/>

⁽⁴⁾ See 'Confronting Homelessness in the European Union' (CSWD (2013) 42 of 20 February 2013),

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=fr&catId=1044&newsId=1807&furtherNews=yes>

⁽⁵⁾ European Social Fund.

⁽⁶⁾ European Regional Development Fund.

⁽⁷⁾ European Agriculture Fund for Regional Development.

⁽⁸⁾ See e.g. <http://www.feantsa.org/>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003293/13
to the Commission
Alyn Smith (Verts/ALE)
(21 March 2013)**

Subject: Homelessness statistics in the EU

Swedish Government sources have recently reported that approximately 3 500 people are sleeping on the streets in the city of Gothenburg ⁽¹⁾. Recent statistics reported by the Scottish Government in January 2013 have shown a significant fall of around 13% in the number of people assessed as homeless in Scotland. Nevertheless, at the same time, studies in England have shown a rise of 25% in homelessness over the past three years.

The difficulties in obtaining accurate figures are no doubt well known to the Commission and will have been experienced by other Member States. In order to effectively eradicate the problem of homelessness, we must ensure that no one falls through the cracks and that all of these people who are in need are accounted for.

Therefore, could the Commission clarify what steps have been taken to compile comparative statistics for levels of homelessness for the whole of the European Union?

Further, what information does the Commission already possess on the extent of homelessness throughout the EU?

**Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(15 May 2013)**

Eurostat statistical activities on issues related to homelessness are unfortunately rather limited at European level. The only source of information is the population and housing census of 2011. Commission Regulation (EU) No 519/2010 ⁽²⁾ of 16 June 2010 adopting the programme of the statistical data and of the metadata for population and housing censuses provided for by Regulation (EC) No 763/2008 ⁽³⁾ of the European Parliament and of the Council foresees the provision of data on homelessness.

The Member States will have to provide data on the number of primary homeless persons (living in the street without shelter) and secondary homeless persons (persons moving frequently between temporary accommodation) in the Member States.

The implementing measure provides the framework for much more detailed data on the homeless:

- Data on the primary homeless broken down by 'Sex' and 'Age' at NUTS 2 and NUTS 3 geographical level. More detailed breakdowns are possible (e.g. education, marital status, size of the locality, etc.);
- Data on all homeless and persons living in non-conventional housing units (huts, cabins, caravans, etc.) broken down by 'Sex', 'Age' and 'Size of the locality' for the NUTS 2 geographical level.

The first results from the population censuses are being progressively released at national level but not yet officially to Eurostat. The principle route for the publication of the EU census programme data will be via the 'Census Hub' that will enable users to define flexible and detailed outputs to meet particular needs. The Census Hub will be available in 2014. Eurostat is also introducing a system to disseminate the main census figures before the introduction of the Census Hub.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p016jv9z>

⁽²⁾ OJ L 151, 17.6.2010, p. 1.

⁽³⁾ Regulation (EC) No 763/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 9 July 2008 on population and housing censuses (OJ L 218, 13.8.2008, p. 14).

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003294/13
a la Comisión**

Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Nadja Hirsch (ALDE), Raúl Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), David Martin (S&D), Dan Jørgensen (S&D), Pavel Poc (S&D), Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D) y Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE)
(21 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Comité de gestión conjunta del Acuerdo internacional en materia de captura no cruel (continuación a la pregunta escrita E-010289/2012)

El 22 de enero de 2013, el Comisario Janez Potočnik respondió a la pregunta escrita E-010289/2012, presentada por Andrea Zanoni y Nadja Hirsch, explicando que la Comisión había comenzado a negociar con los Estados Unidos con el objetivo de alcanzar en este asunto una solución aceptable para ambas partes.

Los Estados Unidos han pedido más tiempo para examinar el informe ⁽¹⁾ realizado por la organización italiana Lega Anti Vivisezione ⁽²⁾ —en colaboración con Born Free USA ⁽³⁾ y Respect for Animals ⁽⁴⁾—, que demuestra que el uso de cepos es una práctica común, regulada y autorizada en los Estados Unidos.

En la Unión Europea, el uso de cepos está prohibido en virtud del Reglamento (CEE) n° 3254/91 del Consejo. Esta prohibición se extiende también a la importación a la Unión de pieles y productos manufacturados de determinadas especies animales salvajes originarias de países que utilizan para su captura cepos o métodos no conformes a las normas internacionales de captura no cruel.

La firma del Acta aprobada relativa a normas de captura no cruel ⁽⁵⁾ no puede servir de excusa para utilizar libremente métodos que, por su diseño y funcionamiento, quedan recogidos por completo en la definición establecida en el artículo 1 del Reglamento (CEE) n° 3254/91 del Consejo.

La información acerca de los avances hechos hasta la fecha en materia de la gestión de las mejores prácticas de captura no cruel que presentó la delegación de los Estados Unidos en la cuarta reunión del comité de gestión conjunta del Acuerdo internacional en materia de captura no cruel no ha bastado para demostrar que los Estados Unidos hayan prohibido el uso de cepos, tal y como se hizo en la EU hace veinte años.

Los ciudadanos europeos están muy preocupados por los sufrimientos innecesarios de los animales debido al uso de métodos de captura inhumanos, como los cepos.

1. ¿Está de acuerdo la Comisión con que ninguna solución que se alcance con los Estados Unidos debería permitir excepción alguna a la prohibición del uso de cepos de la UE?
2. De acuerdo con el mencionado Reglamento del Consejo que prohíbe el uso de cepos, ¿debería la Comisión suspender la importación de pieles, tanto en bruto como curtidas o acabadas, de animales salvajes que hayan sido capturados mediante este método?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión

(30 de abril de 2013)

En la cuarta reunión del Comité de gestión conjunta del Acuerdo internacional en materia de captura no cruel, celebrada en diciembre de 2012, la Comisión Europea señaló a la atención de la delegación de los Estados Unidos, en nombre de la UE, el informe ⁽⁶⁾ de la organización italiana Lega Anti Vivisezione (elaborado en colaboración con Born Free USA y Respect for Animals), en el que se denunciaba que el uso de cepos era una práctica muy extendida y autorizada en los Estados Unidos.

La delegación de los Estados Unidos está investigando el tema e informará de la situación a la Comisión en las próximas semanas.

⁽¹⁾ IAHTS EC-USA — Evidences of Violations (2012):
http://www.lav.it/uploads/90/45406_IAHTS_EC_USA_Evidences_of_violations_LAV_complaint.pdf (en inglés).

⁽²⁾ <http://www.lav.it/>

⁽³⁾ <http://www.bornfreeusa.org/>

⁽⁴⁾ <http://www.respectforanimals.co.uk/home/>

⁽⁵⁾ DO L 219 de 7.8.1998, p. 26.

⁽⁶⁾ IAHTS EC-USA — Evidences of Violations (2012):
http://www.lav.it/uploads/90/45406_IAHTS_EC_USA_Evidences_of_violations_LAV_complaint.pdf

En la Unión Europea, el uso de cepos ha sido prohibido por el Reglamento (CEE) n° 3254/91 del Consejo. Dicho Reglamento también prohíbe importar en la EU pieles y productos manufacturados de determinadas especies animales salvajes originarias de países que utilizan para su captura cepos o métodos no conformes a las normas internacionales de captura no cruel.

La Comisión está de acuerdo con que ninguna solución que se alcance con los Estados Unidos debe permitir excepción alguna a la prohibición del uso de cepos. Sin embargo, toda medida debe estar basada en pruebas, por lo que la Comisión no puede suspender las importaciones de pieles antes de que finalice la investigación que está en marcha y de que se haya confirmado la utilización de métodos de captura inhumanos en los Estados Unidos.

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-003294/13

Komisi

Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Nadja Hirsch (ALDE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), David Martin (S&D), Dan Jørgensen (S&D), Pavel Poc (S&D), Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D) a Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE)
(21. března 2013)

Předmět: Společná výkonná rada Mezinárodní dohody o normách humánního odchytu do pastí (IAHTS) (otázka navazuje na otázku k písemnému zodpovězení E-010289/2012)

Dne 22. ledna 2013 komisař Janez Potočnik ve své odpovědi na otázku k písemnému zodpovězení E-010289/2012, již předložili Andrea Zanoni a Nadja Hirsch, uvedl, že Komise zahájila s USA konzultace s cílem dosáhnout oboustranně přijatelného řešení tohoto problému.

USA požádaly o pozastavení jednání po určitou dobu určenou k přezkoumání zprávy⁽¹⁾ vypracované italskou organizací Lega Anti Vivisezione⁽²⁾ ve spolupráci s organizacemi Born Free USA⁽³⁾ a Respect for Animals⁽⁴⁾, která ukazuje, že nášlapné pasti jsou v USA široce uplatňovanou, regulovanou a povolenou praxí.

V Evropské unii využívání nášlapných pastí zakazuje nařízení Rady (EHS) č. 3254/91. Tento zákaz se rovněž vztahuje na dovoz kožešin a finálních výrobků z některých druhů volně žijících zvířat pocházejících ze zemí, v nichž byla zvířata odchycena prostřednictvím nášlapných pastí nebo jiných metod chytání do pastí, které nedodrží mezínárodní standardy upravující tyto praktiky, do EU.

Podpis dohodnutého protokolu o normách humánního lovu do pastí⁽⁵⁾ nelze považovat za záminku umožňující volně využívat zařízení, která svou konstrukcí a fungováním plně spadají do působnosti definice stanovené článkem 1 nařízení Rady (EHS) č. 3254/91.

Informace, jež na čtvrtém zasedání společné výkonné rady IAHTS předložila delegace USA ohledně pokroku, kterého bylo doposud dosaženo v rámci správy osvědčených postupů chytání do pastí, nepostačují k prokázání toho, že USA zakázaly využívání nášlapných pastí (jak učinila EU již před více než 20 lety).

Evropští občané jsou velmi znepokojeni zbytečným utrpením zvířat, které je výsledkem používání nehumánních zařízení na odchyt zvířat, jako jsou např. nášlapné pasti.

1. Souhlasí Komise s tím, že žádné řešení, na němž se můžeme s USA shodnout, by nemělo umožňovat výjimky z unijního zákazu využívání nášlapných pastí?
2. Neměla by Komise pozastavit dovoz kožešiny (nevydělané či vydělané a také konečných výrobků z kožešiny) pocházející z volně žijících zvířat odchycených tímto způsobem, v souladu s výše uvedeným nařízením Rady zakazujícím využívání nášlapných pastí?

Odpověď komisaře Potočnika jménem Komise

(30. dubna 2013)

Na čtvrtém zasedání společné výkonné rady IAHTS v prosinci 2012 upozornila Evropská komise (jménem EU) delegaci USA na zprávu⁽⁶⁾, kterou vypracovala italská organizace Lega Anti Vivisezione (ve spolupráci s organizacemi Born Free USA a Respect for Animals) a v níž se tvrdí, že používání nášlapných pastí je v USA široce uplatňovanou a povolenou praxí.

Delegace USA v současné době tuto záležitost přezkoumává a měla by Komisi informovat v příštích týdnech.

⁽¹⁾ IAHTS ES-USA – Důkazy porušování (2012), v angličtině na adrese:
http://www.lav.it/uploads/90/45406_IAHTS_EC_USA_Evidences_of_violations_LAV_complaint.pdf

⁽²⁾ www.lav.it

⁽³⁾ <http://www.bornfreeusa.org/>

⁽⁴⁾ <http://www.respectforanimals.co.uk/home/>

⁽⁵⁾ Úř. věst. L 219, 7.8.1998, s. 26.

⁽⁶⁾ IAHTS EC-USA – Důkazy porušování (2012):
http://www.lav.it/uploads/90/45406_IAHTS_EC_USA_Evidences_of_violations_LAV_complaint.pdf

V Evropské unii je používání nášlapných pastí zakázáno nařízením Rady (EHS) č. 3254/91. Tato opatření rovněž zakazuje dovážet do EU kožešiny a finální výrobky z některých druhů volně žijících zvířat pocházejících ze zemí, v nichž byla zvířata odchycena prostřednictvím nášlapných pastí nebo jiných metod chytání do pastí, které nedodržují mezinárodní standardy upravující tyto praktiky.

Komise souhlasí s tím, že jakékoli řešení dosažené s USA by nemělo umožnit žádné výjimky z unijního zákazu používání nášlapných pastí. Komise však nemůže pozastavit dovoz kožešin předtím, než bude vyšetřovací proces ukončen a než budou nehumánní metody lovu do pastí v USA potvrzeny, protože veškerá opatření tohoto charakteru by měla být založena na důkazech.

(Dansk udgave)

**Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-003294/13
til Kommissionen**

Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Nadja Hirsch (ALDE), Raúl Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), David Martin (S&D), Dan Jørgensen (S&D), Pavel Poc (S&D), Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D) og Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE)
(21. marts 2013)

Om: Den Fælles Forvaltningskomité for Aftale om Internationale Standarder for Human Fældefangst (IAHTS) (opfølgning af forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-010289/2012)

Den 22. januar 2013 besvarede kommissær Janez Potočnik forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-010289/2012 indgivet af Andrea Zanoni og Nadja Hirsch, idet han oplyste, at Kommissionen havde indledt drøftelser med USA for at nå frem til en gensidigt acceptabel løsning på dette spørgsmål.

USA har bedt om tid til at gennemgå rapporten ⁽¹⁾ fremsendt af LAV ⁽²⁾ (i samarbejde med Born Free USA ⁽³⁾) og Respect for Animals ⁽⁴⁾), der viser, at brugen af rævesakse er en udbredt, reguleret og tilladt praksis i USA.

I Den Europæiske Union er brugen af rævesakse blevet forbudt ved Rådets forordning (EØF) nr. 3254/91. Forbuddet omfatter ligeledes indførsel i EU af skind af og varer fremstillet på basis af visse vilde dyrearter med oprindelse i lande, der anvender rævesakse eller fangstmetoder, der ikke opfylder de internationale standarder for human fældefangst.

Undertegnelsen af det godkendte protokollat (EUT L219/26 af 7. august 1998) ⁽⁵⁾ kan ikke give mulighed for frit at bruge redskaber, der ved deres udformning og funktion fuldt ud er omfattet af definitionen indeholdt i artikel 1 i Rådets forordning (EØF) nr. 3254/91.

De oplysninger, som USA's delegation forelagde på det fjerde møde i Den Fælles Forvaltningskomité for IAHTS om de fremskridt, der hidtil var blevet gjort med hensyn til bedste praksis for forvaltning af fældefangst, var ikke tilstrækkelige til at vise, at USA har forbudt brugen af rævesakse (hvilket blev forbudt for over 20 år siden i EU).

EU-borgerne er meget bekymrede over dyrs unødvendige lidelse på grund af inhumane fangstredskaber såsom rævesakse.

1. Er Kommissionen enig i, at EU's forbud mod brugen af rævesakse ikke bør fraviges, uanset hvilken løsning man når frem til med USA?
2. Bør Kommissionen ikke i overensstemmelse med Rådets ovennævnte forordning om forbud mod rævesakse suspendere importen af skind (rå, farvede eller forarbejdede) af vilde dyr, der er fanget på denne måde?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Janez Potočnik
(30. april 2013)

På det fjerde møde i Den Fælles Forvaltningskomité for IAHTS i december 2012 gjorde Europa-Kommissionen (på EU's vegne) USA's delegation opmærksom på den rapport ⁽⁶⁾, som den italienske dyreværnsforening LAV (i samarbejde med Born Free USA og Respect for Animals) har udarbejdet, og som indeholder påstande om, at det i USA er en udbredt og tilladt praksis at bruge rævesakse.

USA's delegation er i øjeblikket ved at undersøge spørgsmålet og ventes at melde tilbage til Kommissionen i løbet af de kommende uger.

I Den Europæiske Union er brugen af rævesakse forbudt ved Rådets forordning (EØF) nr. 3254/91. Forbuddet omfatter ligeledes indførsel i EU af skind af og varer fremstillet på basis af visse vilde dyrearter med oprindelse i lande, der anvender rævesakse eller fangstmetoder, der ikke opfylder de internationale standarder for human fældefangst.

⁽¹⁾ IAHTS EC-USA — Evidences of Violations (2012):
http://www.lav.it/uploads/90/45406_IAHTS_EC_USA_Evidences_of_violations_LAV_complaint.pdf

⁽²⁾ LAV Lega Anti Vivisezione, Italian non profit organisation: www.lav.it

⁽³⁾ <http://www.bornfreeusa.org/>

⁽⁴⁾ <http://www.respectforanimals.co.uk/home/>

⁽⁵⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:1998:070:0002:0190:DA:PDF>

⁽⁶⁾ IAHTS EC-USA — Evidences of Violations (2012):
http://www.lav.it/uploads/90/45406_IAHTS_EC_USA_Evidences_of_violations_LAV_complaint.pdf

Kommissionen er enig i, at EU's forbud mod brugen af rævesakse ikke bør fraviges, uanset hvilken løsning man når frem til med USA. Enhver foranstaltning (herunder suspension) bør imidlertid være baseret på beviser, og Kommissionen kan ikke suspendere importen af skind, før undersøgelsen er afsluttet, og før det er bekræftet, at der anvendes inhumane fældefangstmetoder i USA.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003294/13

an die Kommission

Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Nadja Hirsch (ALDE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), David Martin (S&D), Dan Jørgensen (S&D), Pavel Poc (S&D), Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D) und Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE)

(21. März 2013)

Betrifft: Gemeinsamer Verwaltungsausschuss zum Übereinkommen über internationale humane Fangnormen (IAHTS) (Anschlussfrage zu Anfrage E-010289/2012)

Am 22. Januar 2013 antwortete Kommissionsmitglied Janez Potočnik auf die Anfrage E-010289/2012 der Abgeordneten Andrea Zanoni und Nadja Hirsch, dass die Kommission Konsultationen mit den USA aufgenommen habe, um zu einer für beide Seiten akzeptablen Lösung zu gelangen.

Die USA haben sich Zeit erbeten, um den Bericht ⁽¹⁾ der LAV ⁽²⁾ (erstellt in Zusammenarbeit mit Born Free USA ⁽³⁾ und Respect for Animals ⁽⁴⁾) prüfen zu können, in dem aufgezeigt wird, dass die Verwendung von Tellereisen in den USA eine weit verbreitete, gesetzlich geregelte und zulässige Praxis ist.

In der Europäischen Union ist die Verwendung von Tellereisen mit der Verordnung (EWG) Nr. 3254/91 des Rates verboten worden. Das Verbot schließt die Einfuhr von Pelzen und Waren von bestimmten Wildtierarten aus Ländern, die Tellereisen oder den internationalen humanen Fangnormen nicht entsprechende Fangmethoden anwenden, in die EU ein.

Die Unterzeichnung der Vereinbarten Niederschrift (ABl. L 219 vom 7. August 1998, S. 26) ⁽⁵⁾ darf nicht dazu genutzt werden, Geräte, die hinsichtlich ihrer Konzeption und Funktionsweise uneingeschränkt der Begriffsbestimmung in Artikel 1 der Verordnung (EWG) Nr. 3254/91 des Rates entsprechen, ungehindert zu verwenden.

Die Angaben der Delegation der USA in der vierten Sitzung des Gemeinsamen Verwaltungsausschusses des IAHTS zu den bisher erzielten Fortschritten im Hinblick auf die besten Verfahrensweisen beim Fallenstellen waren nicht ausreichend, um den Nachweis zu erbringen, dass die USA die Verwendung von Tellereisen verboten haben (wie es in der EU seit über 20 Jahren der Fall ist).

Die Bürger Europas sind sehr besorgt über das unnötige Leiden der Tiere wegen inhumaner Fangvorrichtungen wie Tellereisen.

1. Teilt die Kommission die Auffassung, dass eine mit den USA erzielte Lösung auf keinen Fall Ausnahmen von dem in der EU geltenden Verbot von Tellereisen vorsehen sollte?
2. Sollte die Kommission nicht gemäß der obengenannten Verordnung des Rates zum Verbot von Tellereisen die Einfuhr von (rohen, gegerbten oder fertigen) Pelzfellen auf diese Weise gefangener Wildtiere aussetzen?

Antwort von Herrn Potočnik im Namen der Kommission

(30. April 2013)

Die Europäische Kommission hat (im Namen der EU) die US-Delegation in der vierten Sitzung des Gemeinsamen Verwaltungsausschusses des IAHTS im Dezember 2012 über den von der italienischen „Lega Anti Vivisezione“ (in Zusammenarbeit mit „Born Free USA“ und „Respect for Animals“) verfassten Bericht ⁽⁶⁾ in Kenntnis gesetzt, wonach die Verwendung von Tellereisen in den USA eine weit verbreitete und zulässige Praxis ist.

Die US-Delegation prüft die Angelegenheit derzeit und dürfte der Kommission in den nächsten Wochen Bericht erstatten.

⁽¹⁾ IAHTS EC-USA — Evidences of Violations (2012):
http://www.lav.it/uploads/90/45406_IAHTS_EC_USA_Evidences_of_violations_LAV_complaint.pdf
⁽²⁾ www.lav.it
⁽³⁾ <http://www.bornfreeusa.org/>
⁽⁴⁾ <http://www.respectforanimals.co.uk/home/>
⁽⁵⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:1998:219:0026:0037:DE:PDF>
⁽⁶⁾ IAHTS EC-USA — Evidences of Violations (2012):
http://www.lav.it/uploads/90/45406_IAHTS_EC_USA_Evidences_of_violations_LAV_complaint.pdf

In der Europäischen Union ist die Verwendung von Tellereisen aufgrund der Verordnung (EWG) Nr. 3254/91 des Rates untersagt. Das Verbot schließt auch den EU-Import von Pelzen und Waren von bestimmten Wildtierarten aus Ländern ein, die Tellereisen oder den internationalen humanen Fangnormen nicht entsprechende Fangmethoden anwenden.

Die Kommission teilt die Auffassung, dass eine mit den USA erzielte Lösung auf keinen Fall Ausnahmen von dem in der EU geltenden Verbot von Tellereisen ermöglichen sollte. Jede Maßnahme sollte allerdings auf Fakten beruhen, und die Kommission kann die Einfuhr von Pelzen nicht aussetzen, solange die Untersuchung noch andauert und sich die Anwendung inhumaner Fangmethoden in den USA nicht bestätigt haben sollte.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003294/13
alla Commissione**

Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Nadja Hirsch (ALDE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), David Martin (S&D), Dan Jørgensen (S&D), Pavel Poc (S&D), Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D) e Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE)
(21 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Comitato congiunto di gestione dell'accordo internazionale sulle norme relative a metodi di cattura non crudeli (seguito dell'interrogazione E-010289/2012)

Il 22 gennaio 2013, il Commissario Janez Potočnik ha risposto all'interrogazione scritta E-010289/2012 presentata da Andrea Zanoni e Nadja Hirsch, indicando che la Commissione aveva avviato una consultazione con gli Stati Uniti al fine di conseguire una soluzione al problema che fosse accettabile per entrambe le parti.

Gli Stati Uniti hanno chiesto del tempo per esaminare la relazione ⁽¹⁾ presentata dalla Lega anti-vivisezione italiana ⁽²⁾ (in collaborazione con Born Free USA ⁽³⁾ e Respect for Animals ⁽⁴⁾) che dimostra che l'uso di tagliole rappresenta una pratica diffusa, regolamentata e autorizzata negli Stati Uniti.

Nell'Unione europea l'uso di tagliole è vietato ai sensi del regolamento (CEE) n. 3254/91 del Consiglio. Il divieto riguarda anche l'importazione nell'UE di pellicce e di prodotti manifatturati di talune specie di animali selvatici originari di paesi che utilizzano per la loro cattura tagliole o metodi non conformi alle norme concordate a livello internazionale in materia di cattura mediante trappole senza crudeltà.

La firma del verbale concordato sulle norme relative a metodi di cattura non crudeli ⁽⁵⁾ non può essere considerata una scusa per usare liberamente sistemi che, per la loro concezione e il loro funzionamento, rientrano appieno nella definizione di cui all'articolo 1 del regolamento (CEE) n. 3254/91 del Consiglio.

Le informazioni presentate dalla delegazione statunitense, in occasione della quarta riunione del comitato congiunto di gestione dell'accordo internazionale sulle norme relative ai metodi di cattura non crudeli, sui progressi conseguiti finora in termini di migliori prassi in materia di gestione dei metodi di cattura non sono state sufficienti per dimostrare che gli Stati Uniti hanno vietato l'uso di tagliole (come è invece avvenuto nell'UE oltre vent'anni fa).

I cittadini europei sono molto preoccupati in merito alle inutili sofferenze causate agli animali da sistemi di cattura crudeli come le tagliole.

1. Concorda la Commissione con il fatto che qualsiasi soluzione conseguita con gli Stati Uniti non dovrebbe consentire alcuna deroga al divieto vigente nell'Unione in relazione all'uso di tagliole?
2. In linea con il suddetto regolamento del Consiglio che vieta l'uso di tagliole, non dovrebbe la Commissione sospendere le importazioni di pellicce (grezze, conciate o finite) di animali selvatici catturati in tal modo?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(30 aprile 2013)

Alla quarta riunione del comitato di gestione comune dell'Accordo internazionale sulle norme relative a metodi di cattura non crudeli (IAHTS) nel mese di dicembre 2012, la Commissione europea ha sottoposto all'attenzione della delegazione statunitense, per conto dell'UE, la relazione ⁽⁶⁾ presentata dalla Lega antivivisezione italiana (in collaborazione con Born Free USA e Respect for Animals), che dimostra che l'uso di tagliole rappresenta una pratica diffusa, regolamentata e autorizzata negli Stati Uniti.

La delegazione degli USA sta esaminando la questione e dovrebbe riferire alla Commissione nelle prossime settimane.

⁽¹⁾ IAHTS EC-USA — Evidences of Violations (2012):
http://www.lav.it/uploads/90/45406_IAHTS_EC_USA_Evidences_of_violations_LAV_complaint.pdf

⁽²⁾ www.lav.it

⁽³⁾ <http://www.bornfreeusa.org/>

⁽⁴⁾ <http://www.respectforanimals.co.uk/home/>

⁽⁵⁾ GU L 219 del 7.8.1998, pag. 26.

⁽⁶⁾ IAHTS CE-USA — Prove di violazioni (2012):
http://www.lav.it/uploads/90/45406_IAHTS_EC_USA_Evidences_of_violations_LAV_complaint.pdf

Il regolamento (CEE) n. 3254/91 del Consiglio vieta l'uso di tagliole nell'Unione europea. Il divieto riguarda anche l'importazione nell'UE di pellicce e di prodotti manufatti di alcune specie di animali selvatici originari di paesi che utilizzano per la loro cattura tagliole o metodi non conformi alle norme concordate a livello internazionale in materia di cattura mediante trappole senza crudeltà.

La Commissione concorda che la soluzione raggiunta con gli USA non dovrebbe consentire deroghe al divieto imposto dall'UE sull'utilizzo di tagliole. Tuttavia, tali misure devono essere basate su prove concrete e la Commissione non può sospendere le importazioni di pellicce finché le indagini non sono terminate e finché non è dimostrato che negli USA si impiegano metodi di cattura crudeli.

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003294/13
aan de Commissie**

**Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Nadja Hirsch (ALDE), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), David Martin (S&D),
Dan Jørgensen (S&D), Pavel Poc (S&D), Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D) en Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE)**
(21 maart 2013)

Betref: Gezamenlijk beheerscomité van de Internationale overeenkomst over normen voor humane vallen (IAHTS) (follow-up van schriftelijke vraag E-010289/2012)

Op 22 januari 2013 vermeldde Commissielid Janez Potočnik in haar antwoord op schriftelijke vraag E-010289/2012 van Andrea Zanoni en Nadja Hirsch dat de Commissie in overleg met de VS was getreden om voor deze kwestie een wederzijds aanvaardbare oplossing te vinden.

De VS had om tijd gevraagd voor de bestudering van het verslag ⁽¹⁾ van de Italiaanse Lega Anti Vivisezione ⁽²⁾ (opgesteld in samenwerking met Born Free USA ⁽³⁾ and Respect for Animals ⁽⁴⁾) dat aantoont dat het gebruik van wildklemmen een wijd verbreide, gereguleerde en toegestane praktijk in de VS is.

In de Europese Unie is het gebruik van wildklemmen op grond van Verordening (EEG) nr. 3254/91 van de Raad verboden. Het verbod geldt ook voor de invoer naar de EU van pelzen en verwerkte goederen van bepaalde diersoorten die afkomstig zijn uit landen waar de dieren worden gevangen met wildklemmen of andere vangstmethoden die niet voldoen aan de internationale humane wildvangnormen.

De ondertekening van de goedgekeurde notulen inzake normen voor humane vallen ⁽⁵⁾ kan niet worden beschouwd als excuus om vrijelijk gebruik te maken van apparaten die op grond van hun ontwerp en werkingwijze geheel vallen onder de definitie zoals bedoeld in artikel 1 van Verordening van de Raad (EEC) nr. 3254/91.

De informatie die de delegatie van de VS naar de vierde bijeenkomst van het Gezamenlijk beheerscomité van de IAHTS heeft verstrekt over de vooruitgang die tot dusver is geboekt op het gebied van de beste praktijken voor het beheer van vallen heeft niet voldoende aangetoond dat de VS het gebruik van wildklemmen heeft uitgebannen (zoals meer dan 20 jaar geleden in de EU werd gedaan).

De burgers in Europa maken zich ernstige zorgen over onnodig lijden van dieren wegens inhumane vangstmethoden zoals het gebruik van wildklemmen.

1. Is de Commissie het ermee eens dat iedere oplossing die met de VS wordt bereikt geen enkele uitzondering op het EU-verbod op het wildklemgebruik mag inhouden?
2. Dient de Commissie overeenkomstig de bovengenoemde verordening van de Raad waarbij het gebruik van wildklemmen wordt verboden de invoer van pelzen (onbewerkt, gelooïd of bewerkt) van op deze wijze gevangen wilde dieren niet op te schorten?

Antwoord van de heer Potočnik namens de Commissie

(30 april 2013)

De Europese Commissie heeft (namens de EU) tijdens de vierde bijeenkomst van het Gezamenlijk beheerscomité van de internationale overeenkomst over normen voor humane vallen (IAHTS) het verslag ⁽⁶⁾ van de Italiaanse Lega Anti Vivisezione (in samenwerking met Born Free USA and Respect for Animals) bij de delegatie van de VS onder de aandacht gebracht waarin de VS ervan beschuldigd wordt dat het gebruik van wildklemmen een wijdverbreide en toegestane praktijk zou zijn.

De delegatie van de VS onderzoekt dit onderwerp momenteel en zal hier in de komende weken verslag van uitbrengen aan de Commissie.

⁽¹⁾ IAHTS EC-USA — Evidences of Violations (2012):
http://www.lav.it/uploads/90/45406_IAHTS_EC_USA_Evidences_of_violations_LAV_complaint.pdf

⁽²⁾ www.lav.it

⁽³⁾ <http://www.bornfreeusa.org/>

⁽⁴⁾ <http://www.respectforanimals.co.uk/home/>

⁽⁵⁾ PB L 219 van 7.8.1998, blz. 26.

⁽⁶⁾ IAHTS EC-USA — Evidences of Violations (2012):
http://www.lav.it/uploads/90/45406_IAHTS_EC_USA_Evidences_of_violations_LAV_complaint.pdf

In de Europese Unie is het gebruik van wildklemmen verboden bij Verordening (EEG) nr. 3254/91 van de Raad. Onder het verbod valt ook de invoer in de EU van pelzen en goederen die vervaardigd zijn van bepaalde in het wild levende diersoorten uit landen waar gebruik wordt gemaakt van de wildklem of andere vangmethoden die niet voldoen aan de normen voor humane vangst met behulp van vallen.

De Commissie is van mening dat een oplossing die met de VS wordt bereikt geen uitzondering mag vormen op het EU-verbod op het wildklemgebruik. Iedere maatregel zou gebaseerd moeten zijn op bewijs, en de Commissie kan de invoer van pelzen niet opschorten voor het einde van het onderzoeksproces en voordat de inhumane vangstmethoden in de VS bevestigd zijn.

(Versiunea în limba română)

**Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-003294/13
adresată Comisiei**

Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Nadja Hirsch (ALDE), Raúl Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), David Martin (S&D), Dan Jørgensen (S&D), Pavel Poc (S&D), Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D) și Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE)
(21 martie 2013)

Subiect: Comitetul mixt de gestionare a Acordului internațional asupra standardelor pentru vânătoria cu capcane fără cruzime (IAHTS) (continuare la întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-010289/2012)

La 22 ianuarie 2013, comisarul Janez Potočnik a răspuns întrebării cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-010289/2012, adresate de Andrea Zanoni și Nadja Hirsch, precizând că Comisia a inițiat consultări cu SUA pentru a ajunge la o soluție acceptabilă pentru ambele părți în ceea ce privește această chestiune.

SUA a solicitat timp pentru a examina raportul ⁽¹⁾ elaborat de asociația Lega Anti Vivisezione ⁽²⁾ din Italia (în colaborare cu Born Free USA ⁽³⁾ și Respect for Animals ⁽⁴⁾), conform căruia utilizarea capcanelor cu pedală este o practică răspândită, reglementată și autorizată în SUA.

În Uniunea Europeană, utilizarea capcanelor cu pedală este interzisă de Regulamentul Consiliului (CEE) nr. 3254/91. Interdicția include, de asemenea, importul în UE de blănuri și produse prelucrate de la anumite specii de animale sălbatice originare din țări care le capturează folosind capcane cu pedală sau alte metode în dezacord cu standardele internaționale de vânătoria cu capcane fără cruzime.

Semnarea procesului-verbal agreat privind standardele pentru vânătoria cu capcane fără cruzime ⁽⁵⁾ nu poate fi considerată drept pretext pentru a utiliza instrumente care, ca urmare a modului de creare și funcționare, intră pe deplin în domeniul de aplicare al definiției prevăzute la articolul 1 din Regulamentul Consiliului (CEE) nr. 3254/91.

Informațiile prezentate de delegația SUA la cea de-a patra reuniune a Comitetului mixt de gestionare a IAHTS privind progresele înregistrate până în prezent în ceea ce privește cele mai bune practici de gestionare a vânătorii cu capcane nu sunt suficiente pentru a demonstra că SUA a interzis vânătoria cu capcane cu pedală (astfel cum a făcut-o UE cu peste 20 de ani în urmă).

Cetățenii europeni sunt foarte preocupați de suferința inutilă a animalelor cauzată de instrumentele de capturare cu cruzime, cum ar fi capcanele cu pedală.

1. Este Comisia de acord cu faptul că soluția convenită cu SUA, oricare ar fi aceasta, nu ar trebui să permită excepții de la interdicția UE privind utilizarea capcanelor cu pedală?
2. În conformitate cu regulamentul Consiliului menționat mai sus, prin care se interzice utilizarea capcanelor cu pedală, nu ar trebui Comisia să suspende importul de blănuri (neprelucrate, tăbăcite sau finisate) provenite de la animale sălbatice capturate în acest mod?

Răspuns dat de domnul Potočnik în numele Comisiei
(30 aprilie 2013)

În cadrul celei de-a patra reuniuni a Comitetului mixt de gestionare a IAHTS din decembrie 2012, Comisia Europeană (în numele UE) a adus în atenția delegației SUA raportul ⁽⁶⁾ prezentat de asociația Lega Anti Vivisezione din Italia (în colaborare cu asociațiile Born Free SUA și Respect for Animals) care conține afirmații privind faptul că utilizarea capcanelor cu pedală este o practică răspândită și autorizată în SUA.

În prezent, delegația SUA investighează problema și ar trebui să raporteze Comisiei în următoarele săptămâni.

⁽¹⁾ IAHTS CE-SUA — Probe privind încălcări (Evidences of Violations) (2012):
http://www.lav.it/uploads/90/45406_IAHTS_EC_USA_Evidences_of_violations_LAV_complaint.pdf

⁽²⁾ www.lav.it

⁽³⁾ <http://www.bornfreeusa.org/>

⁽⁴⁾ <http://www.respectforanimals.co.uk/home/>

⁽⁵⁾ JO L 219, 7.8.1998, p. 26.

⁽⁶⁾ IAHTS EC-USA — Evidences of Violations (IAHTS CE-SUA — Dovezi de încălcare) (2012):
http://www.lav.it/uploads/90/45406_IAHTS_EC_USA_Evidences_of_violations_LAV_complaint.pdf

În Uniunea Europeană, utilizarea capcanelor cu pedală este interzisă prin Regulamentul (CEE) nr. 3254/91 al Consiliului. Interdicția include, de asemenea, importul în UE de blănuri și bunuri fabricate din anumite specii de animale sălbatice originare din țările în care animalele sunt capturate cu ajutorul capcanelor cu pedală sau cu ajutorul altor metode de vânătoare cu capcane care nu îndeplinesc standardele internaționale pentru vânătoarea cu capcane cu suferință minimă.

Comisia este de acord că nicio soluție convenită cu SUA nu ar trebui să permită excepții de la interdicția la nivelul UE privind utilizarea capcanelor cu pedală. Dar orice astfel de măsură ar trebui să fie bazată pe dovezi, iar Comisia nu poate suspenda importurile de blănuri înainte de încheierea procesului de investigație și înainte de confirmarea existenței oricăror tehnici de vânătoare cu capcane altele decât cele cu suferință minimă, în SUA.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003294/13
to the Commission**

Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Nadja Hirsch (ALDE), Raúl Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), David Martin (S&D), Dan Jørgensen (S&D), Pavel Poc (S&D), Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D) and Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE)
(21 March 2013)

Subject: Joint Management Committee of the International Agreement on Humane Trapping Standards (IAHTS) (follow-up to Written Question E-010289/2012)

On 22 January 2013, Commissioner Janez Potočnik replied to Written Question E-010289/2012 submitted by Andrea Zanoni and Nadja Hirsch, indicating that the Commission had started consultation with the USA in order to reach a mutually acceptable solution to this issue.

The USA has asked for time to examine the report ⁽¹⁾ produced by Italy's Lega Anti Vivisezione ⁽²⁾ (in collaboration with Born Free USA ⁽³⁾ and Respect for Animals ⁽⁴⁾), which shows that the use of leghold traps is a widespread, regulated and authorised practice in the USA.

In the European Union the use of leghold traps is banned by Council Regulation (EEC) No 3254/91. The ban also includes the import into the EU of pelts and manufactured goods of certain wild animal species originating in countries where animals are caught by means of leghold traps or other trapping methods which do not meet international humane trapping standards.

The signing of the Agreed Minute on humane trapping standards ⁽⁵⁾ cannot be regarded as an excuse to freely use devices which, by their design and functioning, are fully covered by the definition set out in Article 1 of Council Regulation (EEC) No 3254/91.

Information presented by the US delegation to the Fourth Joint Management Committee Meeting of the IAHTS, on progress made so far in terms of trapping management best practices, has not been sufficient to demonstrate that the USA has banned the use of leghold traps (as was done in the EU over 20 years ago).

European citizens are very concerned about unnecessary suffering of animals as a result of inhumane capture devices such as leghold traps.

1. Does the Commission agree that any solution reached with the USA should not allow any exceptions to the EU ban on the use of leghold traps?
2. In accordance with the abovementioned Council Regulation banning leghold traps, should the Commission not suspend the import of furs (raw, tanned or finished) of wild animals caught in this way?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission

(30 April 2013)

The European Commission (on behalf of the EU) had brought to the attention of the US delegation the report ⁽⁶⁾ produced by Italy's Lega Anti Vivisezione (in collaboration with Born Free USA and Respect for Animals) containing allegations that the use of leghold traps was a widespread and authorised practice in the US, during the Fourth Joint Management Committee Meeting of the IAHTS in December 2012.

The US delegation is currently investigating the issue and should report back to the Commission in the coming weeks.

In the European Union the use of leghold traps is banned by Council Regulation (EEC) No 3254/91. The ban also includes the import into the EU of pelts and manufactured goods of certain wild animal species originating in countries where animals are caught by means of leghold traps or other trapping methods which do not meet international humane trapping standards.

⁽¹⁾ IAHTS EC-USA — Evidences of Violations (2012):
http://www.lav.it/uploads/90/45406_IAHTS_EC_USA_Evidences_of_violations_LAV_complaint.pdf

⁽²⁾ www.lav.it

⁽³⁾ <http://www.bornfreeusa.org/>

⁽⁴⁾ <http://www.respectforanimals.co.uk/home/>

⁽⁵⁾ OJ L 219, 7.8.1998, p. 26.

⁽⁶⁾ IAHTS EC-USA — Evidences of Violations (2012):
http://www.lav.it/uploads/90/45406_IAHTS_EC_USA_Evidences_of_violations_LAV_complaint.pdf

The Commission agrees that any solution reached with the USA should not allow for any exceptions to the EU ban on the use of leghold traps. But any such measure should be based on evidence, and the Commission cannot suspend imports of furs before the end of the investigation process and before any non-humane trapping methods in the US have been confirmed.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-003295/13

προς την Επιτροπή
Niki Tzavela (EFD)
(22 Μαρτίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ενεργειακή φτώχεια

Στην Ευρώπη αυτή τη στιγμή, παρατηρούμε ότι το κόστος της ενέργειας ολοένα και αυξάνεται και δημιουργείται ένα φαινόμενο ενεργειακής φτώχειας.

Το υψηλό κόστος της ενέργειας έχει δημιουργήσει ενεργειακή φτώχεια σε πολλά κράτη μέλη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Τα τεράστια κοινωνικά προβλήματα που δημιουργεί η ακριβή ενέργεια προκάλεσε την πτώση της κυβέρνησης στη Βουλγαρία. Επιπρόσθετα στις χώρες της Νότιας και Κεντρικής Ευρώπης, οι περισσότερες οικογένειες ξοδεύουν το 50% του οικονομικού τους προϋπολογισμού για την κάλυψη των ενεργειακών τους αναγκών. Εάν δεν ληφθούν ειδικά μέτρα αντιμετώπισης του θέματος προβλέπεται αλυσίδα παρόμοιων επαναστάσεων κατά της ενεργειακής φτώχειας, σε πολλά κράτη μέλη της Ένωσης.

Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη τα ανωτέρω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

- Υπάρχουν συγκεκριμένα μέτρα που μελετά η Επιτροπή για να αντιμετωπίσει την ενεργειακή φτώχεια;
- Εξετάζει το ενδεχόμενο να συμπεριληφθεί το κόστος της ενέργειας, για ειδικές ομάδες πληθυσμού, στη κοινωνική της πολιτική; Θα μπορούσε κάτι τέτοιο να καλυφθεί από το Κοινωνικό Ταμείο με την προϋπόθεση ότι θα γίνουν κάποιες αλλαγές στους προσανατολισμούς του;
- Υπάρχει απόφαση και χρονοδιάγραμμα για να συμπεριληφθεί το επίδομα θέρμανσης σε ένα πακέτο κοινωνικών παροχών;

Απάντηση του κ. Oettinger εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής

(30 Απριλίου 2013)

1. Η νομοθεσία ⁽¹⁾ της ΕΕ ορίζει συγκεκριμένες και πολλών ειδών υποχρεώσεις στα κράτη μέλη όσον αφορά την ενεργειακή πενία (όπως και την υποχρέωση να οριστεί η έννοια «ευάλωτοι καταναλωτές», να αντιμετωπισθεί η ενεργειακή πενία όπου παρατηρείται, να χορηγηθεί χρηματοδότηση για τη βελτίωση της ενεργειακής απόδοσης, κ.λπ.), το δε σχέδιο δράσης που έχει επισυναφθεί στην ανακοίνωση της Επιτροπής «Για την εύρυθμη λειτουργία της εσωτερικής αγοράς ενέργειας» ⁽²⁾ περιλαμβάνει δράσεις με σκοπό να διευκολυνθούν τα κράτη μέλη στην εκπλήρωση των υποχρεώσεων που υπέχουν με βάση τη νομοθεσία της ΕΕ. Οι εν λόγω δράσεις έχουν ως αντικείμενο την καθοδήγηση και την προώθηση της διάδοσης βέλτιστων πρακτικών. Επίσης, στην ημερήσια διάταξη των συνεδριάσεων του Ενεργειακού Φόρουμ των Πολιτών η Επιτροπή δίνει προτεραιότητα στα θέματα των ευάλωτων καταναλωτών.

2. Σύμφωνα με τους στόχους του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινωνικού Ταμείου στους οποίους συγκαταλέγονται παρεμβάσεις για την κοινωνική ένταξη των ευάλωτων ομάδων, στη χρηματοδότηση από το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο είναι δυνατόν να περιληφθεί, επί παραδείγματι, στήριξη όσων κινδυνεύουν να μείνουν άστεγοι ώστε να αποφύγουν την έξωση ή κοινωνικών συνεταιρισμών που προσφέρουν βιώσιμες λύσεις στέγασης. Κατά κανόνα, για τη στήριξη από το εν λόγω Ταμείο πρέπει να τηρούνται οι αρχές της αειφορίας και της προσθετικότητας.

3. Η χορήγηση επιδόματος θέρμανσης στο πλαίσιο δέσμης κοινωνικών οφελών είναι θέμα απόφασης σε επίπεδο κράτους μέλους. Περαιτέρω πληροφορίες για τα εθνικά συστήματα κοινωνικής προστασίας παρέχονται στην ηλεκτρονική διεύθυνση <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=el&catId=815>

⁽¹⁾ Συγκεκριμένα, άρθρο 3 παράγραφοι 7 και 8 της οδηγίας 2009/72/ΕΚ; άρθρο 3 παράγραφοι 3 και 4 της οδηγίας 2009/73/ΕΚ, άρθρο 7 παράγραφος 7 στοιχείο α) της οδηγίας 2012/27/ΕΕ.

⁽²⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/energy/gas_electricity/internal_market_en.htm

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-003295/13
to the Commission
Niki Tzavela (EFD)
(22 March 2013)**

Subject: Energy poverty

Energy prices in Europe are rising constantly and energy poverty is now an emerging problem.

The high cost of energy has led to energy poverty in many EU Member States. It was huge social problems linked to energy prices that brought about the fall of the government in Bulgaria. Most families in southern and central European countries are spending half their household budget on meeting their energy needs. Unless specific measures are taken to tackle the problem, we are likely to see a series of similar uprisings against energy poverty in many EU Member States.

- Is the Commission considering any specific measures to tackle energy poverty?
- Is it considering the possibility of including the cost of energy in its social policy for certain sections of the population? Could something of this sort be covered by the Social Fund, if certain changes were made to the guidelines governing that Fund?
- Has any decision been taken and a timetable established to include a heating allowance in a package of social benefits?

**Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(30 April 2013)**

1. While EU legislation ⁽¹⁾ places concrete and multiple obligations on Member States with regards 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.), the action plan annexed to Commission Communication 'Making the Internal Energy Market Work' ⁽²⁾ includes actions to facilitate Member States' fulfilment of their obligations under EC law. These aim at providing guidance and promote the identification and dissemination of best practices. Furthermore, the Commission puts the issues of vulnerable consumers high on the agenda of the Citizens' Energy Forum's meetings.

2. In line with its objectives which include interventions on social inclusion of vulnerable groups, financing from the European Social Fund may include, for example, support to people threatened by homelessness with a view to preventing eviction or to social cooperatives providing sustainable housing solutions. As a general rule, the support by the Fund has to respect the principle of sustainability and additionality.

3. Including a heating allowance in a package of social benefits 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⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/energy/gas_electricity/internal_market_en.htm

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris P-003296/13
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(22 martie 2013)

Subiect: Privatizarea șantierelor navale croate aflate în proprietatea statului

Comisia a solicitat privatizarea șantierelor navale croate aflate în proprietatea statului și a celor care înregistrează pierderi, înainte de aderarea Croației la Uniunea Europeană (anexa VIII la Actul de aderare). În august 2012, Comisia a fost de acord cu contractul de privatizare propus pentru șantierul naval *Brodosplit*. În plus, în aprilie 2012, Comisia a declarat, în raportul său de monitorizare, că guvernul croat a hotărât să inițieze procedura de faliment pentru șantierul *Kraljevica* și să caute noi modalități de privatizare și restructurare pentru șantierele *3.Maj* și *Brodotrogir* în termen de 90 de zile. În octombrie 2012, Comisia a reiterat această declarație, ceea ce indică faptul că nu s-a înregistrat, de fapt, niciun progres în această privință.

Vânzarea acestor șantiere navale trebuie să aibă loc în temeiul legilor relevante ale pieței, inclusiv Legea privind impozitul pe profit. Cu toate acestea, au fost manifestate îngrijorări cu privire la măsura în care Legea croată privind impozitul pe profit, în special articolele 6 și 31 din aceasta, respectă standardele internaționale.

1. Poate Comisia furniza detalii cu privire la procedura aleasă pentru privatizarea șantierului naval *Brodosplit*?
2. Care este situația actuală în ceea ce privește șantierele navale *Kraljevica*, *3.Maj* și *Brodotrogir*?
3. Poate Comisia confirma faptul că toate dispozițiile Legii croate privind impozitul pe profit, și în special articolele 6 și 31, respectă pe deplin cadrul juridic al Uniunii Europene și Standardul Internațional de Contabilitate aplicabil?

Răspuns dat de Füle în numele Comisiei
(6 mai 2013)

Procedura de privatizare a șantierului naval *Brodosplit*, precum și a celorlalte șantiere navale croate aflate în dificultate, enumerate în anexa VIII la Actul de aderare al Croației la UE, avea la bază o procedură de licitație concurențială. Planurile de restructurare au fost prezentate de ofertanți și în cele din urmă acceptate de Agenția de Concurență a Croației și de Comisia Europeană, înainte de semnarea Actului de aderare. În cazul șantierului naval *Brodosplit*, ofertantul ales în urma procedurii de licitație concurențiale a fost întreprinderea DIV d.o.o. Samobor.

În ceea ce privește șantierul naval *Kraljevica*, Tribunalul Comercial din Rijeka a pronunțat hotărârea sa privind inițierea procedurii falimentului la 28 august 2012. Hotărârea Curții a fost înscrisă la grefa tribunalului. Procedura falimentului este în curs. În ceea ce privește șantierul naval *3. MAJ*, Croația a informat Comisia cu privire la intenția sa de a prezenta un plan de restructurare revizuit, pe baza privatizării șantierului naval *Uljanik*. În acest caz, Comisia va trebui să ia o decizie. În ceea ce privește șantierul naval *Brodotrogir*, contractul de privatizare a fost semnat la data de 6 aprilie 2013.

Referitor la legea croată privind impozitul pe profit, în prezent, serviciile Comisiei nu examinează și nici nu au observații asupra vreunui element, inclusiv în ceea ce privește articolele 6 și 31 ale legii. Legislația în vigoare în UE în materie de standarde internaționale de contabilitate se aplică situațiilor consolidate ale societăților UE cotate pe piețele reglementate ale UE și nu legislației fiscale ca atare.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-003296/13
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(22 March 2013)**

Subject: Privatisation of Croatian state-owned shipyards

The privatisation of Croatian state-owned and loss-making shipyards has been requested by the Commission prior to the country's accession to the European Union (Annex VIII to the Act of Accession). In August 2012, the Commission agreed with the proposed privatisation contract for the *Brodosplit* shipyard. Moreover, in April 2012, the Commission stated in its monitoring report that the Croatian Government had decided to initiate bankruptcy proceedings for the *Kraljevica* yard and to seek new privatisation and restructuring arrangements for the *3.Maj* and *Brodotrogir* yards within 90 days. In October 2012, the Commission reiterated the same comment, which indicates that no progress was actually made.

The sale of those shipyards must be based on the relevant market laws, including the Tax on Profit Law. However concerns have arisen regarding the compliance of the Croatian Tax on Profit Law, in particular paragraphs 6 and 31 thereof, with international standards.

1. Can the Commission supply details of the procedure chosen for the privatisation of the *Brodosplit* shipyard?
2. What is the state of play concerning the *Kraljevica*, *3.Maj* and *Brodotrogir* shipyards?
3. Can the Commission establish that all provisions of the Croatian Tax on Profit Law, and especially paragraphs 6 and 31, are fully in line with the European Union's legal framework and the applicable International Accounting Standard?

**Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(6 May 2013)**

The procedure for the privatisation of the *Brodosplit* shipyard, as well as the other Croatian shipyards in difficulties listed in Annex VIII of the Act of Accession of Croatia to the EU, was based on a competitive tendering procedure. Restructuring plans were submitted by the bidders and eventually accepted by the Croatian Competition Agency and the European Commission prior to the signing of the Act of Accession. In the case of the *Brodosplit* yard, the bidder chosen after the competitive tendering process was the undertaking DIV d.o.o. Samobor.

As regards the *Kraljevica* shipyard, the Commercial Court in Rijeka issued its decision on the formal opening of the bankruptcy proceedings on 28 August 2012. The Court's decision was thereupon entered into the Court's Registry. The bankruptcy proceedings are ongoing. As regards the *3. MAJ* shipyard, Croatia informed the Commission of its intention to submit a revised restructuring plan, which will be based on the privatisation of the *Uljanik* shipyard. In such a case, the Commission will have to take a decision. As regards the *Brodotrogir* shipyard, the privatisation contract was signed on 6 April 2013.

As regards the Croatian Profit Law, there are currently no specific items under scrutiny or critically viewed by the Commission services, including in relation to Articles 6 and 31 of the law. The legislation in force in the EU on International Accounting Standards applies to consolidated statements of EU companies listed on EU regulated markets and not to taxation laws as such.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-003297/13
alla Commissione
Carlo Casini (PPE)
(22 marzo 2013)**

Oggetto: Finanziamenti europei per la cooperazione allo sviluppo

Può la Commissione europea fornire un elenco esaustivo delle organizzazioni non governative (ONG) o delle organizzazioni governative (OG) impegnate nella cooperazione allo sviluppo, che beneficiano di finanziamenti della Commissione europea?

Può la Commissione fornire informazioni dettagliate in merito all'ammontare dei finanziamenti europei erogati alle ONG ed alle OG che si dedicano, nel quadro della cooperazione allo sviluppo, alla promozione di programmi per la salute sessuale e riproduttiva?

Può inoltre la Commissione specificare se tali finanziamenti mirano a sostenere, direttamente o indirettamente, programmi, progetti o attività che favoriscono l'interruzione della gravidanza?

**Risposta di Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione
(29 aprile 2013)**

La banca dati sul sito EuropeAid⁽¹⁾ contiene dati completi su tutti i beneficiari delle sovvenzioni e dispone di una funzione di ricerca per ottenere per ogni anno informazioni su tutte le sovvenzioni erogate ai programmi riguardanti, per esempio, le cure per la salute riproduttiva.

Nella presente risposta non è possibile elencare tutte le organizzazioni e agenzie e gli importi delle rispettive sovvenzioni. L'onorevole parlamentare è invitato a consultare la banca dati citata.

Come per gli altri interventi a tutela della salute, la Commissione promuove le migliori pratiche e metodi economicamente efficaci, fra cui la prevenzione sanitaria e la gestione delle cause originarie delle malattie. Per la salute riproduttiva e sessuale, questo significa incoraggiare e assistere i partner, le ONG e i governi a fornire informazioni, istruzione e consulenze, educazione sessuale e pianificazione familiare. In questo modo le persone possono proteggersi dalle malattie sessualmente trasmissibili, decidere quanti figli avere ed evitare gravidanze indesiderate. Questo approccio globale è in linea con la posizione dell'UE basata sul documento finale della Conferenza internazionale su popolazione e sviluppo e ha dimostrato di essere il modo più efficace per migliorare la salute riproduttiva. La Commissione incoraggia i paesi partner ad attuare politiche che garantiscano un'assistenza sanitaria completa e sicura per tutti, comprese le misure essenziali per la salute sessuale e riproduttiva, nel rispetto delle disposizioni giuridiche stabilite dai paesi partner.

⁽¹⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/funding/beneficiaries/index.cfm?lang=en>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-003297/13
to the Commission
Carlo Casini (PPE)
(22 March 2013)**

Subject: European development cooperation funding

Can the Commission supply a complete list of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and government agencies involved in development cooperation which receive European funding?

Can it specify the amounts of European funding granted to NGOs and government agencies which, within the wider field of development cooperation, promote sexual and reproductive health programmes?

Can it say in addition whether that funding serves to support, directly or indirectly, programmes, projects, or activities which encourage abortion?

**Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(29 April 2013)**

Comprehensive information on all beneficiaries of grants can be found in the database on the EuropeAid website ⁽¹⁾. This database has a search function enabling information to be obtained on a year by year basis for all grants awarded to programmes related to, for instance, reproductive healthcare.

Listing all the related organisations and agencies and the corresponding grant amounts would go beyond the possibilities of the present reply and the honourable MEP is referred to the aforementioned database for the requested details.

As with other health aid, the Commission promotes best practices and cost-effective methods such as disease prevention and tackling the underlying causes of ill health. For sexual and reproductive health (SRH), this means encouraging and supporting partners, NGOs and governments, to provide information, education and counselling, sexuality education and family planning. This in turn allows people to protect themselves against sexually transmitted diseases, to choose the number of children they want to have and to prevent unintended pregnancies. Such a comprehensive approach is in line with the EU consensus based on the outcome document of the International Conference on Population and Development, and has proven to be the best way for improving reproductive health. The Commission encourages its partner countries to implement policies that ensure the provision of comprehensive and safe healthcare for all, including essential SRH interventions, within the legal framework set by partner countries.

⁽¹⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/funding/beneficiaries/index.cfm?lang=en>.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003298/13
a la Comisión**

María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE) y Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE)
(22 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Impacto sobre el comercio internacional de la revisión de la Directiva 2001/37/CE que regula los productos del tabaco

El 19 de diciembre de 2012 la Comisión Europea adoptó una propuesta para revisar y actualizar la vigente Directiva 2001/37/CE que regula los productos del tabaco. La propuesta conllevaría una revisión sustancial de la actual legislación, abarcando diferentes áreas como el empaquetado y etiquetado, los ingredientes y aditivos, las ventas a distancia transfronterizas, así como su trazabilidad y medidas de seguridad.

Es importante tener en cuenta que la legislación europea debe respetar y ser consistente con el Derecho internacional y en particular con las normas establecidas por la OMC.

Con relación a esto último cabe mencionar que el pasado 18 de enero la UE notificó la propuesta de Directiva al Comité de Obstáculos Técnicos al Comercio de la OMC, siendo objeto de una discusión los días 6 y 7 de marzo. Durante la misma, varios países miembros de la OMC manifestaron sus preocupaciones sobre la inconsistencia de la propuesta de Directiva de la UE con diferentes obligaciones contenidas en acuerdos internacionales como son el Acuerdo General sobre Aranceles Aduaneros y Comercio (GATT), el Acuerdo sobre Obstáculos Técnicos al Comercio (OTC) y el Acuerdo sobre los Aspectos de los Derechos de Propiedad Intelectual relacionados con el Comercio (ADPIC).

¿Ha tenido debidamente en cuenta la Comisión la posible inconsistencia de su propuesta de Directiva con las obligaciones asumidas por la UE ante la OMC? ¿Ha considerado asimismo la Comisión el posible impacto negativo que sobre el comercio internacional podría suponer esta propuesta de Directiva al poder crear un importante precedente sobre otros productos?

Respuesta del Sr. Borg en nombre de la Comisión
(21 de mayo de 2013)

La Comisión ha tenido muy en cuenta las obligaciones internacionales de la Unión Europea a la hora de presentar su propuesta de revisión de la Directiva sobre productos del tabaco. Tales obligaciones incluyen, en particular, las normas de la Organización Mundial del Comercio (OMC) y el Convenio Marco de la Organización Mundial de la Salud para el Control del Tabaco, que son vinculantes para la UE y sus Estados miembros.

En opinión de la Comisión, la Directiva propuesta es plenamente compatible con las obligaciones derivadas de la OMC. En cuanto al argumento de que la Directiva va a sentar un precedente para otros productos, la Comisión desea subrayar que, debido a sus efectos particularmente dañinos para la salud de las personas, los productos del tabaco no son mercancías normales y, por tanto, no pueden compararse con otros productos comercializados. Además, no hay planes a nivel de la UE para hacer extensivo un enfoque regulador similar a otros productos.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003298/13
to the Commission**

**María Auxiliadora Correa Zamora (PPE), José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE)
and Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE)**
(22 March 2013)

Subject: Revision of Tobacco Products Directive (2001/37/EC) — impact on international trade

On 19 December 2012 the Commission adopted a proposal to revise and update the existing Tobacco Products Directive (2001/37/EC). The proposal would involve a substantial revision of the current legislation, covering different areas such as packaging and labelling, ingredients and additives, cross-border distance sales and traceability and safety measures.

It is important to note that EU legislation should respect and be consistent with international law and in particular with the rules established by the World Trade Organisation (WTO).

With regard to the latter it is worth noting that on 18 January the EU notified the WTO Committee on Technical Barriers to Trade of the proposed Directive, which was then the subject of a discussion on 6 and 7 March. During the meeting, several WTO member countries expressed their concerns about the proposed EU Directive's inconsistency with various obligations under international agreements such as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) and the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS).

Has the Commission taken due account of the proposed Directive's possible inconsistency with the EU's WTO obligations? Has it also considered the potential negative impact that this proposed Directive may have on international trade, by setting an important precedent for other products?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(21 May 2013)

The Commission has fully taken into account the European Union's international obligations when making its proposal to revise the Tobacco Products Directive. Such obligations notably include WTO rules, and the World Health Organisation Framework Convention on Tobacco Control, both of which are binding for both the EU and its Member States.

In the view of the Commission, the proposed Directive is fully compatible with WTO obligations. As to the argument that the directive will set a precedent for other products, the Commission would stress that, given the particularly harmful effect of tobacco products on people's health, tobacco products are no ordinary commodities and cannot therefore be compared to other products placed on the market. Furthermore, there are no plans at EU level to extend a similar regulatory approach to other products.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003299/13
an die Kommission
Horst Schnellhardt (PPE)
(22. März 2013)

Betrifft: Umsetzung der Richtlinie 2008/50/EG über Luftqualität und saubere Luft für Europa

In der Richtlinie 2008/50/EG über Luftqualität und saubere Luft für Europa werden den Mitgliedstaaten strenge Grenzwerte bezüglich der Höchstkonzentrationen von Schadstoffen in der Luft vorgeschrieben. Da viele deutsche Regionen — trotz der Erarbeitung von Luftreinhalteplänen zur Umsetzung von Maßnahmen zur Senkung der Schadstoffkonzentrationen — die in der Richtlinie festgelegten Grenzwerte für Stickstoffdioxid nicht einhalten konnten, beantragten sie bei der Kommission eine Fristverlängerung bis zum 1. Januar 2015. Von insgesamt 57 eingereichten Anträgen deutscher Regionen wurden 33 von der Kommission abgelehnt.

Kann die Kommission vor diesem Hintergrund folgende Fragen beantworten:

1. Aus welchen Mitgliedstaaten kamen ebenfalls Anträge auf Fristverlängerung?
2. Welche Mitgliedstaaten übermitteln der Kommission regelmäßig verlässliche Messdaten?
3. Wie kontrolliert die Kommission die korrekte Durchführung der Messungen in den Mitgliedstaaten?
4. Welche Schritte sieht die Kommission vor, wenn Regionen aufgrund spezifischer klimatischer, gesellschaftlicher und wirtschaftlicher Einflussfaktoren, wie z. B. Verwehungen von Industrieemissionen, nicht in der Lage sind, die festgelegten Grenzwerte einzuhalten?

Antwort von Herrn Potočník im Namen der Kommission
(3. Mai 2013)

1. Die Kommission hat von 18 Mitgliedstaaten Mitteilungen bezüglich einer Verlängerung der Frist für die Einhaltung der NO₂-Grenzwerte erhalten. Sämtliche Informationen zu diesen Mitteilungen sind allgemein zugänglich unter: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/air/quality/legislation/time_extensions.htm
2. Alle Mitgliedstaaten erfüllen die Anforderung der Richtlinie 2008/50/EG über Luftqualität (nachstehend „die Richtlinie“), wonach der Kommission spätestens neun Monate nach Ablauf jedes Jahres Informationen über die Luftqualität übermittelt werden müssen. Für die Zuverlässigkeit dieser Informationen sind in erster Linie die Mitgliedstaaten verantwortlich. Bestehen Zweifel an der Richtigkeit und Zuverlässigkeit der Angaben, so bemüht sich die Kommission stets um eine Fortsetzung des Dialogs, um auf der Grundlage der besten verfügbaren Informationen entscheiden zu können.
3. Die Richtlinie enthält eine Reihe von Kriterien in Bezug auf die Errichtung von Messstationen und die Mindestanzahl der Probenahmestellen. Darüber hinaus organisiert die Kommission regelmäßig vergleichende Untersuchungen und einen breiten Informationsaustausch, um die Luftqualitätsmessungen europaweit zu vereinheitlichen ⁽¹⁾, ⁽²⁾.
4. Zur Verlängerung der für die Einhaltung der NO₂-Grenzwerte geltenden Frist können die Mitgliedstaaten neue Mitteilungen vorlegen, wenn anhand zusätzlicher Informationen belegt werden kann, dass die Einhaltung der Grenzwerte zum 1. Januar 2015 erreicht wird. Bei Nichteinhaltung der Grenzwerte in Gebieten, für die keine Fristverlängerungen gelten, kann die Kommission ein Vertragsverletzungsverfahren gegen den betreffenden Mitgliedstaat einleiten.

⁽¹⁾ Evaluation of the Laboratory Comparison Exercise for SO₂, CO, O₃, NO and NO₂ — 11. — 14. Juni 2012 Ispra — EC Harmonization Program for Air Quality Measurements, Amt für Veröffentlichungen der Europäischen Union, 2012, EUR 25536 EN: <http://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/bitstream/111111111/26675/1/lbna25536enn.pdf>

⁽²⁾ <http://ies.jrc.ec.europa.eu/aquila-project/jrc-aquila-quality-programme-on-pm-measurements.html>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003299/13
to the Commission
Horst Schnellhardt (PPE)
(22 March 2013)**

Subject: Implementation of Directive 2008/50/EC on ambient air quality and cleaner air for Europe

Directive 2008/50/EC on ambient air quality and cleaner air for Europe lays down strict limit values for Member States with regard to the maximum concentrations of pollutants in the air. Since many regions in Germany — despite air quality maintenance plans being drawn up to implement measures to reduce concentrations of pollutants — are not able to comply with the limit values laid down in the directive for nitrogen dioxide, they asked the Commission to postpone the deadline to 1 January 2015. Of a total of 57 applications submitted by German regions, 33 were rejected by the Commission.

1. From which other Member States have applications for postponement of the deadline been received?
2. Which Member States regularly send the Commission reliable measurement data?
3. How does the Commission check that the measurements have been taken correctly in the Member States?
4. What steps will it take if, due to specific climatic, social or economic factors, such as drifting of industrial emissions, regions are not able to comply with the limit values laid down?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission
(3 May 2013)**

1. The Commission has received notifications for postponement of attainment the NO₂ deadline from 18 Member States. All the information regarding the notifications is publicly available at:
http://ec.europa.eu/environment/air/quality/legislation/time_extensions.htm
2. All Member States fulfil the requirement of the ambient air quality Directive 2008/50/EC ('Directive') to ensure that information on ambient air quality is made available to the Commission no later than nine months after the end of each year. It is mainly the responsibility of the Member State to ensure that the information made available is reliable. If the veracity and reliability of the information is put in question, the Commission always attempts to continue the dialogue in order to base its decision on the best available information.
3. The directive provides a number of criteria for setting up monitoring stations as well as the minimum number of sampling points. In addition, the Commission organises regular intercomparison exercises and broader exchange of information with the aim of harmonising ambient air quality measurements at European level ⁽¹⁾ ⁽²⁾.
4. Member States may resubmit notifications for postponement of attainment of the NO₂ deadline if there is additional information showing that compliance will be reached by 1 January 2015. As regards zones not covered by time extensions, the Commission may launch an infringement procedure if a Member State fails to comply with the limit values.

⁽¹⁾ Evaluation of the Laboratory Comparison Exercise for SO₂, CO, O₃, NO and NO₂ — 11th-14th June 2012 Ispra — EC Harmonisation Program for Air Quality Measurements, Publications Office of the European Union, 2012, EUR 25536 EN,
<http://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/bitstream/111111111/26675/1/lbna25536enn.pdf>

⁽²⁾ <http://ies.jrc.ec.europa.eu/aquila-project/jrc-aquila-quality-programme-on-pm-measurements.html>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003300/13
to the Commission**

Martina Anderson (GUE/NGL)

(22 March 2013)

Subject: Fairness and transparency in programmes between Member States

The Italian National Institute of Social Security (INPS) recently issued a call for tenders relating to the Valore Vacanza Programme. In this call many countries were eligible, including the Republic of Ireland and Great Britain.

The north of Ireland was excluded, and no reason was given for this. No other regions of any Member State were excluded.

When questioned, the organisation concerned refused to put anything in writing, saying that it was due to fear about the political situation in the region.

Other projects funded by the Italian Government (PON and Safarijob) do allow applications to be made from the north and have cooperated successfully with the region.

1. Does the Commission consider this discriminatory?
2. Can the Italian Government be reprimanded for its lack of transparency in excluding regions for this cross-border project?
3. Does the Commission plan to bring forward guidelines to ensure transparency and equality in calls for tenders involving more than one Member State?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission

(13 May 2013)

On the basis of the available elements, the Commission considers that the problems raised by the Honourable Member do not entail a violation of the internal market rules. A limitation of the scope of the services covered by a call for tender, in the specific case concerning the locations where the services are provided, remains within the discretion of contracting authorities and does not per se violate Article 56 of the TFEU.

With particular regard to the respect of EU public procurement law, the call for tender does not seem to be discriminatory since it is open to candidates from all EU countries. Furthermore, the respect of equal treatment and transparency in call for tenders is ensured by the correct application of EU public procurement law, notably Directive 2004/17/EC and Directive 2004/18/EC, requiring Member States to award public contracts through procedures that are transparent and allow participation of tenderers from all EU Member States on an equal footing.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003301/13
a la Comisión**

Carl Schlyter (Verts/ALE), Eva Lichtenberger (Verts/ALE), Christian Engström (Verts/ALE), Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE), Malika Benarab-Attou (Verts/ALE), Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE) y Raúl Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(22 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Acuerdo comercial entre la UE y los EE.UU. y obligaciones con arreglo al Pacto Internacional de Derechos Económicos, Sociales y Culturales (Pidesc)

La UE tiene la obligación de respetar, proteger y garantizar el ejercicio de los derechos humanos consagrados en el Pacto Internacional de Derechos Económicos, Sociales y Culturales (Pidesc). Esta obligación es fruto de las tradiciones constitucionales comunes a los Estados miembros (artículo 6, apartado 3, del TUE), habida cuenta de que todos los Estados miembros han ratificado el Pidesc. La UE debe desistir de todo acto y omisión que pueda suponer un verdadero riesgo para los derechos enunciados en el Pidesc por su capacidad para anular o impedir el pleno ejercicio de los mismos (véase también el asunto C-73/08, Nicolas Bressol y otros).

Los Estados Unidos han firmado el Pidesc pero no lo han ratificado.

¿Cómo va a garantizar la Comisión que, en el transcurso de las negociaciones del anunciado acuerdo comercial con los EE.UU., se respetarán los derechos recogidos en el Pidesc, incluido el derecho de toda persona a «participar libremente de manera activa e informada, y sin discriminación, en los procesos importantes de adopción de decisiones que puedan repercutir en su forma de vida y en los derechos que les reconoce el párrafo 1 a) del artículo 15⁽¹⁾»?

Respuesta del Sr. De Gucht en nombre de la Comisión

(15 de mayo de 2013)

La Comisión concede gran importancia a los derechos económicos, sociales y culturales. Además, considera que la transparencia es fundamental para la comprensión mutua y la aceptabilidad de las políticas en cualquier área, conforme a la Observación General n° 21, apartado 49, letra e), del Consejo Económico y Social de las Naciones Unidas a que hace referencia Su Señoría.

En las negociaciones sobre la Asociación Transatlántica sobre Comercio e Inversión con Estados Unidos (EE.UU.), la Comisión respetará la necesidad de que el público esté informado sobre el Acuerdo, de conformidad con el artículo 11 del Tratado de Lisboa.

A tal fin, la Comisión llevará a cabo un diálogo estructurado con la sociedad civil a través de reuniones periódicas sobre política comercial, con objeto de reforzar la comunicación y el entendimiento mutuo. Los días 20 de marzo de 2012 y 4 de abril de 2013 se celebraron dos sesiones específicas sobre las posibles negociaciones con EE.UU.

Además, en 2012 se iniciaron dos consultas públicas a fin de recopilar puntos de vista detallados de los interesados en relación con las futuras relaciones comerciales y económicas entre la UE y Estados Unidos.

Por otra parte, la Comisión ha informado al Comité Económico y Social Europeo.

La UE plantea regularmente la cuestión de la ratificación del Pacto Internacional de Derechos Económicos, Sociales y Culturales con el Gobierno de Estados Unidos.

La Comisión seguirá informando periódicamente al Parlamento sobre la evolución de este asunto.

(1) Comité de Derechos Económicos, Sociales y Culturales, 2009, Observación general n° 21: «Derecho de toda persona a participar en la vida cultural (artículo 15, párrafo 1 a), del Pacto Internacional de Derechos Económicos, Sociales y Culturales», E/C.12/GC/21/Rev.1, <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cescr/docs/E.C.12.GC.21.Rev.1-SPA.doc>

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003301/13
an die Kommission**

Carl Schlyter (Verts/ALE), Eva Lichtenberger (Verts/ALE), Christian Engström (Verts/ALE), Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE), Malika Benarab-Attou (Verts/ALE), Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE) und Raúl Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(22. März 2013)

Betrifft: Handelsabkommen EU-USA und Verpflichtungen aus dem Internationalen Pakt über wirtschaftliche, soziale und kulturelle Rechte (IPWSKR)

Die EU ist verpflichtet, die im Internationalen Pakt über wirtschaftliche, soziale und kulturelle Rechte (IPWSKR) verankerten Menschenrechte zu achten, zu schützen und zu gewährleisten. Diese Verpflichtung ergibt sich aus den gemeinsamen Verfassungsüberlieferungen der Mitgliedstaaten (Artikel 6 Absatz 3 EUV), da alle Mitgliedstaaten den IPWSKR ratifiziert haben. Die EU muss von Handlungen und Unterlassungen absehen, die eine reelle Gefahr bergen, dass der Genuss von Rechten aus dem IPWSKR aufgehoben oder beeinträchtigt wird (siehe auch Rechtssache C-73/08, Bressol u. a.).

Die Vereinigten Staaten haben den IPWSKR zwar unterzeichnet, aber nicht ratifiziert.

Wie wird die Kommission bei den Verhandlungen zum geplanten Handelsabkommen mit den USA sicherstellen, dass die Rechte aus dem IPWSKR, einschließlich des Rechts jedes Menschen, ungehindert, aktiv, aufgeklärt und ohne Diskriminierung an jedem wichtigen Entscheidungsprozess teilzuhaben, der sich auf seine Lebensweise oder seine Rechte nach Artikel 15 Absatz 1 Buchstabe a⁽¹⁾ auswirken könnte, geachtet werden?

Antwort von Herrn De Gucht im Namen der Kommission
(15. Mai 2013)

Die Kommission legt großen Wert auf die Achtung wirtschaftlicher, sozialer und kultureller Rechte. Zudem ist sie im Einklang mit der Allgemeinen Bemerkung Nr. 21 des Wirtschafts- und Sozialrats der Vereinten Nationen (Absatz 49 Buchstabe e), die die Abgeordneten anführen, der Auffassung, dass Transparenz wesentlich für das wechselseitige Verständnis und die Akzeptanz der Politik in jedem Bereich ist.

Während der Verhandlungen mit den Vereinigten Staaten (USA) über die transatlantische Handels- und Investitionspartnerschaft wird die Kommission das Bedürfnis der Öffentlichkeit, hierüber informiert zu werden, entsprechend Artikel 11 des Vertrags von Lissabon durchweg respektieren.

In diesem Sinne führt die Kommission einen strukturierten Dialog mit der Zivilgesellschaft in der Form regelmäßiger Sitzungen zur Handelspolitik, durch die die Kommunikation und das wechselseitige Verständnis gestärkt werden sollen. Zwei Sitzungen speziell zu den möglichen Verhandlungen mit den USA fanden am 20. März 2012 sowie am 4. April 2013 statt.

Ferner wurden 2012 zwei öffentliche Konsultationen durchgeführt, um die Meinungen von Interessenträgern zu den künftigen Handels- und Wirtschaftsbeziehungen zwischen der EU und den USA in ausführlicher Form einzuholen.

Außerdem hat die Kommission den Europäischen Wirtschafts- und Sozialausschuss unterrichtet.

Darüber hinaus spricht die EU der Regierung der USA gegenüber regelmäßig die Frage der Ratifizierung des Internationalen Pakts über wirtschaftliche, soziale und kulturelle Rechte an.

Die Kommission wird dem Parlament weiterhin regelmäßig über den Sachstand in dieser Angelegenheit Bericht erstatten.

⁽¹⁾ Ausschuss für wirtschaftliche, soziale und kulturelle Rechte, 2009, Allgemeine Bemerkung Nr. 21 zum Recht jeder Person auf Teilnahme am kulturellen Leben (Artikel 15 Absatz 1 Buchstabe a des Internationalen Pakts über wirtschaftliche, soziale und kulturelle Rechte), E/C.12/GC/21, <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cescr/comments.htm>

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003301/13
à la Commission**

**Carl Schlyter (Verts/ALE), Eva Lichtenberger (Verts/ALE), Christian Engström (Verts/ALE),
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE), Malika Benarab-Attou (Verts/ALE), Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE)
et Raúl Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)**
(22 mars 2013)

Objet: Accord commercial entre l'Union européenne et les États-Unis et obligations au titre du pacte international relatif aux droits économiques, sociaux et culturels (Pidesc)

L'Union européenne se doit de respecter, de protéger et de faire valoir les Droits de l'homme inscrits dans le pacte international relatif aux droits économiques, sociaux et culturels (Pidesc). L'obligation de l'Union européenne est une obligation qui résulte des traditions constitutionnelles communes aux États membres (article 6, paragraphe 3 du traité sur l'Union européenne), depuis que l'ensemble des États membres a ratifié le Pidesc. L'Union doit s'abstenir de tout acte ou omission qui créent un risque réel de violer de sa substance ou de mettre en péril la jouissance des droits inscrits dans le Pidesc (voir l'affaire C-73/08 Nicolas Bressol e.a).

Les États-Unis ont signé le Pidesc mais ne l'ont pas encore ratifié.

Comment la Commission veillera-t-elle, durant les négociations de l'accord commercial annoncé avec les États-Unis, au respect des droits relevant du Pidesc, y compris du droit de chacun «de participer librement, activement, en connaissance de cause et sans discrimination, à tout processus important de prise de décisions susceptible d'avoir des effets sur son mode de vie et ses droits en vertu du paragraphe 1, point a), de l'article 15»⁽¹⁾.

Réponse donnée par M. De Gucht au nom de la Commission
(15 mai 2013)

La Commission attache une grande importance aux droits économiques, sociaux et culturels. De plus, elle considère la transparence comme fondamentale pour la compréhension mutuelle et l'acceptation des politiques, quel que soit le domaine, dans le droit fil de l'observation générale n° 21, paragraphe 49 e), du Conseil économique et social des Nations unies (ONU) à laquelle l'auteur de la question fait référence.

Tout au long des négociations du partenariat transatlantique de commerce et d'investissement avec les États-Unis, la Commission respectera le besoin d'informer le public à propos de cet accord, conformément à l'article 11 du Traité de Lisbonne.

À cette fin, la Commission mène un dialogue structuré avec la société civile dans le cadre de réunions régulières portant sur la politique commerciale, dans le but de renforcer la communication et la compréhension mutuelle. Deux sessions consacrées aux éventuelles négociations avec les États-Unis ont eu lieu le 20 mars 2012 et le 4 avril 2013.

En outre, deux consultations publiques ont été lancées en 2012 pour tenter de recueillir les avis précis des parties intéressées concernant les futures relations commerciales et économiques entre l'UE et les États-Unis.

La Commission a également informé le Comité économique et social européen.

L'UE aborde régulièrement avec les autorités américaines la question de la ratification du Pacte international relatif aux droits économiques, sociaux et culturels.

La Commission continuera à informer régulièrement le Parlement européen de l'état d'avancement du dossier.

⁽¹⁾ ECOSOC (2009), Comité des droits économiques, sociaux et culturels, observation générale n°21 (article 15, paragraphe 1, point a), du pacte international relatif aux droits économiques, sociaux et culturels), E/C.12/GC/21, <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cescr/comments.htm>

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003301/13
aan de Commissie**

**Carl Schlyter (Verts/ALE), Eva Lichtenberger (Verts/ALE), Christian Engström (Verts/ALE),
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE), Malika Benarab-Attou (Verts/ALE), Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE) en
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)**
(22 maart 2013)

Betref: Handelsovereenkomst tussen de EU en de VS en verplichtingen in het kader van het Internationaal Verdrag inzake economische, sociale en culturele rechten (International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, ICESCR)

De EU is verplicht de in het Internationaal Verdrag inzake economische, sociale en culturele rechten vastgelegde mensenrechten in acht te nemen, te beschermen en na te komen. Aangezien alle lidstaten het ICESCR hebben geratificeerd, vloeit deze verplichting voort uit de constitutionele tradities die de lidstaten gemeen hebben (artikel 6, lid 3, VEU). De EU moet ophouden te handelen en nalaten te handelen als dit een reëel risico inhoudt het genot van ICESCR-rechten teniet te doen of er afbreuk aan te doen (zie ook C-73/08, Bressol e.a.).

De Verenigde Staten hebben het ICESCR ondertekend, maar niet geratificeerd.

Hoe zal de Commissie ervoor zorgen dat tijdens de onderhandelingen over de aangekondigde handelsovereenkomst met de VS de ICESCR-rechten worden in acht genomen, met inbegrip van eenieders recht om „zonder discriminatie op een actieve en geïnformeerde wijze vrij deel te nemen aan elk belangrijk besluitvormingsproces dat een impact kan hebben op zijn of haar levenswijze en op zijn of haar rechten overeenkomstig artikel 15, lid 1, onder a)“⁽¹⁾?

Antwoord van de heer De Gucht namens de Commissie
(15 mei 2013)

De Commissie hecht groot belang aan economische, sociale en culturele rechten. Bovendien beschouwt zij transparantie, in overeenstemming met paragraaf 49 e) van General Comment 21 van de Economische en Sociale Raad van de Verenigde Naties (VN), waarnaar het Parlementslid verwijst, als essentieel voor wederzijds begrip voor en aanvaarding van beleid op welk vlak dan ook.

Tijdens de volledige duur van de onderhandelingen over een trans-Atlantisch handels- en investeringspartnerschap met de Verenigde Staten (VS) zal de Commissie in overeenstemming met artikel 11 van het Verdrag van Lissabon de bevolking informeren met betrekking tot het partnerschap.

Daarom houdt de Commissie een gestructureerde dialoog met het maatschappelijk middenveld door middel van regelmatige bijeenkomsten over het handelsbeleid met het doel de communicatie en het wederzijdse begrip te versterken. Twee sessies die specifiek gewijd waren aan de mogelijke onderhandelingen met de VS vonden op 20 maart 2012 en 4 april 2013 plaats.

Verder zijn in 2012 twee openbare raadplegingen van start gegaan om gedetailleerde visies van belanghebbenden te verkrijgen over de toekomstige economische en handelsbetrekkingen tussen de EU en de VS.

De Commissie heeft ook het Europees Economisch en Sociaal Comité geïnformeerd.

De EU brengt de ratificatie door de VS van het Internationaal Verdrag inzake economische, sociale en culturele rechten regelmatig ter sprake bij de regering van de VS.

De Commissie zal het Parlement regelmatig blijven informeren over de stand van zaken met betrekking tot dit dossier.

⁽¹⁾ Comité over economische, sociale en culturele rechten, 2009, algemene opmerking nr. 21: „Het recht van eenieder om deel te nemen aan het culturele leven (artikel 15, lid 1, onder a), van het Internationaal Verdrag inzake economische, sociale en culturele rechten)“ E/C.12/GC/21, <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cescr/comments.htm>

(Svensk version)

**Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-003301/13
till kommissionen**

Carl Schlyter (Verts/ALE), Eva Lichtenberger (Verts/ALE), Christian Engström (Verts/ALE), Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE), Malika Benarab-Attou (Verts/ALE), Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE) och Raúl Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(22 mars 2013)

Angående: Handelsavtal mellan EU och Förenta staterna samt skyldigheter inom ramen för den internationella konventionen om ekonomiska, sociala och kulturella rättigheter

EU har skyldighet att respektera, skydda och uppfylla de mänskliga rättigheter som fastslås i den internationella konventionen om ekonomiska, sociala och kulturella rättigheter. Denna skyldighet är ett resultat av medlemsstaternas gemensamma konstitutionella traditioner (artikel 6.3 i fördraget om Europeiska unionen), eftersom alla medlemsstaterna ratificerat den internationella konventionen om ekonomiska, sociala och kulturella rättigheter. EU måste avstå från handlingar eller underlåtenhet som utgör en faktisk risk att upphäva eller försämra åtnjutandet av rättigheterna i den internationella konventionen om ekonomiska, sociala och kulturella rättigheter (se även mål C-73/08, Bressol m.fl.).

Förenta staterna har undertecknat men inte ratificerat den internationella konventionen om ekonomiska, sociala och kulturella rättigheter.

Hur kommer kommissionen, under förhandlingen om det tillkännagivna handelsavtalet med Förenta staterna, att garantera att rättigheterna i den internationella konventionen om ekonomiska, sociala och kulturella rättigheter respekteras, inbegripet allas rätt att fritt delta på ett aktivt och informerat sätt, och utan diskriminering, i alla viktiga beslutsprocesser som kan ha en inverkan på denna persons livsstil eller på dennes rättigheter, i enlighet med artikel 15, punkt 1 a (¹)?

Svar från Karel De Gucht på kommissionens vägnar
(15 maj 2013)

Kommissionen fäster stor vikt vid ekonomiska, sociala och kulturella rättigheter. Dessutom anser vi att öppenhet är en grundförutsättning för ömsesidig förståelse och acceptans av politiken på alla områden i linje med artikel 49 e i den allmänna kommentaren nr 21 från FN:s ekonomiska och sociala råd som parlamentsledamöterna hänvisar till.

Vid förhandlingarna om ett transatlantiskt partnerskap för handel och investeringar med USA kommer kommissionen att respektera allmänhetens behov av information om avtalet i enlighet med artikel 11 i EU-fördraget.

Därför för kommissionen en strukturerad dialog med civilsamhället i form av regelbundna möten om handelspolitiken för att förbättra kommunikationen och den ömsesidiga förståelsen. Två speciella möten om förhandlingarna med USA hölls den 20 mars 2012 och den 4 april 2013.

Dessutom hölls två offentliga samråd 2012 för att få in synpunkter från berörda aktörer om de framtida handelsförbindelserna och ekonomiska förbindelserna mellan EU och USA.

Kommissionen har också informerat Europeiska ekonomiska och sociala kommittén.

EU tar regelbundet upp frågan om ratificering av den internationella konventionen om ekonomiska, sociala och kulturella rättigheter med den amerikanska administrationen.

Kommissionen fortsätter att regelbundet rapportera till Europaparlamentet om hur det går i det här ärendet.

(¹) Kommittén för ekonomiska, sociala och kulturella rättigheter, 2009, allmän kommentar nr 21: Allas rätt att fritt delta i det kulturella livet (artikel 15.1 a), i den internationella konventionen om ekonomiska, sociala och kulturella rättigheter, E/C.12/GC/21, <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cescr/comments.htm>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003301/13
to the Commission**

Carl Schlyter (Verts/ALE), Eva Lichtenberger (Verts/ALE), Christian Engström (Verts/ALE), Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE), Malika Benarab-Attou (Verts/ALE), Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE) and Raúl Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(22 March 2013)

Subject: EU-US trade agreement and obligations under the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR)

The EU is obliged to respect, protect and fulfil the human rights enshrined in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). This obligation results from the constitutional traditions common to the Member States (Article 6(3) TEU), since all the Member States have ratified the ICESCR. The EU must desist from acts and omissions that create a real risk of nullifying or impairing the enjoyment of ICESCR rights (see also Case C-73/08, Bressol and Others).

The United States has signed but not ratified the ICESCR.

How will the Commission ensure, during the negotiation of the announced trade agreement with the US, that the ICESCR rights are respected, including everyone's right 'to take part freely in an active and informed way, and without discrimination, in any important decision-making process that may have an impact on his or her way of life and on his or her rights under Article 15, paragraph 1(a)' ⁽¹⁾?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission

(15 May 2013)

The Commission attaches great importance to economic, social and cultural rights. In addition, it considers that transparency is essential for mutual understanding and acceptability of policy in any area in line with the General Comment No 21, paragraph 49(e) of the United Nations (UN) Economic and Social Council that the Honourable Member refers to.

Throughout the negotiations of the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership with the United States (US), the Commission will respect the need of the public to be informed about the agreement in compliance with Article 11 of the Lisbon Treaty.

To this end, the Commission conducts a structured dialogue with civil society through regular meetings on trade policy with the purpose of strengthening communication and mutual understanding. Two dedicated sessions on the possible US negotiations were held on 20 March 2012 and on 4 April 2013.

Furthermore, two public consultations were launched in 2012 to enable the gathering of detailed views from stakeholders relating to the future trade and economic relationship between the EU and the US.

The Commission has also informed the European Social and Economic Committee.

The EU regularly raises the issue of ratification of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights with the US Government.

The Commission will continue reporting regularly to Parliament on the state-of-play of the file.

⁽¹⁾ Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 2009, General comment No 21: 'Right of everyone to take part in cultural life (Article 15, paragraph 1(a), of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights)', E/C.12/GC/21, <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cescr/comments.htm>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003302/13
to the Commission**

Martina Anderson (GUE/NGL)

(22 March 2013)

Subject: Funding to tackle transgender discrimination

Are there currently any EU funding streams available to encourage the creation of equality- or LGBT-related, specifically transgender forums and organisations?

Are there any such streams envisaged under the next MFF, and will they be crossborder or involve more than one Member State?

Will the rights and citizenship programme have specific funds to deal with issues of transgender equality, in terms of support, challenging discrimination and best-practice sharing?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission

(3 May 2013)

Under the current financial framework the PROGRESS Programme ⁽¹⁾ provides funding to support the effective implementation of the principle of non-discrimination (Section 4: Antidiscrimination and diversity), and aims, among others, to promote networking, mutual learning, identification and dissemination of good practice and innovative approaches, as well as to support the capacity of key European level networks. Funding is available from the PROGRESS Programme to organisations which are active to combat discrimination and meet the priorities and provisions established in the annual work programmes and in the relevant calls for proposals.

As the Honorable Member is aware of, under the 2014-2020 multiannual financial framework the Commission has included the Anti-discrimination and Diversity section of the PROGRESS Programme into the Rights and Citizenship Programme, currently under negotiation with the European Parliament and the Council. In the Commission's proposal, one of the specific objectives of this Programme is to support the effective implementation of the principle of non-discrimination and possible types of actions to be funded include support to main actors, networking among specialised bodies and organisations, mutual learning, identification and dissemination of good practices, etc. The Commission proposal allows funding for either national or transnational actions.

⁽¹⁾ Decision 1672/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 2006 establishing a Community Programme for Employment and Social Solidarity-Progress, OJ L 315, 1.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003303/13
to the Commission
Roger Helmer (EFD)
(22 March 2013)**

Subject: EU aid to Palestine

The EU is, according to the European External Action Service's website, the largest donor of financial assistance to the Palestinian Authority ⁽¹⁾, and therefore has considerable responsibility.

While there is little doubt that Palestinians experience hardship and assistance is needed, it is also alleged that the Palestinian Authority continues to misappropriate funds:

1. What measures have been taken by the Commission to address the recommendations made by the OLAF report of 2004 ⁽²⁾?
2. Can the Commission provide evidence that EU aid funds can no longer be misappropriated by the Palestinian Authority?

While I am aware that basic data is provided on EU grants to Palestine, I am also informed that substantial documentation on grants relating to organisations involved in the Arab-Israeli conflict remains hidden. Can the Commission explain why there is a lack of transparency in this instance?

**Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(6 May 2013)**

The Olaf Report of 2004 found no proof that EU funds were misappropriated. Nevertheless a number of measures have been taken to address the recommendations made to the Commission at that time.

Under the Temporary International Mechanism (TIM) from 2006-2008 and the PEGASE ⁽³⁾ which replaced it in 2008 and continues, the EU no longer provides direct budget support to the Palestinian Authority (PA). Funds for civil service salaries and pensions, as well as for social security allocations, are paid into a Single Treasury Sub-Account, established by the Ministry of Finance specifically for this purpose.

Disbursements are made on the basis of lists of eligible beneficiaries, submitted by the PA and subject to *ex ante* authorisation and *ex post* verification by audit companies employed by the Commission specifically for this purpose. Through this system the EU is able to verify the amount of money paid to each individual beneficiary.

The TIM was subject to an external evaluation and audit which provided reasonable assurance on the procedures used. PEGASE has also been subject to an internal audit which reached similar conclusions. An audit by the Court of Auditors of the PEGASE direct financial support mechanism is ongoing.

The Commission does not accept the allegations of a lack of transparency in funding for projects implemented by NGOs in the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Grants for projects which are awarded to NGOs under the EIDHR ⁽⁴⁾ and Partnership for Peace initiative are attributed following public calls for proposals. These calls — as well as the names of the projects selected and the beneficiary — are published on the website of the Directorate General for Development and Cooperation and of the EU Delegations concerned ⁽⁵⁾.

⁽¹⁾ http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/westbank/eu_westbank/political_relations/index_en.htm

⁽²⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/anti_fraud/media-corner/press-releases/press-releases/2005/20050317_01_en.htm

⁽³⁾ French acronym for 'Mécanisme Palestino — Européen de Gestion et d'Aide Socio-Economique'.

⁽⁴⁾ European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights.

⁽⁵⁾ The Commission also refers the Honourable Member to its replies to Question P-003198/2013 on the same subject: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003304/13
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(22 March 2013)**

Subject: Nutrition and healthy eating in hospitals and nursing homes

Food nutrition is vital for a healthy lifestyle and is even more important when people are unwell or recovering from illness or medical procedures. Increasingly studies are demonstrating that malnourished patients can suffer from decreased appetite, reduced cardiac output, slower healing of wounds and higher rates of mortality.

It was recently reported that patients in Irish hospitals are being fed a high-fat, high-calorie diet based mainly on processed foods, in direct contravention of departmental healthy eating guidelines. For example, the sick and elderly in more than 100 public hospitals and nursing homes in Ireland are being offered highly processed foods such as potato waffles, pies with just 10% meat, fish dishes that were only 50% fish, etc.

Further studies have highlighted the fact that 11% of people who go into Irish hospitals are malnourished and 30% show nutritional decline during their stay.

Given that a study carried out in 70 hospitals in the USA showed that patients who got proper nutrition stayed in hospital 2.1 fewer days on average, thus saving almost USD 700 per bed day, it is clear that proper nutrition for hospital patients could also save money, for the national health authorities as well as the patient.

In this regard, could the Commission comment on what policy is in place in relation to nutrition in hospitals and nursing homes on an EU-wide basis? Has the Commission conducted research on what constitutes best practice in relation to food nutrition in hospitals and nursing homes across the EU? What recommendations does the Commission make to Member States in relation to food nutrition and public bodies such as national health authorities and care organisations?

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

The Commission is promoting EU action to promote healthier diets as set out in the strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity-related Health issues ⁽¹⁾. The strategy is implemented through the High Level Group for Nutrition and Physical Activity ⁽²⁾ and the EU Platform for Action on Diet, Physical Activity and Health ⁽³⁾.

The food provided at hospitals and nursing homes is a Member State responsibility and national authorities have a key role in providing appropriate meals to the patients. Therefore, the Commission is not in a position to inform or comment on the specific policies in this area in the Member States.

The Commission will be supporting a two year pilot project aimed at promoting healthy diets targeting pregnant women, children, as well as elderly people. This project will involve relevant stakeholders comprising among others paediatric doctors, nurses, midwives and nutritionists, and will be implemented in specific settings including hospitals.

Moreover, under the EU Platform for Action on Diet, Physical Activity and Health, there is a commitment by German retailers (in cooperation with other organisations) on offering healthy meals in German canteens and nursing homes.

⁽¹⁾ A Strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity related health issues, COM(2007) 279.

⁽²⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/high_level_group/index_en.htm

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/platform/index_en.htm

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-003305/13
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(22 martie 2013)

Subiect: Instituirea unui registru public pentru cel de al 8-lea, al 9-lea și al 10-lea Fond european de dezvoltare

În raportul său privind descărcarea de gestiune pentru execuția bugetului celui de al 8-lea, al 9-lea și al 10-lea Fond european de dezvoltare aferent exercițiului financiar 2010, Parlamentul a solicitat Comisiei și statelor membre să creeze un registru public în care să fie enumerate în mod transparent acordurile de sprijin bugetar, procedurile și indicatorii de dezvoltare. Comisia pentru control bugetar a Parlamentului a reiterat această solicitare în proiectul său de raport privind descărcarea de gestiune 2011 pentru execuția bugetului celui de al 8-lea, al 9-lea și al 10-lea Fond european de dezvoltare, pe care l-a adoptat la 18 martie 2013.

Poate Comisia să prezinte stadiul măsurilor adoptate și calendarul stabilit pentru instituirea acestui registru public?

Răspuns dat de dl Piebalgs în numele Comisiei
(16 mai 2013)

Comisia s-a angajat, în Comunicarea din 2011 privind o nouă abordare a sprijinului bugetar, să publice informații relevante privind operațiunile de sprijin bugetar ale UE ⁽¹⁾.

În prezent, există mai multe instrumente, care nu sunt specifice pentru sprijinul bugetar, prin care se asigură transparența ajutoarelor și a operațiunilor Comisiei [de exemplu, sistemul de transparență financiară ⁽²⁾ sau instrumentul pentru transparența ajutoarelor (TR-AID) ⁽³⁾].

În 2012 și 2013, Comisia a pus în aplicare noile instrumente și proceduri introduse de noua abordare a sprijinului bugetar, cum ar fi cadrul de gestionare a riscurilor. Pornind de la această revizuire radicală a sistemului de sprijin bugetar, Comisia a început în 2013 să analizeze natura informațiilor pe care trebuie să le publice în lumina angajamentelor politice asumate, precum și cele mai potrivite mijloace prin care pot fi puse la dispoziție aceste informații.

A fost instituit un grup de lucru care să examineze implicațiile juridice, tehnice și de comunicare ale structurii și naturii informațiilor ce trebuie furnizate.

În contextul pregătirii următorului cadru financiar multianual (CFM 2014-2020) și a celui de al 11-lea Fond european de dezvoltare, Comisia urmărește dezvoltarea instrumentului de informare necesar. Publicarea acestor informații va trebui să fie corelată cu bazele de date existente, de exemplu bazele de date menționate anterior.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2011) 638 final.

⁽²⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/beneficiaries/fts/index_en.htm

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/index_en.htm

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003305/13
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(22 March 2013)**

Subject: Establishment of a public register for the 8th, 9th and 10th European Development Funds

In its report on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the Eighth, Ninth and Tenth European Development Funds for the financial year 2010, Parliament called on the Commission and Member States to create a public register in which budget support agreements, procedures and development indicators would be fully transparently listed. Parliament's Committee on Budgetary Control reiterated this call in its draft report on the 2011 discharge in respect of the Eighth, Ninth and Tenth European Development Funds, which it adopted on 18 March 2013.

Can the Commission outline the state of play and time framework regarding the establishment of this public register?

**Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(16 May 2013)**

The Commission has committed itself, in the 2011 Communication on a new approach to Budget Support, to publishing relevant information on EU budget support operations ⁽¹⁾.

Currently, several instruments, not specific to Budget Support, allow for transparency of aid and Commission's operations (for instance the financial transparency system (FTS) ⁽²⁾ or the Transparent Aid (TR-AID) tool ⁽³⁾).

In 2012 and 2013, the Commission put in place the new tools and procedures introduced by the new approach to Budget Support, such as the Risk Management Framework. Based on this overhaul of the Budget Support system, the Commission has started in 2013 to analyse the nature of the information to be published in line with its policy commitment and the best media for publishing it.

A working group has been established to look into the legal, technical and communication aspects of the information structure and nature to be provided.

In the framework of the preparation of the next Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF 2014 — 2020) and the 11th European Development Fund, the Commission aims at developing the needed information tool. The publication of this information will have to be linked to existing databases such as those mentioned above.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2011)638 final.

⁽²⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/beneficiaries/fts/index_en.htm

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/index_en.htm

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-003306/13
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(22 martie 2013)

Subiect: Mai multă transparență cu privire la achizițiile publice pe site-ul de internet al OLAF

Site-ul de internet al Oficiului European de Luptă Antifraudă (OLAF) oferă acces la lista contractanților cărora le-au fost atribuite contracte cu valoare scăzută între 2005 și 2011, așa cum prevăd articolul 91 din Regulamentul financiar și articolul 129 din Normele de aplicare și în conformitate cu articolul 119 alineatul (3) din Normele de aplicare.

Pe de altă parte, lista contractanților cărora li s-au atribuit contracte cu valoare ridicată nu a fost pusă la dispoziție pe site-ul de internet. În plus, pagina de internet a OLAF prezintă doar procedurile recente de achiziții pentru „Crearea unui mecanism de evaluare al UE în domeniul combaterii corupției, acordând o atenție deosebită identificării și reducerii costurilor corupției în achizițiile publice care implică fonduri europene” și „Furnizarea și instalarea de fișete mobile”. Aceasta constituie o deficiență gravă în materie de transparență și îngreunează monitorizarea de către contribuabilii și părțile interesate din UE a modului în care OLAF cheltuiește banii publici.

1. Căror contractanți le-a atribuit OLAF contractele cu valoare ridicată din 2005 până în prezent? Pentru fiecare contract atribuit, vă rugăm să oferiți informații detaliate privind data, perioada de executare și valoarea contractului, contractanții și subcontractanții, precum și tipul exact de atribuire utilizat.

2. Ce măsuri va lua OLAF și în ce interval de timp pentru a asigura mai multă transparență pe site-ul său de internet (a) publicând lista contractanților cărora li s-au atribuit contracte cu valoare ridicată și (b) oferind acces direct la toate procedurile de achiziții publice deschise și închise/finalizate? În cazul procedurilor de achiziții, ar trebui să fie accesibile nu doar notificările de atribuire a contractelor, ci și anunțurile și invitațiile de participare, caietele de sarcini și celelalte documente conexe.

Răspuns dat de dl Šemeta în numele Comisiei
(6 mai 2013)

1. În calitatea sa de serviciu al Comisiei, Oficiul European de Luptă Antifraudă (OLAF) se supune obligațiilor reglementate de normele privind achizițiile publice și transparența ⁽¹⁾ care sunt gestionate la nivel instituțional. În ceea ce privește Regulamentul financiar ⁽²⁾ (articolul 101 și următoarele), pentru fiecare procedură de ofertare corespunzătoare unui așa-numit contract de „valoare mare” (peste 60 000 EUR), anunțul de participare este publicat, împreună cu setul complet de specificații, în Jurnalul Oficial al Uniunii Europene (JOUE), precum și pe site-ul OLAF ⁽³⁾, pe pagina de internet aferentă. Aceste informații sunt menținute online până la executarea contractului. După ce contractul a fost atribuit, decizia de atribuire este publicată pe site-ul TED al JOUE ⁽⁴⁾. Există obligația de a publica, pe site-ul internet al instituției, contractele cu valoare mică, până la data de 30 iunie a următorului exercițiu financiar. În conformitate cu articolul 35 din Regulamentul financiar și cu articolul 21 din normele de aplicare, publicarea contractelor se realizează prin intermediul sistemului de transparență financiară (STF) ⁽⁵⁾, care este accesibil publicului. STF este un motor de căutare web care oferă posibilitatea de a căuta beneficiarii fondurilor Uniunii Europene gestionate de către Comisie pe baza gestiunii centralizate. Printre informațiile financiare obligatorii se numără numele și adresa beneficiarului (localitatea în cazul persoanelor fizice), suma acordată, precum și natura și scopul cheltuielilor.

2. OLAF își îndeplinește toate obligațiile cu privire la toate normele și reglementările actuale privind transparența și achizițiile publice.

⁽¹⁾ 2004/18/CE.

⁽²⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/budget/biblio/documents/regulations/regulations_en.cfm

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/anti_fraud/about-us/calls-for-tender/index_en.htm

⁽⁴⁾ <http://ted.europa.eu/TED/main/HomePage.do>

⁽⁵⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/beneficiaries/fts/>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003306/13
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(22 March 2013)**

Subject: Increasing the transparency of OLAF's website with regard to public procurement

The website of the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) offers access to the list of contractors awarded low-value contracts between 2005 and 2011. This is in accordance with Article 91 of the Financial Regulation and Article 129 of the Implementing Rules and based on Article 119(3), paragraph 2 of the Implementing Rules.

On the other hand, the list of contractors awarded high-value contracts has not been made available on this website. Moreover, OLAF's website only presents recent calls for tenders for the 'Development of an EU Evaluation Mechanism in the area of Anti-Corruption with a particular focus on identifying and reducing the costs of corruption in Public Procurement involving EU Funds' and 'Supply and installation of mobile filing cabinets'. This represents a serious weakness in terms of transparency and makes it more difficult for EU taxpayers and interested parties to monitor OLAF's public spending.

1. To which contractors has OLAF awarded high-value contracts from 2005 to present? For each of the contracts awarded, please provide detailed information on its date, period of execution, value, the contractor(s) and sub-contractor(s) as well as the specific award type used.

2. Which measures will OLAF implement, and under which timeframe, in order to further increase the transparency of its website by (a) making the list of contractors awarded high-value contracts publicly available and (b) providing direct access to all open and closed/completed calls for tender? In the case of calls for tender, access should not only be given to the contract award notice but also to the contract notice, the invitation to tender, the tender specifications and any other related documents.

**Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(6 May 2013)**

1. The European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) as a Commission service is subject to the obligations governed by the procurement and transparency rules ⁽¹⁾ which are handled on an institutional level. In respect to the Financial Regulation ⁽²⁾ (Article 101 and following), for every call for tender for a so-called 'high-value' contract (above EUR 60 000) the contract notice is published in the *Official Journal of the European Union* (OJEU) as well as on the OLAF website ⁽³⁾ on the designated webpage together with the full set of specifications. This information is kept online until the contract is executed. Once the contract has been awarded the award decision is published in the OJEU TED website ⁽⁴⁾. There is an obligation to publish low-value contracts on the institution's Internet website by June 30th of the next financial year. In respect of Articles 35 of the Financial Regulation and 21 of the Rules of Application, the publication of the contracts is done via the Financial Transparency System (FTS) ⁽⁵⁾ which is accessible for the public. The FTS is a web searching engine which offers the possibility to search for recipients of European Union funds managed by the Commission under centralised management. Mandatory financial information includes recipient's name and address (locality in the case of natural persons), the amount awarded and the nature and purpose of the expenditure.

2. OLAF fulfils all its obligations with respect to all standing rules and regulations regarding transparency and procurement.

⁽¹⁾ 2004/18/EC.

⁽²⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/budget/biblio/documents/regulations/regulations_en.cfm

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/anti_fraud/about-us/calls-for-tender/index_en.htm

⁽⁴⁾ <http://ted.europa.eu/TED/main/HomePage.do>

⁽⁵⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/beneficiaries/fts/>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003307/13
to the Commission
Fiona Hall (ALDE)
(22 March 2013)**

Subject: National policies regarding electromagnetic field (EMF) exposure across the EU

In 1998, the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) published guidelines for limiting exposure to time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields. In 1999, the Council published its recommendation on the limitation of the exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz) ⁽¹⁾, based on the limitations recommended in the ICNIRP guidelines. The Commission last reported on the implementation of the Council's recommendation in 2008, and in 2011 the Netherlands' National Institute for Public Health and the Environment published a report entitled 'Comparison of international policies on electromagnetic fields (power frequency and radiofrequency fields)'.

Is the Commission aware of any research or evidence which indicates that different national (or even regional) policies on the limitation of EMF exposure have had any effect on the health of citizens living in different areas?

Would the Commission be willing to instigate research into the impact on health of the differing policies to limit EMF exposure across EU Member States?

Given that in 2011 it was estimated that 1.4 million base stations exist worldwide and that this number is significantly increasing, especially as a result of 3G and 4G technology, does the Commission consider the EU's current legislation on EMF exposure, which dates back more than a decade, to still be sufficient to protect the general public?

**Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(6 May 2013)**

The Commission is not aware of the studies mentioned by the Honourable Member. Health impact assessment of exposure to EMF poses a significant scientific challenge as to date no firm conclusions can be drawn as to potential adverse health effects of exposure to EMFs.

The Commission is currently funding three projects on health impacts of EMFs ⁽²⁾, with a possible fourth one coming from a currently open call, which may serve as a basis for health impact assessment research in the future. The evaluation and measurement of effective EMF exposures are one of the main scientific questions addressed by these projects.

Council Recommendation 1999/519/EC ⁽³⁾ provides for clear limitations of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields.

To make sure that the exposure limits of the Council Recommendation do indeed provide a high level of protection, the Commission requests periodically an independent update of the scientific evidence available and checks whether it still supports the proposed exposure limits. The Scientific Committee on Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks (SCENIHR) has a standing mandate to provide these independent updates.

All assessments to date have concluded that there is no scientific rationale to revise the exposure limits. A new update has been launched, with an expected public consultation by June 2013 ⁽⁴⁾.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 199, 30.7.1999, p. 59.

⁽²⁾ Advanced research on interaction mechanisms of electromagnetic exposures with organisms for risk assessments (<http://arimmora-fp7.eu>); Risk of brain cancer from exposure to radio frequency fields in childhood and adolescence (www.mbkds.com); Sound exposure and risk assessment of wireless network devices (<http://seawind-fp7.eu>).

⁽³⁾ OJ L 199, 30.7.1999.

⁽⁴⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/health/electromagnetic_fields/policy/index_en.htm

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003308/13
aan de Commissie
Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE) en Esther de Lange (PPE)
(22 maart 2013)**

Betreft: Prestaties van de Geriatric Expert Group met betrekking tot de veiligheid van geneesmiddelen voor ouderen

Via haar antwoord op onze vraag E-011147/2012 heeft de Commissie ons medegedeeld dat het Europees Geneesmiddelenbureau (EMA) een Geriatric Expert Group heeft opgericht, die wetenschappelijk advies geeft aan het Comité voor geneesmiddelen voor menselijk gebruik (CHMP) en het EMA-secretariaat over kwesties met betrekking tot ouderen.

Het is voor ons echter niet duidelijk op welke wijze deze deskundigengroep invloed uitoefent op de bescherming van de belangen van ouderen bij het testen van medicijnen. Deze invloed lijkt tot nu toe zeer beperkt te zijn, hetgeen onaanvaardbaar zou zijn. Bovendien moeten ouderen volledig kunnen vertrouwen op de geneesmiddelen die zij innemen.

Kan de Commissie specifiekere zijn bij het beantwoorden van de volgende vragen:

1. Wat zijn de specifieke rol en opdracht van deze deskundigengroep?
2. Over welk soort kwesties geeft de groep advies?
3. Om welke adviezen heeft het CHMP gevraagd sinds de oprichting van de deskundigengroep?
4. Welke directe gevolgen heeft het bestaan van de deskundigengroep gehad voor de werkzaamheden van het CHMP?

**Antwoord van de heer Borg namens de Commissie
(14 mei 2013)**

1. De Geriatric Expert Group van het Europees Geneesmiddelenbureau is opgericht om bijstand te verlenen bij de uitvoering van de strategie van het Geneesmiddelenbureau ten aanzien van geriatrische patiënten. Op aanvraag voorziet de deskundigengroep het Geneesmiddelenbureau van advies over aangelegenheden die verband houden met geriatrische medicijnen en gerontologie ⁽¹⁾.
2. Op aanvraag voorziet de deskundigengroep het Geneesmiddelenbureau van advies over aangelegenheden die verband houden met geriatrische medicijnen en gerontologie, zoals:
 - wetenschappelijk advies over geriatrische aspecten van richtlijnen die vrijgegeven worden voor raadpleging
 - wetenschappelijk advies over specifieke geriatrische aspecten bij de ontwikkeling van geneesmiddelen, de beoordeling van producten of over kwesties die verband houden met geneesmiddelenbewaking;
 - deskundig geriatrisch advies tijdens bijeenkomsten van het Geneesmiddelenbureau, indien nodig;
 - deelname aan andere activiteiten die verband houden met de uitvoering van de strategie van het Geneesmiddelenbureau ten aanzien van geriatrische patiënten.
3. De deskundigengroep wordt stelselmatig verzocht om commentaar te geven op richtsnoeren. Zij heeft veiligheids- en werkzaamheidstabellen ontwikkeld die sinds een jaar deel uitmaken van het model van het beoordelingsverslag van het Geneesmiddelenbureau. Daarnaast is de deskundigengroep door het Geneesmiddelenbureau gevraagd om bij te dragen aan zwakteanalyse tools die beschikbaar zijn voor klinisch gebruik.
4. De uitkomsten van het werk van de deskundigengroep hebben geholpen om de verwachtingen te verduidelijken wat betreft de benodigde gegevens voor het vormen van een positieve baten/risico-verhouding van geneesmiddelen voor ouderen. Dit wordt geïllustreerd door de aanwezigheid van een geriatrisch onderdeel in alle nieuw ontworpen richtsnoeren.

⁽¹⁾ http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Other/2011/06/WC500107028.pdf

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003308/13
to the Commission
Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE) and Esther de Lange (PPE)
(22 March 2013)**

Subject: Achievements of the Geriatric Expert Group in keeping medicines safe for older people

The Commission has informed us, answering our Question E-011147/2012, that in 2011 the European Medicines Agency (EMA) created a Geriatric Expert Group, which provides scientific advice to the Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use (CHMP) and the EMA secretariat on issues related to older people.

However, the impact of this Expert Group in terms of safeguarding the interests of older people when testing medicines is unclear to us. So far, its influence seems very limited. If this were to be the case it would not be acceptable. Also, older people should be able to completely trust the medicines they take.

Can the Commission be more specific and answer the following questions:

1. What are the specific role and remit of this Expert Group?
2. On what kind of questions is it advising?
3. What advice has been asked for by the CHMP since the Expert Group's inception?
4. What immediate influence has the Expert Group's existence had on the work of the CHMP?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(14 May 2013)**

1. The European Medicines Agency's Geriatric Expert Group has been established in order to assist in the implementation of the Agency's Geriatric Medicines Strategy. The Group provides the Agency, upon request, with scientific advice on matters relating to geriatric medicines and gerontology ⁽¹⁾.
2. The Group provides the Agency, upon request, with scientific advice on matters relating to geriatric medicines and gerontology, such as
 - scientific advice on geriatric aspects of guidelines to be released for consultation;
 - scientific advice on specific geriatric aspects of medicines development, assessment of products or pharmacovigilance issues;
 - geriatric expertise during to Agency meetings, when needed;
 - participation in other activities linked to the implementation of the Agency's geriatric medicines strategy.
3. The group is routinely requested to comment on guidelines. It has drafted safety and efficacy tables that have become, since a year, part of the Agency's assessment report template. In addition the group has been asked by the Agency to input in an analysis of frailty evaluation tools available for clinical use.
4. The output of the Group's work has helped clarify the expectations in terms of data requirements necessary for confirming a positive benefit/risk balance of medicinal products for the older population. This is exemplified by the presence in all new guidelines drafted of a geriatric section.

(1) http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Other/2011/06/WC500107028.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003309/13
alla Commissione
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(22 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Certificazione SOA

Considerato che l'Attestazione SOA è la certificazione obbligatoria per la partecipazione a gare d'appalto per l'esecuzione di appalti pubblici di lavori, ovvero un documento necessario e sufficiente a comprovare, in sede di gara, la capacità dell'impresa di eseguire, direttamente o in subappalto, opere pubbliche di lavori con importo a base d'asta superiore a 150.000 euro.

Considerato che l'Attestazione SOA ha validità quinquennale (sempre che ne venga verificata la validità al terzo anno dal primo rilascio) e viene rilasciata a seguito di un'istruttoria di validazione dei documenti prodotti dall'impresa, facenti capo agli ultimi dieci esercizi di attività dell'impresa (dieci anni di lavori e i migliori cinque esercizi tra gli ultimi dieci) da appositi Organismi di Attestazione, ovvero società autorizzate ad operare dall'Autorità per la Vigilanza sui Contratti Pubblici (AVCP).

Considerato che l'Attestazione SOA qualifica l'azienda ad appaltare lavori per categorie di opere quali opere di carattere generale (edilizia civile e industriale, fogne e acquedotti, strade, restauri, etc.) e opere specializzate (impianti, restauri di superfici decorate, scavi, demolizioni, arredo urbano, finiture tecniche, finiture in legno, in vetro e in gesso, arginature etc.).

Considerato che il rilascio dell'Attestazione SOA ha un costo minimo di 5.296,57 euro e che pertanto, in un momento di crisi come quello attuale, imprese in difficoltà rischiano di essere tagliate fuori da procedure di gare di appalto che facilitano le imprese economicamente più forti a scapito delle piccole e medie aziende in difficoltà.

Considerato che in altri paesi come Regno Unito e Germania esistono sistemi volontari e preventivi di qualificazione che non comportano costi per le imprese partecipanti a gare di appalto.

Considerato che regole di funzionamento omogenee in tutti gli Stati membri garantirebbero un mercato interno più efficiente.

— Non ritiene la Commissione che sia necessario intervenire al fine di armonizzare un settore normativo dove le differenze esistenti in materia di accesso alla gara di appalto rendono farraginoso il mercato interno?

— Non ritiene inoltre che l'Attestazione SOA sia discriminatoria e tenda a privilegiare le aziende che possono permettersi la cifra necessaria all'ottenimento della stessa?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(13 maggio 2013)

Per valutare quanto le attestazioni SOA gravano sulle imprese, occorre considerare che sono valide cinque anni e che sono obbligatorie solo per gli appalti per lavori pubblici di valore superiore a 150 000 euro. Inoltre, ai sensi della normativa italiana le imprese di altri Stati membri non sono tenute a essere in possesso di un'attestazione SOA e possono dimostrare la loro idoneità con strumenti alternativi. Questo assicura, conformemente alla direttiva 2004/18/CE, l'assenza di discriminazione nei confronti delle imprese di altri Stati membri ed evita ostacoli alle offerte transfrontaliere. Gli Stati membri sono autorizzati ad avere in vigore norme quali quella in questione, a condizione che rispettino la legislazione dell'UE in materia di appalti pubblici e i principi del trattato.

La Commissione condivide tuttavia la preoccupazione di ridurre al minimo gli oneri amministrativi a carico degli offerenti potenziali. Visto il contesto, la proposta della Commissione di una nuova direttiva in materia di appalti pubblici dispone che le amministrazioni aggiudicatrici accettino autodichiarazioni come prova preliminare che i candidati e gli offerenti non presentano motivi di esclusione e soddisfano i criteri di selezione. Questa proposta ridurrà ulteriormente gli ostacoli all'accesso agli appalti pubblici.

La proposta della Commissione intende inoltre promuovere gli appalti elettronici — rendendoli obbligatori — e rafforzare il ruolo di e-Certis, un sistema di informazione che aiuta le imprese a individuare quali attestazioni e certificati sono necessari nelle gare di appalto degli Stati membri definendo le equivalenze fra le varie certificazioni. In questo modo le procedure di partecipazione alle gare di appalto risulteranno snellite.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003309/13
to the Commission
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(22 March 2013)**

Subject: SOA certification

The SOA certificate (Certification Body certificate) is the certificate required in Italy for submitting tenders for public works contracts, or a necessary and sufficient document for proving a company's ability in a tendering process, either directly or as a subcontractor, to execute public works contracts with a bid price greater than EUR 150 000.

A SOA certificate is valid for five years (provided its validity is checked in the third year after it was first issued) and is issued after examination and validation of the documents produced by the company relating to the company's last 10 years of operation (10 years' work and the best five years out of the last 10) conducted by specific certification bodies, which are organisations authorised to operate by the Public Contract Supervisory Authority (AVCP). A SOA certificate qualifies the company to undertake work in categories such as general works (civil and industrial construction, sewerage and water supply systems, highways, restoration work, etc.) and specialised works (industrial plant, restoration of decorated surfaces, excavations, demolitions, urban design, technical finishes, timber, glass and plaster finishes, embankments, etc.).

It costs at least EUR 5 296.57 to issue a SOA certificate and, therefore, in an economic crisis such as the one we are experiencing companies in difficulties are likely to be excluded from tendering procedures, which favour companies in a stronger financial position over small and medium-sized enterprises in difficulties.

Other countries such as the United Kingdom and Germany have voluntary, provisional qualification systems that entail no cost to tendering companies.

Uniform operating rules for all Member States would ensure a more efficient single market.

— Does the Commission not think that intervention is needed to harmonise an area of legislation in which the existing differences in access to tendering procedures leave the single market in a state of confusion?

— Does it not also believe that the SOA certificate is discriminatory and tends to favour those companies that can afford one?

**Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(13 May 2013)**

When assessing the burden of SOA certificates on companies it should be considered that they are valid for five years and are compulsory only for public works contracts of value exceeding EUR 150,000. Furthermore, under Italian law companies from other Member States are not obliged to hold a SOA certificate and can prove their qualification by alternative means. This ensures, in compliance with Directive 2004/18/EC, that there is no discrimination against companies from other Member States and avoids obstacles to cross-border bids. As long as EU public procurement legislation and the principles of the Treaty are complied with, Member States are allowed to have in force rules such as those in question.

The Commission shares however the concern that the administrative burden on potential tenderers should be limited as much as possible. In this context, the Commission's proposal for a new Directive on Public Procurement provides that contracting authorities accept self-declarations as preliminary evidence that candidates and tenderers do not present any grounds for exclusion and fulfill the selection criteria. This proposal will further reduce entry barriers to public procurement.

The Commission proposal also aims at promoting e-procurement — by making it mandatory — and at strengthening the role of e-Certis, an information system that helps companies to identify certificates and attestations required in Member States' tendering procedures, by setting out the equivalence between certificates. This will also help making participation in tendering procedures less burdensome.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003310/13
alla Commissione**

Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)

(22 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Possibile nuova violazione da parte dell'Italia delle procedure di cui alla direttiva 2004/18/CE, in relazione alla realizzanda opera «Superstrada Pedemontana Veneta»

Si fa seguito alle due precedenti interrogazioni P-009842/2011 e E-007368/2012, depositate rispettivamente in data 20 ottobre 2011 e 23 luglio 2012 in merito alla realizzanda Superstrada Pedemontana Veneta, per sottoporre all'attenzione della Commissione i possibili profili di violazione della direttiva 2004/18/CE relativa al coordinamento delle procedure di aggiudicazione degli appalti pubblici di lavori, di forniture e di servizi, che potrebbero caratterizzare la convenzione di concessione di progettazione definitiva ed esecutiva, costruzione e gestione dell'opera del 21 ottobre 2009. Convenzione della quale, come riferito nelle precedenti interrogazioni, viene sistematicamente negata copia da parte delle autorità competenti agli espropriati e ai comitati e associazioni costituitisi a contrasto dell'infrastruttura ⁽¹⁾.

In base allo schema di tale convenzione, a suo tempo allegato al bando di gara, che disciplina la costruzione e gestione della Superstrada in regime di concessione, sono previsti alcuni meccanismi volti a spostare il rischio imprenditoriale legato all'opera dal concessionario (la Società Superstrada Pedemontana Veneta S.P.V. S.r.l.), come proprio della forma della concessione, al concedente (la Regione Veneto ⁽²⁾), come avviene invece nell'appalto pubblico. In particolare, viene previsto l'obbligo in capo al concedente di garantire l'equilibrio economico finanziario dell'accordo nel caso in cui il concessionario consegua ricavi da pedaggio minori rispetto a quelli previsti.

Secondo la giurisprudenza della Corte di giustizia delle Comunità europee, proprio nell'elemento della sussistenza del rischio in capo al concessionario risiede la distinzione tra il contratto di concessione di lavori o servizi pubblici e quello di appalto pubblico, discriminare che, come ha chiarito la Corte stessa, va valutato esclusivamente alla stregua del diritto comunitario ⁽³⁾, a garanzia della concorrenza nell'Unione europea ⁽⁴⁾. L'Italia, in particolare, è già stata condannata in passato dalla Corte per violazione delle direttive 92/50/CEE e 93/37/CEE (ora rifeuse nella direttiva 2004/18/CE) a causa del mancato rispetto delle procedure ivi previste ⁽⁵⁾.

Tutto ciò premesso, non ritiene opportuno aprire un'indagine per chiarire se, nel caso in esame, la citata convenzione sia stata stipulata impropriamente come concessione di lavori o servizi anziché come appalto pubblico, in violazione del disposto dalla direttiva 2004/18/CE?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione

(14 maggio 2013)

La Commissione desidera informare l'onorevole deputato che un'indagine è attualmente in corso per verificare, da un lato, l'accesso alle informazioni ai sensi della direttiva 2003/4/CE in merito alla costruzione della superstrada Pedemontana Veneta in Italia e, dall'altro, l'applicazione delle direttive 85/337/CE e 92/43/CE al progetto in questione.

I servizi competenti stanno esaminando le ultime risposte trasmesse dalle autorità italiane nel mese di dicembre 2012 e informeranno l'onorevole deputato sul risultato dell'analisi.

L'onorevole deputato attira l'attenzione della Commissione su nuovi elementi riguardanti una possibile violazione, da parte dell'Italia, delle procedure stabilite nella direttiva 2004/18/CE in relazione alla superstrada Pedemontana Veneta, attualmente in costruzione.

Le informazioni trasmesse dall'onorevole deputato non sono sufficienti affinché la Commissione possa valutare la presenza di un'eventuale violazione della normativa dell'UE in materia di appalti pubblici. La Commissione esaminerà ulteriormente il caso e terrà informato l'onorevole deputato sugli ulteriori sviluppi.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.covepa.blogspot.it/>, sito del CO.VE.P.A. (Coordinamento Veneto Pedemontana Alternativa).

⁽²⁾ Come convenuto dal commissario delegato alla realizzazione del progetto Ing. Silvano Vernizzi, istituito con ordinanza n. 3802 del 15.8.2009.

⁽³⁾ Cfr. Corte di Giustizia CE, 2° sez., 18.7.2007, causa C-382/05.

⁽⁴⁾ Cfr. <http://amministrazioneincammino.luiss.it/wp-content/uploads/2007/09/nota.pdf>

⁽⁵⁾ Cfr. sempre Corte di Giustizia CE, 2° sez., 18.7.2007, causa C-382/05 e Corte di Giustizia CE, 3° sez., 13.11.2008, causa C-437/07.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003310/13
to the Commission**

Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)

(22 March 2013)

Subject: Possible further infringement by Italy of the procedures laid down in Directive 2004/18/EC in relation to the Pedemontana Veneta expressway, currently under construction

Following the previous two questions — P-009842/2011 and E-007368/2012, lodged on 20 October 2011 and 23 July 2012, respectively — concerning the Pedemontana Veneta expressway, which is currently under construction, I would draw the Commission's attention to possible infringements of Directive 2004/18/EC on the coordination of procedures for the award of public works contracts, public supply contracts and public service contracts, in the agreement of 21 October 2009 awarding the contract for the final execution plan, construction and management of the project. As mentioned in the previous questions, the competent authorities have consistently refused to provide copies of the agreement to the people whose properties have been subject to compulsory purchase and the committees and associations formed to oppose the project ⁽¹⁾.

The agreement outline, which was originally attached to the invitation to tender and governs the construction and management of the expressway under a concession arrangement, provides for certain mechanisms designed to shift the business risk associated with the project from the concessionaire (Società Superstrada Pedemontana Veneta S.P.V. s.r.l.), who would normally bear it under a concession, to the contracting authority (the Veneto Regional Government ⁽²⁾), as would happen instead under a public contract. In particular, the contracting authority is required to guarantee the financial and economic stability of the agreement in the event that the concessionaire's toll revenue is less than expected.

According to European Court of Justice case law, the difference between works or service concessions and public contracts lies in whether the risk is retained by the contracting authority. As the Court itself has made clear, this distinction should be assessed purely on the basis of EC law ⁽³⁾ in order to safeguard competition within the EU ⁽⁴⁾. The Court has already found Italy guilty of breaching Directives 92/50/EEC and 93/37/EEC (now recast in Directive 2004/18/EC) by failing to comply with the procedures they laid down ⁽⁵⁾.

In view of all the above, does the Commission believe it should set up an enquiry into the case in question to determine whether the abovementioned agreement has been improperly drawn up as a works or service concession instead of as a public contract, in breach of Directive 2004/18/EC?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission

(14 May 2013)

The Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that it is currently investigating on the one hand access to information under Directive 2003/4/EC with regard to the construction of the Pedemontana Veneta toll expressway in Italy, and on the other hand the application of Directives 85/337/EC and 92/43/EC to the same project of Pedemontana Veneta toll expressway.

The last replies submitted by the Italian authorities in December 2012 are currently under assessment by the competent services. The Commission will keep the Honourable Member informed on the outcome of this assessment.

The Honourable Member draws the Commission's attention to new elements concerning a possible infringement by Italy of the procedures laid down in Directive 2004/18/EC in relation to the Pedemontana Veneta expressway, currently under construction.

The information provided by the Honourable Member is not sufficient for the Commission to assess whether an infringement of EU public procurement law has been committed. The Commission will therefore look into this case more closely and keep the Honourable Member informed of further developments.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.covepa.blogspot.it/>, the CoVePA (Veneto Pedemontana Alternative Coordination) site.

⁽²⁾ As agreed by Silvano Vernizzi, the commissioner in charge of project execution, who was appointed by Order 3802 of 15 August 2009.

⁽³⁾ See Court of Justice of the European Communities, Second Chamber, 18 July 2007, Case C-382/05.

⁽⁴⁾ See <http://amministrazioneincammino.luiss.it/wp-content/uploads/2007/09/nota.pdf>

⁽⁵⁾ See again Court of Justice of the European Communities, Second Chamber, 18 July 2007, Case C-382/05, and Court of Justice of the European Communities, Third Chamber, 13 November 2008, Case C-437/07.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003311/13
alla Commissione**

Andrea Zaroni (ALDE)

(22 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Possibile violazione del regolamento (CE) n. 1007/2009 del Parlamento e del Consiglio e del regolamento (UE) n. 737/2010 della Commissione

Il 7 marzo 2013, in Italia, a seguito di segnalazione delle organizzazioni HSI ⁽¹⁾ e LAV ⁽²⁾, il Corpo Forestale dello Stato ha effettuato un sequestro di calzature (90 pelli grezze e oltre 100 paia di scarpe) realizzate con pelli di foca, prodotte e commercializzate da un'azienda italiana.

Tale azienda dichiarava sul proprio sito web che le pelli di foca utilizzate provenivano da fonti sostenibili Inuit e direttamente importate dalla Groenlandia, nel rispetto del regolamento (UE) n. 737/2010.

Secondo il regolamento (UE) n. 737/2010, prodotti originati dalla caccia praticata dalla popolazione Inuit o da altre comunità indigene possono essere immessi sul mercato solo quando conformi a determinati parametri, e solo se accompagnati da un documento di certificazione emesso da un'autorità competente riconosciuta dalla Commissione europea.

Nella lista di autorità riconosciute dalla Commissione e pubblicate sul sito della Direzione Generale Ambiente ⁽³⁾, tuttavia, non compare alcuna autorità della Groenlandia.

Considerato che le pellicce di foca utilizzate dall'azienda italiana sono state importate per il tramite di una società danese, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Quali azioni intende intraprendere per assicurare la corretta implementazione del regolamento (CE) n. 1007/2009 e del regolamento (UE) n. 737/2010?
2. Quali azioni intende intraprendere per verificare se ci sono state altre importazioni illegali di prodotti di foca, dal 2010 ad oggi?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione

(27 maggio 2013)

Il recente sequestro di prodotti derivati dalla foca da parte del corpo forestale dello Stato italiano, immessi in libera pratica dalle autorità doganali danesi, è stato appurato presso le autorità competenti danesi e italiane. La Commissione porterà la questione all'attenzione degli Stati membri in seno al comitato per la protezione di specie della flora e della fauna selvatiche mediante controllo del loro commercio, al fine di evitare casi simili in futuro.

Si noti che il 25 aprile 2013 la Commissione ha riconosciuto il ministero della Pesca, della caccia e dell'agricoltura della Groenlandia tra le autorità autorizzate a rilasciare le certificazioni necessarie per l'immissione sul mercato dei prodotti derivati dalla foca.

⁽¹⁾ HSI Humane Society International www.hsi.org.

⁽²⁾ LAV Lega Anti vivisezione www.lav.it.

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/environment/biodiversity/animal_welfare/seals/seal_hunting.htm

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003311/13
to the Commission
Andrea Zaroni (ALDE)
(22 March 2013)**

Subject: Possible breach of Regulation (EC) No 1007/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council and Regulation (EU) No 737/2010 of the Commission

On 7 March 2013, in Italy, after being tipped off by the organisations HSI ⁽¹⁾ and LAV ⁽²⁾, the State Forestry Corps seized footwear (90 raw hides and over 100 pairs of shoes made out of seal hide) manufactured and marketed by an Italian firm.

The company claimed on its website that the seal hides came from sustainable Inuit sources and had been directly imported from Greenland, in compliance with Regulation (EU) No 737/2010.

According to Regulation (EU) No 737/2010, products originating from hunts conducted by the Inuit and other indigenous communities may be placed on the market only when they meet certain criteria and must be accompanied by certification issued by a competent authority recognised by the European Commission.

However, on the list of authorities recognised by the Commission and published on the website of the Directorate-General for the Environment ⁽³⁾, there are none from Greenland.

Given that the seal hides used by the Italian company were imported through a Danish company:

1. What action will the Commission take to ensure the proper implementation of Regulation (EC) No 1007/2009 and Regulation (EU) No 737/2010?
2. What action will the Commission take to check whether there have been any other illegal imports of seal products since 2010?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission
(27 May 2013)**

The recent seizure of seal products by the Italian State Forestry Corps, which were released for free circulation by the Danish customs authorities, has been clarified with the Danish and Italian competent authorities. The Commission will raise this issue with Member States through the Committee on the protection of species of wild fauna and flora by regulating trade therein, with a view to avoid such cases in the future.

Please note that Commission recognised, on 25 April 2013, the Greenland Department of Fisheries, Hunting and Agriculture, as a body that can issue the attesting documents that are needed when seal products are placed on the market.

⁽¹⁾ HSI Humane Society International www.hsi.org

⁽²⁾ LAV Lega Anti Vivisezione www.lav.it

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/environment/biodiversity/animal_welfare/seals/seal_hunting.htm

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-003312/13
do Komisji**

Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)

(22 marca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Obywatelka Polski bezprawnie przetrzymywana na terenie Białorusi

Jak informują media, obywatelka Polski Teresa Strzelec od dwóch tygodni nie może wydostać się z Białorusi, gdyż białoruscy celnicy zabrali jej paszport i anulowali wizę.

Rok temu Teresa Strzelec pojechała na wycieczkę do Mińska. Gdy zepsuł jej się samochód, zostawiła go u mechanika. Autem bez wiedzy właścicielki jeździł syn mechanika, którego zatrzymała białoruska milicja. Samochód został zarekwirowany i przekazany do składu celnego.

Białoruski sąd orzekł w styczniu tego roku, że auto ma być oddane właścicielom. Jednak celnicy wcześniej je sprzedali i wprawdzie zaproponowali rodzinie zwrot pieniędzy, ale naliczyli wysokie cło i podatki – 80 tys. złotych. Strzelcowie nie zapłacili, więc gdy przed dwoma tygodniami przybyli do Brześcia, Teresie Strzelec anulowano wizę, zatrzymując ją na Białorusi.

W związku z tymi doniesieniami zwracam się z zapytaniem, czy Komisja ma zamiar wyjaśnić sprawę bezprawnego przetrzymywania obywatelki kraju członkowskiego Unii Europejskiej na terytorium Białorusi oraz podjąć interwencję w tej sprawie?

**Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu
Komisji**

(23 maja 2013 r.)

Instytucje UE nie posiadają uprawnień w zakresie ochrony konsularnej obywateli UE, a kwestią tą zajmowały się właściwe służby polskie. Delegatura UE w Mińsku została jednak poinformowana o tej sprawie i podniosła ją w rozmowach z władzami Białorusi. Teresa Strzelec otrzymała pozwolenie na opuszczenie Białorusi.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003312/13
to the Commission**

Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)

(22 March 2013)

Subject: Polish woman unlawfully held in Belarus

According to media reports, Teresa Strzelec from Poland has been unable to leave Belarus for two weeks after Belarusian customs agents confiscated her passport and cancelled her visa.

Teresa travelled to Minsk one year ago. When her car broke down, she left it with a mechanic. The mechanic's son then took the car for a drive without the owner's knowledge and was detained by the Belarusian police. The car was confiscated and transported to a customs warehouse.

In January 2013, a Belarusian court ruled that the car must be returned to its owners. However, the customs agents had already sold the car. They did offer to reimburse the money to the Strzelec family, but only after charging high customs duty and taxes amounting to PLN 80 000. The Strzelec family did not pay, and when they travelled to Brest two weeks ago, Teresa Strzelec's visa was cancelled and she was held in Belarus.

Does the Commission intend to seek clarification on the unlawful holding of a citizen of an EU Member State in Belarus and intervene in this matter?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(23 May 2013)

EU institutions have no competence for the consular protection of EU citizens and the matter was dealt with by the competent services of Poland. The EU Delegation in Minsk was however aware of this case and raised it with the Belarusian authorities. Teresa Strzelec was allowed to leave Belarus.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-003313/13
to the Commission
Julie Girling (ECR)
(22 March 2013)**

Subject: Delay in signing off shark finning ban

There appears to be a delay in getting the final sign-off regarding the shark finning ban, despite the agreement reached between the Council and Parliament (Fish stock conservation: removal of fins of sharks on board vessels, amending Regulation (EC) No 1185/2003).

Can the Commission explain the reasons for the delay? What is being done to bring this to a final conclusion?

**Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(17 April 2013)**

The Commission was informed that on 22 March 2013 a letter was sent from the Secretary General of the Council to the Secretary General of the Parliament in order to secure the final signing of the regulation amending Council Regulation (EC) No 1185/2003. According to the letter the delay in signing was caused by the introduction of modifications agreed during the joint legal-linguistic revision of the Parliament and the Council. The Commission is confident that Parliament and Council will ensure a swift conclusion of the procedure so that the amended Regulation can enter into force as soon as possible.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003314/13
a la Comisión**

Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(22 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Turismo náutico — Aplicación del IEDMT en España

La Ley española de Impuestos Especiales (Ley 38/1992), que regula el Impuesto Especial sobre Determinados Medios de Transporte (IEDMT), grava con este impuesto las embarcaciones de más de 15 metros de otros Estados de la UE destinadas al arrendamiento (chárter náutico) y que operan en aguas jurisdiccionales españolas, aunque ya hayan cumplido todos los requisitos de abanderamiento y matriculación en sus respectivos Estados.

En la respuesta a la pregunta E-003584/2011 sobre este mismo asunto, la Comisión manifestó que, en el arrendamiento de medios de transporte, los Estados miembros deben ajustarse a los requisitos que derivan del principio de libertad de prestación de servicios conforme a la interpretación del Tribunal de Justicia de la UE en los asuntos *Cura Anlagen y van de Coevering*: el principio de libertad de prestación de servicios se opone a que un Estado miembro exija el pago total del impuesto de matriculación a una empresa establecida en dicho Estado miembro por el arrendamiento de un vehículo matriculado en otro Estado miembro.

1. ¿Ha analizado la Comisión la aplicación del IEDMT en España tal como afirmaba en la respuesta a la pregunta E-003584/2011?
2. ¿Considera necesario la Comisión modificar la legislación española de manera que sea compatible con el Derecho de la UE?
3. ¿Qué opina la Comisión respecto de la aplicación del criterio de proporcionalidad en la aplicación del IEDMT?

Respuesta del Sr. Šemeta en nombre de la Comisión
(24 de abril de 2013)

La Comisión remite a Su Señoría a la respuesta que dio a la pregunta escrita E-011079/2012.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003314/13
to the Commission**

Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)

(22 March 2013)

Subject: Maritime tourism — Application of IEDMT in Spain

Spanish Law 38/1992 on special taxes regulates a special tax on certain means of transport (*Impuesto Especial sobre Determinados Medios de Transporte* — IEDMT). It uses the latter to tax chartered boats over 15 metres in length from other EU Member States operating within Spanish waters, despite them having complied with all the flagging and registration requirements of their respective States.

In its answer to Question E-003584/2011 on this subject, the Commission said that as regards the leasing or hiring of means of transport, Member States must respect the requirements flowing from the principle of freedom to provide services as interpreted by the EU Court in *Cura Anlagen* and *van de Coevering*: the principle of the freedom to provide services precludes a Member State from requiring the full payment of the registration tax from an undertaking established in that Member State which leases a vehicle registered in another Member State.

1. Has the Commission assessed the application of the IEDMT in Spain as it stated it would in its answer to Question E-003584/2011?
2. Does it believe that Spanish law must be amended to be compatible with EC law?
3. What is its opinion regarding the application of the proportionality criterion in the operation of this special tax?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission

(24 April 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-011079/2012.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003315/13
an die Kommission
Werner Langen (PPE)
(22. März 2013)

Betrifft: Prüfung potenzieller Beihilfen für von Netzentgelten befreite große Stromverbraucher in Deutschland

Am 6. März 2013 hat die Kommission bekannt gegeben (IP/13/191), dass sie überprüft, ob die Befreiung großer Stromverbraucher von Netzentgelten in Deutschland eine staatliche Beihilfe darstellt und ob, gegebenenfalls, diese Beihilfe zu übermäßigen Wettbewerbsverzerrungen führt oder gerechtfertigt werden kann.

1. Wie ist der aktuelle Stand der eingeleiteten Prüfung?
2. Wann können die betroffenen Stromverbraucher mit einer Entscheidung rechnen?
3. Teilt die Kommission die Auffassung, dass die Besonderheiten der großen Stromverbraucher bzw. der stromintensiven Unternehmen berücksichtigt werden müssen, und, wenn ja, wie werden diese Besonderheiten berücksichtigt?

Antwort von Herrn Almunia im Namen der Kommission
(11. Juni 2013)

Am 6. März 2013 hat die Kommission eine ergebnisoffene förmliche Prüfung nach Artikel 108 Absatz 2 AEUV eingeleitet, um die verschiedenen Aspekte dieses Sachverhalts eingehend zu untersuchen. Dadurch erhalten Deutschland und andere Beteiligte die Gelegenheit, zu den ersten Erkenntnissen der Kommission Stellung zu nehmen. Die Kommission hat bereits eine Stellungnahme Deutschlands erhalten. Die Ergebnisse der vorläufigen Prüfung wurden im Amtsblatt C 128 vom 4. Mai 2013 veröffentlicht. Alle Beteiligten haben einen Monat Gelegenheit zur Stellungnahme.

Der Fall ist komplex, und vor einer abschließenden Würdigung der Kommission liegen noch mehrere Verfahrensschritte: die Veröffentlichung, die Stellungnahmen von Beteiligten, die Weiterleitung dieser Stellungnahmen an Deutschland und die Äußerungen Deutschlands zu den Stellungnahmen. Zudem ist nicht auszuschließen, dass die Kommission Deutschland um weitere Auskünfte ersuchen wird. Aus diesen Gründen lässt sich derzeit nicht vorhersagen, wann mit einem abschließenden Beschluss zu rechnen ist. Generell ist es jedoch das Ziel der Kommission, innerhalb von 18 Monaten nach Einleitung eines förmlichen Prüfverfahrens zu einem abschließenden Beschluss zu gelangen.

Ob und in welchem Umfang die Besonderheiten der großen Stromverbraucher beziehungsweise der energieintensiven Unternehmen berücksichtigt werden können, ist einer der Aspekte, den die Kommission nun im Rahmen der förmlichen Prüfung untersucht. Die Fragen des Herrn Abgeordneten werden im abschließenden Beschluss ordnungsgemäß beantwortet werden.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003315/13
to the Commission
Werner Langen (PPE)
(22 March 2013)**

Subject: Inquiry into potential aid for large electricity consumers exempted from network charges in Germany

On 6 March 2013, the Commission announced (IP/13/191) that it is investigating whether an exemption for large electricity consumers from network charges in Germany constitutes state aid and, where relevant, whether this aid will lead to undue distortion of competition or whether it can be justified.

1. What is the current status of the inquiry that has been opened?
2. When can the electricity consumers concerned expect a decision?
3. Does the Commission agree that the particular characteristics of large electricity consumers or electro-intensive undertakings need to be taken into account and, if so, how will this be done?

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

On 6 March 2013, the Commission opened its formal investigation under Article 108(2) TFEU. The formal investigation does not prejudice the outcome of the investigation. It enables the Commission to examine various aspects of the case in greater detail. It also offers Germany and other interested parties the opportunity to submit comments on the Commission's initial findings. The Commission has already received Germany's comments. The opening findings were published in the Official Journal on 4 May 2013 (OJ C 128). Third parties have a one-month deadline to submit comments.

The case is complex and several procedural steps still need to happen before the Commission can make its final assessment (publication, third parties' comments, transmission of third parties' comments to Germany, Germany's observations on third parties' comments), nor can it be ruled out that the Commission will ask for further information from Germany. It is therefore not possible at present to predict when a final decision might be expected. However, in general, the Commission aims to adopt final decisions within 18 months of a formal investigation being opened.

Whether and to what extent the particularities of large electricity consumers or electro-intensive undertakings can be taken into account is one of the issues that the Commission is in the course of examining during the formal investigation procedure. The Honourable Member's questions will be duly answered in the final decision.

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003316/13
à la Commission**

Malika Benarab-Attou (Verts/ALE)

(22 mars 2013)

Objet: U-Multirank

La commissaire à l'éducation, à la culture, à la jeunesse et au multilinguisme, Androulla Vassiliou, était à Paris les 18 et 19 mars dernier pour évoquer le classement U-Multirank développé ces dernières années sous l'égide de l'Union européenne.

La France ayant annoncé le lancement de son projet de cartographie des établissements d'enseignement supérieur et de recherche (CERES), auquel devraient participer dans un premier temps une trentaine d'établissements, la Commission pourrait-elle préciser comment cette initiative s'articulera avec U-Multirank?

D'autres États membres envisagent-ils de développer des systèmes parallèles de classement? Dans l'affirmative, comment U-Multirank pourrait-il en tirer parti?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Vassiliou au nom de la Commission

(7 mai 2013)

Des projets nationaux tels que le projet CERES (cartographie des établissements d'enseignement supérieur et de recherche), mis en œuvre en France, viendront compléter le classement européen des universités, à l'instar d'organisations nationales telles que l'Observatoire des Sciences et des Techniques (OST), qui fait partie du consortium exploitant U-Multirank. Les organisations nationales impliquées dans le classement et l'établissement de profils d'universités coopéreront avec U-Multirank afin d'éviter que les mêmes données ne soient collectées deux fois auprès des établissements d'enseignement supérieur et de faire en sorte que ces données soient fiables et représentatives des domaines de performance couverts par U-Multirank. La participation à U-Multirank permettra également de comparer les résultats des initiatives de classement nationales à l'échelon international en dotant les établissements d'enseignement supérieur et les responsables politiques d'un ensemble de données disponibles plus vaste. D'autres pays comme la Pologne, l'Espagne, l'Allemagne et l'Autriche, par exemple, ont déjà mis au point des classements nationaux qui seront reliés à U-Multirank.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003316/13
to the Commission**

Malika Benarab-Attou (Verts/ALE)

(22 March 2013)

Subject: U-Multirank

The Commissioner for Education, Culture, Multilingualism and Youth, Androulla Vassiliou, was in Paris on 18 and 19 March to discuss U-Multirank, the new European Union-backed university ranking.

As France has announced the launch of the CERES (cartographie des établissements d'enseignement supérieur et de recherche) project to map the country's higher education system, which will initially involve some thirty institutions, could the Commission explain how this initiative will work with U-Multirank?

Do other Member States plan to develop parallel ranking systems? If so, how could U-Multirank benefit from them?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission

(7 May 2013)

National projects like CERES (cartographie des établissements d'enseignement supérieur et de recherche) in France will complement the European university ranking as will National Organisations such as the Observatoire des Sciences et des Techniques (OST) which forms part of the consortium running U-Multirank. National organisations involved in the ranking and profiling of universities will cooperate with U-Multirank in order to both avoid duplicating the collection of data from higher education institutions and to ensure that data is both reliable and representative of the performance areas covered by U-Multirank. Equally, participation in U-Multirank will enable national ranking initiatives to compare their results internationally, providing a wider evidence base for higher education institutions and policy-makers. Other countries, for example Poland, Spain, Germany and Austria have already developed national rankings that will link in to U-Multirank.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003317/13
alla Commissione
Andrea Cozzolino (S&D)
(22 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Recepimento in Italia della direttiva 89/391/CEE concernente l'attuazione di misure volte a promuovere il miglioramento della sicurezza e della salute dei lavoratori durante il lavoro

Il 21 novembre 2012 la Commissione, nell'ambito della procedura d'infrazione n. 2010/4227, ha trasmesso al governo italiano le sue osservazioni circa il non corretto recepimento della direttiva 89/391/CEE.

La Commissione, a seguito dell'analisi della risposta fornita l'8 dicembre 2011 dalle autorità italiane, ha comunque deciso di procedere con la messa in mora, con particolare riferimento a due delle sei osservazioni contenute nella precedente lettera di costituzione in mora (SG(2011)D/16130).

La Commissione, conformemente all'articolo 258 del TFUE, ha concesso due mesi di tempo all'Italia per conformarsi alla direttiva 89/391/CEE in relazione a due punti: 1) deresponsabilizzazione del datore di lavoro in caso di delega o sub-delega (violazione dell'articolo 5) e 2) proroga dei termini prescritti per la redazione del documento di valutazione dei rischi per una nuova impresa o per le modifiche sostanziali apportate a un'impresa esistente (violazione dell'articolo 9).

I due mesi dal ricevimento del parere sono ampiamente trascorsi, e di conseguenza il termine imposto all'Italia è spirato senza che il paese si adeguasse.

Alla luce di quanto sopra l'interrogante chiede:

1. se risponde al vero che il governo italiano ha scritto alla Commissione in data 11 febbraio 2013 e, in caso affermativo, in che termini;
2. se, a fronte di detta missiva e del mancato adeguamento nei termini previsti, la Commissione ritiene necessario proseguire con la procedura di infrazione per violazione del diritto dell'Unione secondo l'articolo 258 del TFUE, ai fini di un corretto recepimento della direttiva 89/391/CEE;
3. se è vero che, sempre in relazione alla presunta violazione della direttiva 89/391/CEE, è stata depositata una nuova denuncia nel febbraio 2012, e, in caso affermativo, a che punto è la procedura.

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(22 maggio 2013)

Nell'ambito della procedura di infrazione menzionata, il 21 novembre 2012 la Commissione ha inviato alle autorità italiane un parere motivato.

1. La Commissione non ha ricevuto dalle autorità italiane nessuna comunicazione datata 11 febbraio 2013 relativa a detta procedura di infrazione.
2. La procedura di infrazione è in corso. Le autorità italiane hanno risposto al parere motivato della Commissione con lettera del 24 gennaio 2013, che è stata tradotta ed è attualmente in corso di analisi ad opera dei servizi competenti.
3. Il 24 febbraio 2012 la Commissione ha ricevuto un'altra denuncia in merito a una presunta violazione della direttiva 89/391/CEE. Tale denuncia è stata passata al sistema EU Pilot e, tramite tale sistema, l'11 dicembre 2012 è stata trasmessa una lettera alle autorità italiane.

L'11 febbraio 2013 le autorità italiane hanno inviato una risposta che è ora in corso di analisi.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003317/13
to the Commission
Andrea Cozzolino (S&D)
(22 March 2013)**

Subject: Implementation in Italy of Directive 89/391/EEC on the introduction of measures to encourage improvements in the safety and health of workers at work

In relation to infringement procedure No 2010/4227, on 21 November 2012 the Commission sent the Italian Government its observations on the failure to implement Directive 89/391/EEC correctly.

After examining the reply given by the Italian authorities on 8 December 2011, the Commission decided to continue with the formal notice procedure, particularly in relation to two of the six points made in the previous letter of formal notice (SG(2011)D/16130).

In accordance with Article 258 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), the Commission gave Italy two months to comply with Directive 89/391/EEC in relation to two points: 1) avoidance of employer responsibilities with regard to delegation and sub-delegation (in breach of Article 5), and 2) extension of the prescribed deadline for drafting the risk assessment document for a new business or for substantial changes made to an existing business (in breach of Article 9).

Far more than two months have gone by since the opinion was received and consequently Italy's deadline has passed without the country having made the necessary changes.

In light of the above, I would ask the Commission:

1. Whether it is true that the Italian Government wrote to the Commission on 11 February 2013 and, if so, in what terms?
2. Given that letter and the failure to make the necessary changes in the allotted time, whether the Commission considers it necessary to continue the infringement proceedings for the breach of EC law under Article 258 TFEU, with a view to the proper implementation of Directive 89/391/EEC?
3. Whether it is true that a further complaint in connection with the alleged breach of Directive 89/391/EEC was made in February 2012 and, if so, what stage the procedure has now reached?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(22 May 2013)**

The Commission sent a reasoned opinion on the infringement procedure concerned to the Italian authorities on 21 November 2012.

1. The Commission has received no communication from the Italian authorities dated 11 February 2013 and relating to that infringement procedure.
2. The infringement procedure is in progress. The Italian authorities replied to the Commission's reasoned opinion by letter of 24 January 2013, which has been translated and is currently being analysed by the competent departments.
3. On 24 February 2012 the Commission received another complaint regarding an alleged breach of Directive 89/391/EEC. That complaint was transferred to the EU Pilot system and a letter was sent to the Italian authorities via that system on 11 December 2012.

On 11 February 2013 the Italian authorities sent a reply, which is currently being analysed.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003318/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Eleni Theocharous (PPE) και Niki Tzavela (EFD)
(22 Μαρτίου 2013)

Θέμα: Αντιμετώπιση των επιπτώσεων της οικονομικής κρίσης στην Κύπρο μέσω του Ευρωπαϊκού Ταμείου Προσαρμογής στην Παγκοσμιοποίηση (ΕΤΠ)

Με βάση τα σενάρια για τη συμφωνία διάσωσης της κυπριακής οικονομίας, όπως αυτή προωθήθηκε στην Κυπριακή Βουλή, είναι εμφανής ο κίνδυνος απώλειας εργασίας τουλάχιστον σε μία από τις μεγαλύτερες τράπεζες του τόπου (LAIKI BANK). Λόγω της κρίσης, υπάρχει κίνδυνος και για απώλεια εργασίας σε άλλες τράπεζες και επιχειρήσεις.

Είναι έτοιμη η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, και ειδικότερα το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Προσαρμογής στην Παγκοσμιοποίηση (ΕΤΠ), να στηρίξει, επί τη βάση εθνικών προγραμμάτων και κατόπιν αιτήσεως της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας και των ενδιαφερομένων μερών, τους ανέργους αφενός, για να εκπαιδευτούν και αφετέρου, για να εξεύρουν νέες θέσεις εργασίας, να καταπολεμηθεί η ανεργία και να διατηρηθεί η κοινωνική συνοχή;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(7 Μαΐου 2013)

Οι κ. βουλευτές γνωρίζουν ότι στο τέλος του 2011 έληξε η ισχύς του κριτηρίου για την κρίση του Ευρωπαϊκού Ταμείου Προσαρμογής στην Παγκοσμιοποίηση (ΕΤΠ). Κάθε επιλέξιμη αίτηση πρέπει, επομένως, σύμφωνα με τον ισχύοντα κανονισμό, να αποδείξει την ύπαρξη σχέσης μεταξύ των απολύσεων και της παγκοσμιοποίησης σε επίπεδο εμπορίου. Αυτό θα μπορούσε να είναι δύσκολο στην περίπτωση των επιχειρήσεων που δραστηριοποιούνται στον τραπεζικό τομέα. Ωστόσο, αν στην Κύπρο γίνονται απολύσεις στη Λαϊκή Τράπεζα, σε άλλες τράπεζες ή σε εταιρείες, και αν η Κύπρος μπορεί να αποδείξει τη σχέση μεταξύ των εν λόγω απολύσεων και της παγκοσμιοποίησης σε επίπεδο εμπορίου (π.χ. που προκύπτει από ταχεία απώλεια του μεριδίου της αγοράς της ΕΕ, ή από την αύξηση των εισαγωγών καταγωγής χωρών μη μελών της ΕΕ, ή από μετεγκατάσταση των εργοδωτών από την Κύπρο σε άλλες χώρες εκτός της ΕΕ), τότε η Κύπρος μπορεί να αποφασίσει να υποβάλει αίτηση για στήριξη από το ΕΤΠ, ώστε οι απολυμένοι εργαζόμενοι να μπορούν να βοηθηθούν για να βρουν νέα απασχόληση όσο το δυνατόν γρηγορότερα.

Για την περίοδο 2014-2020, η Επιτροπή πρότεινε να επαναφέρει το κριτήριο για την κρίση σε μόνιμη βάση, ως ένα από τα κριτήρια για πιθανή στήριξη από το ΕΤΠ. Η στήριξη του Κοινοβουλίου θα είναι αποφασιστικής σημασίας για τη νομοθετική διαδικασία ώστε να εξασφαλιζεται η τελική έγκριση του στοιχείου αυτού.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003318/13
to the Commission
Eleni Theocharous (PPE) and Niki Tzavela (EFD)
(22 March 2013)**

Subject: Action via the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) to address the impact of the economic crisis in Cyprus

On the basis of scenarios tabled in the Cypriot Parliament for an agreement to rescue the Cypriot economy, there is clearly a risk of job losses in at least one of the biggest banks in Cyprus (Laiki Bank). There is also a danger that the crisis will trigger job losses in other banks and companies.

Are the European Union and, more importantly, the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) prepared to support unemployed persons in obtaining training and finding new jobs, on the basis of national programmes and following requests by the Republic of Cyprus and the parties concerned, in a bid to combat unemployment and maintain social cohesion?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(7 May 2013)**

The Honourable Members are aware of the fact that the crisis criterion of the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) lapsed at the end of 2011. Any eligible application must therefore according to the applicable regulation demonstrate a link between the redundancies and trade-related globalisation. This could be difficult in the case of enterprises operating in the banking sector. However, if redundancies in the Laiki Bank, other banks or companies occur in Cyprus, and if Cyprus can establish a link between these redundancies and trade-related globalisation (e.g. resulting from a rapid loss of EU market share, or from rising imports originating in non-EU countries, or by delocalisation of employers from Cyprus to other countries outside the EU), Cyprus may decide to apply for support from the EGF, so that the redundant workers can be helped to find new jobs as quickly as possible.

For the period of 2014-2020, the Commission has proposed to reintroduce the crisis criterion on a permanent basis, as one of the criteria for potential EGF support. The Parliament's support will be critical in the legislative process to ensure the final adoption of this element.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003319/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Niki Tzavela (EFD)
(22 Μαρτίου 2013)

Θέμα: Πρόγραμμα επανένταξης εργαζομένων

Μετά τις πρόσφατες αποφάσεις του Eurogroup για την αναδιάρθρωση του τραπεζικού τομέα της Κύπρου με τις γνωστές δραματικές συνέπειες για την οικονομία της χώρας, οι οποίες περιλαμβάνουν και πολλές απολύσεις, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Πόσο σύντομα μπορεί να καταρτίσει ένα ειδικό πρόγραμμα επανένταξης εργαζομένων (tailor-made) του τραπεζικού τομέα στην Κύπρο, χρηματοδοτούμενο από το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο;
2. Θα μπορούσε να καταρτιστεί ένα ίδιο πρόγραμμα και για τους εργαζόμενους στον τραπεζικό τομέα της Ελλάδας;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(8 Μαΐου 2013)

Οι ενέργειες για ένα πρόγραμμα με σκοπό την επανένταξη των εργαζομένων του τραπεζικού τομέα τόσο στην Κύπρο όσο και στην Ελλάδα μπορούν να χρηματοδοτούνται από τα διαρθρωτικά ταμεία της ΕΕ για την περίοδο 2007-2013, συμπεριλαμβανομένου του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινωνικού Ταμείου (ΕΚΤ).

Για το ΕΚΤ εφαρμόζεται επιμερισμένη ευθύνη και, ως εκ τούτου, αποτελεί ευθύνη των αρμόδιων αρχών του κράτους μέλους η πρόταση και η επιλογή νέων έργων στο πλαίσιο κατάλληλου επιχειρησιακού προγράμματος για χρηματοδότηση από τα διαρθρωτικά ταμεία της ΕΕ, σύμφωνα με τους κανόνες των σχετικών κανονισμών. Η Επιτροπή δεν έχει άμεση επιρροή στην ταχύτητα με την οποία θα μπορούσε να καταρτιστεί το πρόγραμμα αυτό.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003319/13
to the Commission
Niki Tzavela (EFD)
(22 March 2013)**

Subject: Worker reintegration programme

Following recent Eurogroup decisions to reform the banking sector in Cyprus and in light of the drastic and widely reported consequences which this has had on the country's economy, including numerous redundancies, will the Commission say:

1. How quickly could it prepare a special worker reintegration programme tailor-made to the banking sector and financed by the European Social Fund?
2. Could it also prepare a tailor-made programme for workers in the banking sector in Greece?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(8 May 2013)**

Actions for a programme for the reintegration of workers of the banking sector in both Cyprus and Greece can be financed under the 2007-2013 EU Structural Funds, including European Social Fund (ESF).

The ESF is under shared management, hence it is the responsibility of the competent Authorities of the Member State to propose and select new projects within the appropriate operational programme for financing by the EU Structural Funds according to the rules of the relevant Regulations. The Commission has no direct influence on how quickly such a programme could be drawn up.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-003321/13
an die Kommission
Richard Seeber (PPE)
(25. März 2013)

Betrifft: Interpretation der Richtlinie 2009/43/EG in Bezug auf Zielfernrohre

Anmerkung 4 der Unternummer ML1d des Anhangs zur Richtlinie 2009/43/EG scheint im deutschen Sprachraum Auslegungsunsicherheiten mit sich zu bringen. So hat der deutsche Gesetzgeber in seiner Umsetzung der Richtlinie eine generelle Ausnahme von der Einstufung als Verteidigungsgut für Zielfernrohre, die nicht für militärische Zwecke konstruiert sind, festgelegt. Der österreichische Gesetzgeber wiederum, scheint dieselbe Richtlinienpassage so zu interpretieren, dass nur „Zielfernrohre ohne elektronische Bildverarbeitung mit bis zu vierfacher Vergrößerung, vorausgesetzt, sie sind nicht besonders konstruiert oder geändert für militärische Zwecke“ von der Einstufung als Verteidigungsgut ausgenommen sind. Diese Auslegungsunterschiede führen zu großer Rechtsunsicherheit und potenziellen Wettbewerbsverzerrungen.

Wie ist die Anmerkung 4 der Unternummer ML1d des Anhangs zur Richtlinie 2009/43/EG korrekt auszulegen?

Antwort von Herrn Tajani im Namen der Kommission
(29. April 2013)

Die Kommission prüft die unterschiedliche Auslegung der Liste der Verteidigungsgüter im Anhang der Richtlinie 2009/43/EG unter dem Aspekt der Einbeziehung von Zielfernrohren. Das Problem wird außerdem auf der Tagesordnung der Sitzung des im Rahmen der Richtlinie 2009/43/EG eingerichteten Ausschusses stehen, die am 28. Juni stattfindet und bei der alle Mitgliedstaaten vertreten sein werden.

Die Kommission möchte jedoch darauf hinweisen, dass die Liste im Anhang der Richtlinie auf der Gemeinsamen Militärgüterliste der Europäischen Union beruht, die wiederum im Rahmen des Wassenaar-Abkommens regelmäßig aktualisiert wird. Die Kommission wird daher auch mit dem Sekretariat des Wassenaar-Abkommens in Kontakt stehen, um diese Frage zu klären.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-003321/13
to the Commission
Richard Seeber (PPE)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: Interpretation of Directive 2009/43/EC with regard to optical weapon sights

There seems to be some uncertainty in the German-speaking Member States about the interpretation of Note 4 on sub-item ML1.d. of the annex to Directive 2009/43/EC. In Germany, the legislation implementing the directive makes optical weapon sights not designed for military purposes generally exempt from classification as defence-related products. By contrast, in the corresponding legislation in Austria this section of the directive has been interpreted so as to exempt from classification as defence-related products only 'optical weapon sights without electronic image processing, with a magnification of 4 times or less, provided they are not specially designed or modified for military use'. These differences of interpretation create considerable legal uncertainty and could potentially distort competition.

What is the correct interpretation of Note 4 on sub-item ML1.d. of the annex to Directive 2009/43/EC?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(29 April 2013)**

The Commission is investigating the issue of differences of interpretation of the content of the list of defence-related products set out in the annex to the Directive 2009/43/EC regarding the inclusion of optical weapon sights. The question shall also feature on the agenda of the 28 June meeting of the Committee established under Directive 2009/43 EC where all Member States are represented.

The Commission would like however to stress that the list in the annex to the directive is based on the Common Military List of the European Union which is, in turn, regularly updated in the context of the Wassenaar Arrangement. Therefore, the Commission will also be in contact with the secretariat of the Wassenaar Arrangement in order to clarify this question.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003322/13

a la Comisión

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)

(25 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Gestión de los bosques

Quiero referirme a las respuestas escritas E-003711/12, E-003713/12, de 30 de mayo de 2012, del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión, donde explicaba: «la Comisión está realizando, en colaboración con los Estados miembros y las partes interesadas, la cartografía de los ecosistemas y una evaluación del estado de los ecosistemas y de sus servicios en la UE. Los resultados de esta iniciativa deben tenerlos en cuenta las autoridades nacionales y locales a la hora de preparar la segunda ronda de planes hidrológicos de cuenca en 2015», ya que el papel de los bosques está muy relacionado con la protección de los recursos hídricos y, por lo tanto, relacionado directamente con la Directiva marco sobre el agua.

1. ¿Ha hablado la Comisión con el Reino de España sobre este asunto?
2. ¿En qué fase se encuentra el proceso, teniendo en cuenta que el Reino de España no está cumpliendo la Directiva marco sobre el agua?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión

(21 de mayo de 2013)

De acuerdo con el objetivo 2 de la Estrategia de la UE sobre la biodiversidad hasta 2020 está previsto que los Estados miembros realicen la cartografía y una evaluación de los ecosistemas y de sus servicios antes de 2014.

El «Plan para salvaguardar los recursos hídricos de Europa»⁽¹⁾ propone una serie de acciones para favorecer la adopción de medidas de retención natural de agua en la segunda ronda de planes hidrológicos de cuenca que deben ser adoptados por los Estados miembros en 2015. Las medidas de retención natural de agua incluyen actuaciones que abordan el papel de los bosques para proteger los recursos hídricos. Las acciones propuestas en el Plan incluyen la elaboración de orientaciones en el marco de la estrategia común de aplicación de la Directiva Marco del Agua⁽²⁾ de aquí a 2014. Dichas orientaciones también abarcarán la integración de los servicios ecosistémicos en la aplicación de la Directiva Marco del Agua teniendo en cuenta la cartografía de los ecosistemas y sus servicios.

Todos los Estados miembros discutieron las propuestas del Plan en el Consejo, que adoptó sus Conclusiones a este respecto el 17 de diciembre de 2012⁽³⁾.

Por otra parte, los Estados miembros, incluida España, participan en el trabajo de seguimiento del Plan a través de la estrategia común de aplicación de la Directiva Marco del Agua y, en el caso de las actividades de apoyo de la Estrategia de la UE sobre la biodiversidad hasta 2020, a través del Grupo de coordinación sobre biodiversidad y naturaleza en virtud del marco de aplicación común. Se espera que los Estados miembros se comprometan activamente en la elaboración de los documentos sobre las directrices desarrolladas al respecto.

⁽¹⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2012:0673:FIN:ES:PDF>

⁽²⁾ Directiva 2000/60/CE, DO L 327 de 22.12.2000.

⁽³⁾ Doc. 17872/12.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003322/13
to the Commission**

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)

(25 March 2013)

Subject: Forest management

I would like to address Commissioner Potočnik's answer of 30 May 2012, on behalf of the Commission, to Written Questions E-003711/12 and E-003713/12 which states that: 'the Commission is working together with Member States and stakeholders on ecosystem mapping and an assessment of the state of ecosystems and their services in the EU. The results of this initiative should be taken on board by national and local authorities when drafting the second round of the River Basin management Plans in 2015'. The role of forests is closely related to the protection of water resources and is therefore directly related to the Water Framework Directive.

1. Has the Commission contacted Spain about this issue?
2. At what stage is the process, given that Spain does not comply with the Water Framework Directive?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission

(21 May 2013)

The mapping and assessment of the ecosystems and their services is expected to be performed by Member States by 2014 according to Target 2 of the EU 2020 Biodiversity Strategy.

The 'Blueprint to safeguard Europe's water resources' ⁽¹⁾ proposes actions to support the uptake of Natural Water Retention Measures (NWRM) in the second River Basin Management Plans to be adopted by Member States in 2015. NWRMs include measures that address the role of forests to protect water resources. The actions proposed by the Blueprint include the development of guidance under the Common Implementation Strategy (CIS) of the Water Framework Directive (WFD) ⁽²⁾ by 2014. This guidance will also cover the integration of ecosystems services into WFD implementation taking into account the mapping of the ecosystems and their services.

The Blueprint proposals have been discussed by all Member States in the Council which adopted Conclusions on it on 17 December 2012 ⁽³⁾.

Moreover, Member States, including Spain, participate in the Blueprint follow up work through the CIS of the WFD and, for the activities in support of the EU 2020 Biodiversity Strategy, through the Coordination Group for Biodiversity and Nature under the Common Implementation Framework (CIF). They are expected to actively engage in the development of the Guidance documents developed thereunder.

⁽¹⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2012:0673:FIN:EN:PDF>

⁽²⁾ Directive 2000/60/EC, OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.

⁽³⁾ Doc. 17872/12.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003323/13
a la Comisión**

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)

(25 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Límites a los depósitos

El Banco de España ha decidido limitar al 1,75 % la remuneración de los depósitos a un año, al 2,25 % para los de dos y al 2,75 % para los que tengan un plazo superior. ⁽¹⁾ Esta decisión tendrá como consecuencia hacer más atractivos otros instrumentos financieros e incentivará la toma de riesgos de los ahorradores españoles. Se ha de tener en cuenta que la inflación anual se sitúa alrededor del 2,75 % y que por lo tanto los ahorradores pierden dinero en términos reales.

La nueva norma, no sólo se aplicará a las entidades nacionalizadas, sino a todo el sector.

1. ¿No cree la Comisión que esta norma supone una vulneración de la libre competencia en el sector bancario?
2. ¿No cree la Comisión que esta medida puede dar incentivos a los ahorradores no expertos para tomar riesgos excesivos con otros productos financieros?
3. ¿Cree la Comisión que la decisión del Banco de España está relacionada con una voluntad política del Gobierno español de empujar a los ahorradores españoles a comprar deuda pública del Estado?
4. ¿Cree la Comisión que el Banco de España no debería interferir en el tipo de interés que ofrezcan las entidades bancarias no nacionalizadas?

Respuesta del Sr. Almunia en nombre de la Comisión

(30 de mayo de 2013)

Según la información de que dispone la Comisión, el Banco de España no ha dictado ninguna norma. La Comisión entiende que el Banco de España ha formulado recomendaciones para casos concretos de conformidad con los reglamentos sobre solvencia, que vinculan el riesgo contraído por las entidades financieras con determinados requisitos de capital y solvencia.

Las normas y reglamentos emitidos por el Banco de España con objeto de garantizar el adecuado funcionamiento y la estabilidad del sistema financiero en España se aplican a todas las entidades bancarias que operan en ese país. En esa medida, no distinguen entre los bancos que son propiedad privada y los que puedan estar controlados por el Gobierno de España.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.elconfidencial.com/mercados/2013/01/14/el-limite-a-los-depositos-llevara-la-primera-a-200-puntos-basicos-8026>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003323/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: Deposit limits

The Bank of Spain has decided to limit remuneration on one-year deposits to 1.75%, on two-year deposits to 2.25% and on longer-term deposits to 2.75% ⁽¹⁾. This decision will render other financial instruments more attractive and will encourage Spanish savers to take risks. Annual inflation stands at around 2.75% and savers are therefore losing money in real terms.

The new rule will not only apply to nationalised entities, but to the entire banking sector.

1. Does the Commission not believe that this rule is a breach of free competition in the banking sector?
2. Might this measure encourage non-expert savers to take excessive risks with other financial products?
3. Does it believe that the Bank of Spain's decision is related to the Spanish Government's political will to encourage Spanish savers to buy government debt?
4. Should the Bank of Spain interfere in the interest rate offered by non-nationalised banks?

**Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2013)**

According to the information available to the Commission, no rule was issued by the Bank of Spain. The Commission understands that recommendations were issued by the Bank of Spain on a case-by-case basis in accordance with solvency regulations, which link the risk undertaken by financial institutions with the requirements in terms of capital and solvency.

Rules and regulations issued by the Bank of Spain which are aimed at ensuring the proper working and the stability of the financial system in Spain apply to all banking entities operating in Spain. As such, they do not differentiate between privately owned banks and banks which may be controlled by the Spanish Government.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.elconfidencial.com/mercados/2013/01/14/el-limite-a-los-depositos-llevara-la-primera-a-200-puntos-basicos-8026>

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-003324/13
til Kommissionen
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(25. marts 2013)

Om: Godkendelse af dansk støtte til biogas

Den 22. marts 2012 indgik en række danske partier et energiforlig, som skal sikre Danmark en fremtidig energiforsyning dækket af vedvarende energi. Aftalen fastlægger de energipolitiske initiativer fra 2012-2020. Aftalen indebærer bl.a. en ambitiøs udbygning med biogas, som betyder, at den samlede støtte til biogas, der anvendes til kraftvarme eller sendes ud i naturgasnettet, beløber sig til 115 DKK/GJ⁽¹⁾.

Aftalen om støtte til biogas venter stadig på godkendelse af Kommissionen.

En række danske virksomheder producerer i dag biogas, men har det økonomisk svært uden en statsstøtte på 115 DKK/GJ. Nogle biogasvirksomheder er i dag lukningstruede. Hvis den danske statsstøtte til biogas godkendes af Kommissionen, vil en række biogasvirksomheder kunne fortsætte deres produktion. Ligeledes står nogle biogasproducenter i den situation, at de er blevet pålagt, jf. loven om Finansiell Stabilitet, at sælge deres biogasvirksomhed på grund af bankkrak. Prisen for virksomheden er afhængig af, om biogasproduktion i Danmark fremover vil modtage statsstøtte.

På baggrund af overstående oplysninger bedes Kommissionen svare på, om den er opmærksom på de problemer, mange biogasvirksomheder står i på grund af uvished om, om biogasproduktion vil modtage statsstøtte eller ej?

Kommissionen bedes ligeledes oplyse, hvornår den forventer at have en godkendelse eller underkendelse af den danske statsstøtte til biogas klar?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Joaquin Almunia
(27. juni 2013)

De danske myndigheder har anmeldt en støtteordning vedrørende biogas til Kommissionen, som undersøger sagen. Den nye ordning ændrer i væsentlig grad den hidtidige støtteforanstaltning, som Kommissionen havde godkendt. Den igangværende undersøgelse har givet anledning til vanskelige tekniske spørgsmål, som skal besvares i samarbejde med de danske myndigheder.

Kommissionen er opmærksom på, at det haster med at få skabt retssikkerhed på biogasmarkedet i Danmark og fører derfor i øjeblikket intensive drøftelser med de danske myndigheder om støtteordningens forenelighed med statsstøttereglerne.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.kemin.dk/Documents/Presse/2012/Energiaftale/Aftale%2022-03-2012%20FINAL.docpdf>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003324/13
to the Commission
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: Approval of Danish aid for biogas

On 22 March 2012, a number of Danish parties entered into an energy agreement intended to safeguard Denmark's future energy supply covered by renewable energy. The agreement establishes the energy policy initiatives for 2012-2020. It includes, among other things, an ambitious expansion of biogas, which means that the total aid for biogas used for combined heat and power or distributed in the natural gas network will amount to DKK 115/GJ⁽¹⁾.

The agreement on aid for biogas is still awaiting the approval of the Commission.

A number of Danish undertakings currently produce biogas, but are finding it difficult financially without the state aid of DKK 115/GJ. Some biogas undertakings are currently struggling to stay in business. If the Danish state aid for biogas is approved by the Commission, a number of biogas undertakings will be able to continue production. Similarly, some biogas producers are in a situation where they have been ordered to sell their biogas undertaking on account of bank failure, cf. the Act on financial stability. The price of the undertaking is dependent on whether biogas production in Denmark will receive state aid in future.

On the basis of the above information, can the Commission state whether it is aware of the problems faced by many biogas undertakings on account of the uncertainty as to whether or not biogas production will receive state aid?

Can the Commission also say when it expects to be ready with an approval or non-approval of the Danish state aid for biogas?

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

The Danish authorities have notified a support scheme for biogas to the Commission which is currently being examined. The new scheme changes significantly the support mechanism which has been in place so far and which was approved by the Commission. The assessment raises difficult technical questions which need to be answered in cooperation with the Danish authorities.

The Commission is aware of the urgency to establish legal certainty on the biogas market in Denmark and is therefore currently in intensive discussions with the Danish authorities regarding the compatibility of the support scheme with state aid rules.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.kemin.dk/Documents/Presse/2012/Energiaftale/Aftale%2022-03-2012%20FINAL.docpdf>

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003325/13

an die Kommission

Norbert Neuser (S&D)

(25. März 2013)

Betrifft: EU-Beihilfverfahren Rennstrecke „Nürburgring“

Seit geraumer Zeit läuft ein EU-Beihilfverfahren zu der Autorennstrecke „Nürburgring“ in Deutschland, die im Bundesland Rheinland-Pfalz liegt. Auf dem 86 Jahre alten Nürburgring in der Eifel werden unterschiedliche Rennsportveranstaltungen ausgetragen. Diese Rennsportveranstaltungen sind zu rund 90 % Breitensportveranstaltungen. Diese Veranstaltungen werden von Motorsportklubs veranstaltet und widmen sich dem Amateursport. Daneben finden auch andere Amateur-Sportveranstaltungen, wie z. B. Radrennen und leichtathletische Läufe, Duathlonwettkämpfe für Jedermann statt. Zusammengefasst kann gesagt werden, dass die Autorennstrecke „Nürburgring“ ein einzigartiges Kulturgut darstellt, das vorrangig dem Breitensport dient.

Vor diesem Hintergrund frage ich die Kommission:

1. Ist es seitens der Kommission denkbar, dass die eigentliche Rennstrecke, insbesondere im Hinblick auf die oben gemachten Angaben, vom geplanten Verkaufsprozess ausgenommen werden kann?
2. Wenn ja, ist es korrekt, dass die notwendige Ausschreibung der Rennstrecke entfallen würde und sich die Ausschreibung lediglich auf die anderen wirtschaftlichen Gebäudeteile beziehen würde?
3. Wenn die Kommission die Rennstrecke vom Verkauf nicht ausnehmen sollte, wäre dann eine gesetzliche Klausel in den Kaufverträgen, nämlich den öffentlichen Zugang zur Rennstrecke für den Breitensport zu wahren, mit den EU-Rechtsvorschriften vereinbar?

Antwort von Herrn Almunia im Namen der Kommission

(13. Mai 2013)

Die Rennstrecke des Nürburgrings kann nicht von einem offenen, nichtdiskriminierenden und bedingungsfreien Ausschreibungsverfahren ausgenommen werden. Interessierte Parteien könnten geltend machen, dass der Verkauf des Kerngeschäfts ohne ein solches Ausschreibungsverfahren nicht gerechtfertigt sei und dass sie einen besseren Preis geboten hätten. Es wäre daher unklar, ob der Verkaufspreis dem Marktwert entsprechen würde. Eine Übertragung der Beihilfe auf den Käufer könnte nicht ausgeschlossen werden.

Im Hinblick auf den Vorschlag der Insolvenzverwalter hinsichtlich der Aufnahme bestimmter Bedingungen haben gemäß der Mitteilung der Kommission betreffend Elemente staatlicher Beihilfe bei Verkäufen von Bauten oder Grundstücken durch die öffentliche Hand vom 10.7.1997 bestimmte Bedingungen in Verbindung mit der Anwendung von Regulierungsaufgaben des Staates (d. h. Stadt- und Regionalplanung gemäß nationalem Recht) im Prinzip keine Auswirkung auf die Neutralität des Verkaufs und bevorzugen auch keinen potenziellen Käufer. Bei besonderen Vorkaufsrechten, bei denen Eigentum gemäß nationalem Recht öffentlichen Behörden vorbehalten wird, ist dies jedoch nicht der Fall.

Andere Bedingungen auf der Grundlage von politischen Anliegen (Aufrechterhaltung des Betriebs oder Weiterbeschäftigung von Arbeitnehmern) würden ebenfalls nicht dem Grundsatz des marktwirtschaftlich handelnden Kapitalgebers entsprechen, da sie die Anzahl der Käufer unter Umständen beschränken würden. Deutschland müsste nachweisen, dass solche Bedingungen gerechtfertigt sind. Sie müssten nach deutschem Recht eingeführt werden und nicht über Anforderungen in der Leistungsbeschreibung. Sie müssten auch mit den allgemeinen Legalitätsanforderungen übereinstimmen, die im Vertrag über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union festgeschrieben sind.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003325/13
to the Commission
Norbert Neuser (S&D)
(25 March 2013)

Subject: EU State aid procedure — 'Nürburgring' race track

For some time there has been an ongoing EU State aid procedure relating to the 'Nürburgring' motor racing track in Germany, located in the federal state of Rhineland-Palatinate. Various racing events are held at the 86-year old 'Nürburgring' in the Eifel region. Around 90% of these racing events are grassroots sporting events. These events are organised by motor sport clubs and are devoted to amateur sports. Other amateur sports events also take place, such as cycling and athletics track events and duathlon competitions for all comers. In short, it can be said that the 'Nürburgring' motor racing track is a unique cultural asset that caters primarily for grassroots sports.

1. Is it conceivable from the Commission's point of view, in particular in view of the information given above, for the race track itself to be excluded from the planned sale?
2. If so, is it correct that the necessary invitation to bid for the race track would not be issued and that the invitation to bid would only relate to the other commercial building units?
3. If the Commission were to exclude the race track from the sale, would a legal clause in the transaction contracts, namely one securing public access to the race track for grassroots sports, be compatible with EU legislation?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(13 May 2013)

The Nürburgring race tracks cannot be excluded from an open, non-discriminatory and unconditional bidding procedure. Interested parties could claim that the sale of the core business without such a bidding procedure is not justified, and that they would have offered a better price. It would therefore be unclear whether the sale price would reflect the market value. A transfer of the aid to the buyer could not be ruled out.

As regards the proposal by the insolvency trustees concerning the inclusion of certain conditions, according to the Commission Communication on state aid elements in sales of land and buildings by public authorities of 10/07/97, certain conditions which are linked with the application of the State regulatory functions (i.e. urban and regional planning according to national law) do not in principle affect the neutrality of the sale or favour any potential buyer. However, this is not the case with special pre-emption rights, reserving property for public authorities under national law.

Other conditions based on policy concerns (maintenance of the operation, or employee retention etc.) would also not be in line with the market economy investor principle, as they may restrict the number of buyers. Germany would have to demonstrate that any such conditions are justified. These would need to be introduced under German public law, rather than by requirements in the tender specifications. They would also have to be compatible with the general legality requirements laid down in the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

—————

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003326/13
to the Commission
Catherine Stihler (S&D)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: Avoidance of EU tax duty

There have been repeated cases of Israeli companies labelling their products 'Made in Israel' when, in fact, their factories are located in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, meaning that goods produced there cannot be labelled in such a manner.

What measures has the EU developed in order to track where Israeli products are physically made? What methods has the EU adopted in order to protect its customers from buying products with misleading labels indicating their place of origin?

I would like to enquire whether this is not also being done by Israeli companies in order to avoid paying EU tax on exports to the EU?

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

The VP/HR's position with regard to the first two questions can be found in answer to Written Question E-244/2013 ⁽¹⁾.

As regards the third question, the Commission would like to point out that a technical arrangement between the EU and Israel is in place since 1 January 2005 the aim of which is to avoid that products originating in territories beyond Israel's pre-1967 borders benefit, upon importation in the EU, from preferential customs tariff treatment under the EU-Israel Association Agreement. More information on that technical arrangement can be found at the following Internet address ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq#sidesForm>

⁽²⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/customs/customs_duties/rules_origin/preferential/israel_ta_en.htm

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003328/13
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: Increase of registration fee by Antwerp City Council

I have been contacted by a constituent who has informed me that a recent edition of 'Flanders Today' has reported that Antwerp City Council intends to increase its registration fee for all non-Belgian residents to EUR 250 in April 2013. My constituent is concerned that this is an illegal proposal which is in breach of the free movement of EU citizens, and that if Antwerp is allowed to make this change other cities in the EU may also raise their fees.

Could the Commission confirm:

1. whether it is aware of this proposed increase;
2. if so, whether this fee increase is in breach of the EU's policy of free movement for its citizens;
3. whether it will be seeking an explanation from Antwerp City Council as to why it has decided it needs a higher fee?

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

The Commission refers the Honourable Member of the Parliament to its answers to parliamentary questions P-001746/2013 and E-003069/2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003330/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(25 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Scarsa trasparenza nella procedura di finanziamento da parte dell'Unione europea delle ONG attive nel conflitto arabo-israeliano — Accesso limitato alla documentazione pertinente

La scarsa trasparenza nelle procedure attraverso cui vengono erogati consistenti finanziamenti alle organizzazioni non governative coinvolte nell'ambito del conflitto arabo-israeliano comporta gravi problemi. Ogni anno la Commissione eroga un contributo finanziario a queste ONG con l'intento di garantire pari diritti individuali e collettivi. Tuttavia, in passato, quando le ONG hanno chiesto documentazione dettagliata per comprovare tutte le attività specificatamente contemplate dal regolamento (CE) n. 1049/2001, sono stati trasmessi soltanto dati incompleti e di scarsa qualità, in cui mancavano importanti informazioni che invece erano disponibili presso altre fonti. Secondo la Commissione l'esigenza di serbare la riservatezza sul contenuto dei documenti e la conseguente mancanza di dati dettagliati sarebbero dettate da ragioni di pubblica sicurezza, tutela dei dati personali e interessi commerciali, nonché dalla necessità di non complicare ulteriormente le relazioni tra Israele e Palestina. La questione è stata portata dinanzi la Corte di giustizia dell'Unione europea, ma non è stata ancora pronunciata alcuna sentenza.

Tenuto conto del fatto che:

- tramite quotidiani e articoli online sono ampiamente disponibili informazioni sul finanziamento delle ONG, ma i documenti continuano a essere tenuti segreti o non vengono aggiornati per considerazioni di pubblica sicurezza,
- al contrario, i documenti relativi a sovvenzioni erogate per paesi quali l'Angola, la Somalia o lo Sri Lanka sono facilmente accessibili,
- la ricerca eseguita attira l'attenzione sul coinvolgimento di alcune ONG che ricevono finanziamenti dalla Commissione in boicottaggi contro Israele e campagne a favore del conflitto,
- non vi è alcuna certezza che gli aiuti stanziati a queste ONG in futuro non avranno l'effetto di supportare o incoraggiare violenze contrarie ai valori europei di democrazia, libertà e tolleranza,

può la Commissione precisare quanto segue:

1. Quali criteri sono applicati impiegati per giustificare le differenze a livello di apertura e trasparenza nell'accesso ai documenti relativi ai programmi di finanziamento dell'UE nel caso dei paesi summenzionati?
2. Su quali basi si decide che alcuni documenti sono *sensibili*?
3. A suo parere, risulta necessario accertare che le informazioni legate alla fase di valutazione della procedura di finanziamento siano già state rese pubbliche?

Risposta congiunta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(11 giugno 2013)

Con sentenza del 27 novembre 2012 (causa T-17/10 Steinberg/Commissione), la Corte di giustizia ha respinto il ricorso cui si riferiscono gli onorevoli parlamentari in quanto in parte manifestamente irricevibile e in parte privo di qualunque fondamento giuridico.

Non esistono disparità di trattamento in merito alle procedure a livello di apertura e trasparenza tra Israele e Palestina ed eventuali altri paesi citati nelle domande.

Riguardo alle informazioni fornite sui finanziamenti, alle procedure seguite e alle decisioni prese in tale ambito, la Commissione rimanda gli onorevoli parlamentari al testo della sentenza in questione per ulteriori dettagli sulle argomentazioni presentate e le conclusioni motivate della Corte ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://curia.europa.eu/juris/liste.jsf?language=en&jur=C,T,F&num=T-17/10&td=ALL>

Le valutazioni sono effettuate conformemente ai criteri stabiliti nel trattato sull'Unione europea, nello strumento europeo per la democrazia e i diritti umani, nelle direttive sull'informazione dei cittadini e negli accordi interistituzionali pertinenti tra Commissione europea, Consiglio dei ministri e Parlamento europeo.

La Commissione invita inoltre gli onorevoli parlamentari a prendere visione della risposta all'interrogazione E-003077/13 ^(?).

(?) <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/it/parliamentary-questions.html>

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-003386/13

komissiolle

Sari Essayah (PPE)

(25. maaliskuuta 2013)

Aihe: Eräiden kansalaisjärjestöjen EU-rahoituksen avoimuuden parantaminen

Komissio rahoittaa vuosittain yli 10 miljoonalla eurolla palestiinalaisia ja israelilaisia kansalaisjärjestöjä (esim. EIDHR ja Partnership for Peace). On esitetty vakavia epäilyjä siitä, että tätä rahoitusta on käytetty esimerkiksi kampanjoihin, joissa on lietsottu "oikeutettua" väkivaltaa ja terrorismia israelilaisia siviilejä vastaan, juurrutettu kuvaa israelilaisista viranomaisista "sotasyllisinä" sekä ajettu Palestiinalaishallinnon hajottamista. Nämä epäillyt toimet ovat EU:n arvojen vastaisia eivätkä mitenkään edistä rauhan toteutumista Lähi-idässä, vaan päinvastoin. Tässä tilanteessa on huolestuttavaa, että komissio ei ole antanut edes pyydettyä asetuksen 1049 mukaisesti tarkkoja ja kattavia tietoja EU-rahoituksesta, siihen liittyvästä päätöksenteosta ja toiminnan arvioinnista.

Komissio on käyttänyt vuonna 2009 NGO Monitor -järjestölle antamassaan vastauksessa perusteluna asetuksen poikkeusta "yleisen turvallisuuden suojelemiseksi". Vastaus ei kuitenkaan tarjoa tarvittavia yksityiskohtaisia esimerkkejä siitä, mitä vaaraa kansalaisjärjestöille tai yleiselle turvallisuudelle EU:n antaman tuen avoimuudesta on ollut tai olisi pelättävissä. Ristiriidassa komission perustelun kanssa on se tosiasia, että monet kyseisistä organisaatioista itse pitävät rahoitustietoja esillä avoimesti ja jopa niitä korostaen.

Onko komissio todennut, että Lähi-idän konfliktin ympärillä toimiville järjestöille myönnetyn EU-rahoituksen avoimuudesta aiheutuu konkreettisia ongelmia tai odotettavissa olevia uhkia, jotka vaarantavat yleisen turvallisuuden? Mitä eroa Lähi-idän tilanteella on esimerkiksi Somalian, Sri Lankan ja Iranin tilanteisiin, joiden osalta vastaavaa rahoitustietoa on avoimesti saatavilla?

Mihin pikaisiin toimiin komissio ryhtyy, jotta näiden kolmansissa maissa toimivien, hallituksista riippumattomien israelilaisten ja palestiinalaisten järjestöjen EU-lähteistä peräisin oleva rahoitus ja siihen liittyvä päätöksenteko sekä tulosten arviointi olisivat julkisesti saatavilla EU:n avoimuuden ja vastuullisuuden periaatteen mukaisesti?

Štefan Fülen komission puolesta antama yhteinen vastaus

(11. kesäkuuta 2013)

Unionin tuomioistuin hylkäsi 27. marraskuuta 2012 antamallaan päätöksellä (asia T-17/10 Steinberg v. Euroopan komissio) kanteen, johon arvoisat parlamentin jäsenet viittaavat. Kanne hylättiin osittain siksi, että tutkittavaksi ottamisen edellytykset puuttuivat selvästi, ja osittain siksi, että kanne oli selvästi täysin perusteeton.

Israelia ja Palestiinaa ja muita kysymyksissä mainittuja maita ei kohdella eri tavoin avoimuusmenettelyjen suhteen.

Rahoituksesta annettuun tietoon sekä siihen liittyviin menettelyihin ja tehtyihin päätöksiin liittyen komissio pyytää arvoisia parlamentin jäseniä tutustumaan kyseisen päätöksen tekstiin, josta ilmenevät esitettyjen väitteiden yksityiskohdat ja tuomioistuimen perustellut päätelmät ⁽¹⁾.

Arviointeja järjestetään sen mukaisesti, mitä on sovittu Euroopan unionista tehdyssä sopimuksessa, demokratiaa ja ihmisoikeuksia koskevasta eurooppalaisesta rahoitusvälineestä annetussa asetuksessa, julkiseen tietoon liittyvissä direktiiveissä sekä asiaa koskevissa toimielinten välisissä sopimuksissa, jotka on tehty Euroopan komission, ministerineuvoston ja Euroopan parlamentin kesken.

Komissio myös pyytää arvoisia parlamentin jäseniä tutustumaan vastaukseen, jonka se antoi kysymykseen E-003077/2013 ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://curia.europa.eu/juris/liste.js?language=en&jur=C,T,F&num=T-17/10&td=ALL>

⁽²⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fi/parliamentary-questions.html>

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003330/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(25 March 2013)

Subject: Lack of transparency in EU funding process of NGOs active in Arab-Israeli conflict — limited access to the related documentation

The lack of transparency in processes which provide significant funding for non-governmental organisations involved in the context of the Arab-Israeli conflict is an issue that raises serious problems. Every year the Commission makes its financial contribution to these NGOs as it strives to achieve equal individual and collective rights. However, in the past when the NGOs asked for detailed materials documenting all activities specifically related to Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001, it received only incomplete, badly written material from which important information available elsewhere was missing. The Commission maintained that the need for secrecy concerning the content of the documents and the consequent lack of detailed data arose from reasons of public safety, privacy and commercial interests and from the need not to make the Israel-Palestine relationship even more difficult. The matter has been taken to the European Court of Justice, but there has been no ruling yet.

Taking into account that:

- documents on NGO funding are widely available through newspapers and Internet articles, but continue to be kept secret or are not fully updated because of public safety concerns;
- by contrast, documents pertaining to grants for countries such as Angola, Somalia or Sri Lanka are easily accessible;
- the research undertaken draws attention to the involvement of some NGOs which are recipients of Commission funding in anti-Israel boycotts and pro-war campaigns;
- there is no certainty that aid granted to these NGOs in the future will not have the effect of supporting or encouraging violence that runs counter to the European values of democracy, freedom and tolerance;

can the Commission state:

1. what criteria are used to justify the differences in access to openness and transparency as regards documents relating to EU funding programs in the cases of the countries mentioned above;
2. on what grounds it decides that certain materials are 'sensitive';
3. whether it believes it needs to ensure that the information related to the evaluation phase of the funding process have already been made public?

Question for written answer E-003386/13
to the Commission
Sari Essayah (PPE)
(25 March 2013)

Subject: Improvements to the transparency of EU funding for certain NGOs

Each year the European Commission provides Palestinian and Israeli NGOs, such as the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR) and Partnership for Peace, with more than EUR 10 million in funding. There have been serious suspicions that this money has been used for purposes such as campaigns to fan the flames of 'justified' violence and terrorism perpetrated against Israeli civilians, instil the image of the Israeli authorities as 'war criminals', and promote the break-up of the Palestinian Authority. These suspicious moves run counter to the EU's values and are in no way conducive to peace in the Middle East: just the opposite. Given this situation, it is worrying that the Commission, even when asked, has not provided any accurate and comprehensive information, under Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001, on EU funding, decisions taken in connection with it or any evaluation of the measures taken.

In its reply to NGO Monitor in 2009, the Commission justified its decision with reference to the exception in the regulation which deals with the interests of 'public security'. However, that reply fails to provide the necessary detailed examples of what danger to NGOs or public security transparency we should have been, or should be, fearful of, with respect to EU aid. What contradicts the Commission's reasoning in this case is the fact that many of these organisations make information on funding readily available for inspection and even draw attention to it.

Has the Commission established that the transparency of EU funding for organisations associated with the conflict in the Middle East will lead to substantial problems or anticipated threats that will endanger public security? What is the difference between the situation in the Middle East and, say, that in Somalia, Sri Lanka or Iran, regions for which similar information on funding is openly available?

What urgent steps will the Commission take to ensure that funding from EU sources for non-governmental Israeli and Palestinian organisations active in third countries, decisions taken in connection with it and an evaluation of the results are in the public domain in line with the EU's principles of transparency and accountability?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission

(11 June 2013)

By its judgment of 27th November 2012 (Case T-17/10 *Steinberg v European Commission*), the Court of Justice dismissed the application referred to by the Honourable Members as, in part manifestly inadmissible and, in part, lacking any foundation in law.

There is no differentiation of treatment regarding procedures on openness and transparency between Israel and Palestine and any of the countries referred to in the questions.

Concerning the information provided on funding and procedures and decisions taken in this regard, the Commission refers the Honourable Members to the text of the judgment in question for details of the arguments presented and the reasoned conclusions of the Court ⁽¹⁾.

Evaluations are organised in accordance with the Treaty of the European Union, the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights Regulation, public information directives and the relevant interinstitutional agreements between the European Commission, the Council of Ministers and the European Parliament.

The Commission also refers the Honourable Members to its reply to Question E 003077/13 ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://curia.europa.eu/juris/liste.jsf?language=en&jur=C,T,F&num=T-17/10&td=ALL>

⁽²⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html>

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-003331/13

Komisijai

Laima Liucija Andrikienė (PPE)

(2013 m. kovo 25 d.)

Tema: ES ir Armėnijos bendradarbiavimas

Būdama Europos Parlamento nare ir EURONEST parlamentinės asamblėjos komiteto pirmininke, atidžiai stebinėcia ES ir Armėnijos santykius, labai džiaugiuosi šios Pietų Kaukazo šalies padaryta pažanga ir žinau, kokį svarbų vaidmenį jos siekiant atliko ES patariamoji grupė Armėnijos Respublikos klausimais. Esu šio reikšmingo pastarųjų trejų metų bendradarbiavimo projekto įnašo liudininkė ir Parlamentas keturiuose dabartinės kadencijos metu priimtose rezoliucijose yra pabrėžęs, jog remia ES patariamąją grupę.

Taip pat žinau, kad šis projektas svarbus Armėnijos valstybinėms institucijoms ir kad dabar jos glaudžiai bendradarbiauja su ES patariamąsios grupės patarėjais.

Tačiau iš mūsų kolegų armėnų sužinojau, kad per pastaruosius 12 mėnesių ES delegacija sąmoningai neištraukė Armėnijos valstybinių institucijų į sprendimų priėmimo procesą dėl šio susitarimu pagrįsto projekto – atsidūrėme padėtyje, kuri prieštarauja ne tik mūsų santykių esmei, bet ir ES patariamąsios grupės teisiniams pagrindui.

Dėl šio nepriimtino ir padriko ES delegacijos atliekamo valdymo, neatitinkančio su Armėnija pasiekto susitarimo lygio, ES patariamoji grupė neteko visų pagrindinių patarėjų, Armėnijos valstybinėse institucijose kilo nerimas ir bereikalingas nepasitenkinimas, o tai gali pakenkti mūsų tolimesniems santykiams.

1. Kokių taisyklių veiksmy ketina imtis Komisija, siekdama užkirsti kelią šiai padėčiai ir tikrai dar kartą įtraukti Armėnijos valdžios institucijas į ES patariamąsios grupės sprendimų priėmimo procesą?
2. Kaip Komisija ketina stebėti, kaip ES delegacija vadovauja šiam pavyzdiniam projektui, kad išvengtų tokių neatsakingų veiksmy, kurie visiškai prieštarauja mūsų draugiškų santykių dvasiai?
3. Kaip galima sustiprinti šią veiksmingą bendradarbiavimo priemonę?

Š. Füle atsakymas Komisijos vardu

(2013 m. gegužės 30 d.)

Komisija sutaria, kad ES Patariamoji grupė (EUAG) buvo svarbi ES ir Armėnijos bendradarbiavimo priemonė. Kaip visoms ES finansinę paramą gaunantioms priemonėms, jai turėtų būti taikomos atitinkamos valdymo ir vertinimo procedūros.

Armėnijos valdžios institucijų dalyvavimą užtikrina EUAG patariamąsios tarybos veikimas – ji renkasi kas ketvirtį ir priima jos įgaliojimus atitinkančius sprendimus. Pagal šią sistemą su naudos gavėjais konsultuotasi dėl ataskaitų ir veiklos planų; be to, jie dalyvavo visose darbuotojų atrankos komisijose. Be to, EUAG neseniai sutarė reguliariai rengti darbo posėdžius, skirtus parengti patariamąją tarybą.

EU delegacijai suteikti projekto valdymo ir priežiūros įgaliojimai yra aiškiai apibrėžti, kaip ir jos vykdančiojo partnerio, Jungtinių tautų vystymosi programos (JTVP). Komisija reguliariai gauna ES delegacijos ataskaitas apie projekto įgyvendinimą, kurios rodo nuoseklų ir kruopštų valdymą. Jokiu būdu negalima sakyti, kad UAG prarado visus pagrindinius patarėjus: dviem iš jų neseniai atsistatydinus, EUAG greitai pradėjo atitinkamas darbuotojų atrankos procedūras.

Atsižvelgdama į būsimus naujus asociacijos susitarimu nustatomus ES ir Armėnijos sutartinius santykius, ES imasi žingsnių užtikrinti, kad patariamoji parama padėtų Armėnijai veiksmingai reaguoti į naujus poreikius. Pavyzdžiui, paskelbtas papildomas su Nacionaline Asamblėja susijęs etatas, siekiant padėti Armėnijos parlamentui didinti institucinius pajėgumus, kad būtų galima geriau spręsti sudėtingą teisės aktų derinimo prie ES teisės sistemos užduotį.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003331/13
to the Commission**

Laima Liucija Andrikiene (PPE)

(25 March 2013)

Subject: EU-Armenia cooperation

As a Member of the European Parliament and a Euronest Parliamentary Assembly committee Chair who closely monitors EU-Armenia relations, I am very pleased with the progress made by this South Caucasus country, and aware of the important role that the EU Advisory Group to the Republic of Armenia has played in it. I have witnessed the contribution made by this important cooperation project in the last three years, and Parliament has underlined its support for the EU Advisory Group in four resolutions adopted during the current term.

I am also well aware of the importance accorded to this project by Armenian state institutions and of the high level of interaction they now have with the advisers in the EU Advisory Group.

However, I have learned from our Armenian colleagues that during the last 12 months the EU Delegation has deliberately excluded Armenian state institutions from the decision-making process for this agreement-driven project, a situation that is contrary not only to the spirit of our relations but also to the legal base of the EU Advisory Group.

This unacceptable and erratic management by the EU Delegation, which does not correspond to the level of understanding reached with Armenia, has resulted in the loss of all the key advisers in the EU Advisory Group and created worrisome and unnecessary discontent in Armenian state institutions, which could undermine our wider relations.

1. What remedial action is the Commission going to take to stop this situation and genuinely involve Armenian state institutions once again in the EU Advisory Group's decision-making process?
2. How is the Commission going to monitor the EU Delegation's management of this flagship project in order to avoid such irresponsible actions, which are absolutely contrary to the spirit of our friendly relations?
3. How can this effective cooperation tool be reinforced?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission

(30 May 2013)

The Commission agrees that the EU Advisory Group (EUAG) has been an important cooperation instrument in the EU's relations with Armenia. Like all measures supported by EU financial assistance, it should be the subject of appropriate management and evaluation procedures.

The involvement of the Armenian authorities has been ensured in the framework of the EUAG Advisory Board which meets on a quarterly basis and takes decisions in line with its mandate. Within its framework, the beneficiaries have been consulted on reports and work plans, and have also participated in all recruitment committees. The EUAG has also recently established regular working meetings to prepare the Advisory Board.

The mandate of the EU Delegation in the management and oversight of the project is clearly defined, as is that of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) as the implementing partner. The Commission receives regular reports from the EU Delegation on the implementation of the project, and these demonstrate consistent and diligent management. The EUAG has certainly not lost all key advisors: following two recent resignations, the EUAG has quickly launched appropriate recruitment procedures.

In view of the forthcoming new contractual relationship between the EU and Armenia, governed by the Association Agreement, the EU is taking steps to ensure that the advisory support to Armenia provides an effective response to newly emerging needs. As an example, an additional post attached to the National Assembly has been published in order to assist the Armenian parliament in increasing its institutional capacities, with a view to tackling the complex task of approximation to the EU legislation.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003332/13
to the Commission
Arlene McCarthy (S&D)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: Non-bank finance

Effective competition in the EU's banking sector is necessary to ensure a well-functioning and efficient sector which funds the real economy by reducing the cost of banking services. In 2011, a British local entrepreneur set up a company which acts as a link between savers and borrowers. The company is an innovative peer-to-peer lending scheme that enables people who have struggled to obtain finance from high-street banks to obtain affordable loans, and offers 5% AER on loan repayments. All borrowing and lending transactions are entered into in the company's office following a face-to-face interview. The company holds a consumer credit licence with the Office of Fair Trading, but is not regulated by the Financial Services Authority as its activities do not fall within the regulatory framework.

Is the Commission aware of any examples of innovative financing companies being set up across the EU?

What action can the Commission take to promote such innovative models across Europe?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(17 May 2013)**

Peer-to-peer lending schemes fall under the general concept of crowdfunding, where financing of various projects are channelled through open calls to the wider public. Promoters of an initiative can collect funds ⁽¹⁾ directly or use a web-based intermediary which will assist in promotion and collecting funds.

While crowdfunding may constitute a financing source, especially for small firms or local projects, it may also carry some risks in terms of fraud or investor protection. Due to the dynamic nature of this phenomenon, the Commission considers it too early to judge whether a specific regulatory framework for these activities is needed. It might, however, monitor market ⁽²⁾ and national legal developments and assess whether the subsidiarity and proportionality conditions of any EU action would be fulfilled.

The recent 'Entrepreneurship 2020 Action Plan' ⁽³⁾ contains an invitation for Member States to assess the need to amend current national financial legislation with the aim of facilitating new, alternative forms of financing for start-ups and SMEs in general, in particular as regards platforms for crowdfunding.

The recent Commission Staff Working Document 'Strengthening the environment for Web entrepreneurs in the EU' ⁽⁴⁾ includes an action aimed at supporting a network of European crowdfunding platforms in view of providing support, visibility, transparency and interconnectivity among existing EU platforms, including those specialised in Web start-ups.

More generally, the recent Commission Green Paper on long-term financing of the European economy ⁽⁵⁾ recognises the need to reflect further on how to diversify the financing system in Europe to ensure it better supports the real economy, without jeopardising financial stability ⁽⁶⁾.

⁽¹⁾ In the form of loans, donations, sponsoring or investments.

⁽²⁾ The Commission has taken initial steps in this direction: a stock-taking of crowdfunding market developments has been the subject of a workshop, jointly organised by DG Enterprise and DG CNECT, in November 2012. Discussions on the regulatory aspects have also taken place with the US government in the framework of the Transatlantic Economic Council. DG Internal Market will organise a workshop in Brussels on June 3rd 2013, with the aim of further exploring the development of crowdfunding.

⁽³⁾ COM(2012) 795 final, http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/public-consultation/files/report-pub-cons-entr2020-ap_en.pdf

⁽⁴⁾ SWD(2013) 142 final.

⁽⁵⁾ COM(2013) 150 final (<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52013DC0150:EN:NOT>).

⁽⁶⁾ Building on the 2011 Commission Action Plan to improve access to finance for SMEs (http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/finance/files/com-2011-870_en.pdf), the Green Paper includes and is consulting on a number of additional innovative ideas that could further ease access to finance for these types of enterprises.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003334/13
aan de Raad
Marietje Schaake (ALDE)
 (25 maart 2013)

Betreft: NAVO-handboek inzake cyberoorlogvoering en de EU-strategie inzake cyberveiligheid

Op 21 maart 2013 werd er op de website „The Verge” melding gemaakt ⁽¹⁾ van een nieuw document van de NAVO over cyberdefensie, namelijk het „Handboek van Tallinn over het internationale recht toepasselijk op cyberoorlogvoering” ⁽²⁾ (het handboek van Tallinn). Hierin wordt het internationale recht vermeld dat van toepassing is op cyberoorlogvoering en worden aanbevelingen gedaan voor vergeldingsacties — onder meer met gebruik van traditionele wapens — en aanvallen op hackers die pogingen hebben gedaan om in computernetwerken in te breken. Op 7 februari 2013 stelde de Commissie de cyberveiligheidsstrategie van de Europese Unie (de cyberstrategie) ⁽³⁾ voor, opgesteld door de commissaris voor de digitale agenda, de commissaris voor binnenlandse zaken en de vicevoorzitter van de Commissie/hoge vertegenwoordiger van de Unie voor buitenlandse zaken en veiligheidsbeleid. In scherpe tegenstelling met het handboek van Tallinn omvat de cyberstrategie geen enkel concreet voorstel met betrekking tot het gemeenschappelijk veiligheids- en defensiebeleid van de EU noch betreffende de ontwikkeling van offensieve cyberverdedigingscapaciteiten of regels inzake het in de aanval gaan in het kader van cyberoorlogvoering. Kan de Raad antwoord geven op de volgende vragen?

1. Wat is de rechtspositie van het handboek van Tallinn?
2. Was de Raad betrokken bij de opstelling van het handboek van Tallinn of is hij in het kader van de opstelling van dit handboek geraadpleegd?
3. Wat is de betekenis van het handboek van Tallinn voor de EU in het licht van het strategische partnerschap tussen de EU en de NAVO?
4. Zal de Raad voorstellen om het het handboek van Tallinn integraal in de cyberstrategie op te nemen? Zo niet, wat is dan het verband tussen de twee documenten?
5. De meeste lidstaten van de EU zijn eveneens lid van de NAVO. Is de Raad het eens met de stelling dat het handboek van Tallinn een grote impact zal hebben op het beleid inzake cyberdefensie, -oorlogvoering en -veiligheid van de landen die zowel lid zijn van de EU als van de NAVO, en bijgevolg op het desbetreffende beleid van de EU als geheel?
6. Wat vindt de Raad van de stelling dat „het doden van hackers in de context van cyberoorlogvoering gerechtvaardigd is”?
7. Is de Raad van mening dat de EU-lidstaten op het vlak van cyberveiligheid en -defensie een offensief beleid en vergeldingsmaatregelen moeten uitwerken?
8. Is de Raad bereid conclusies goed te keuren over de toepasselijkheid van traditionele juridische concepten op het internet, in de context van de op digitale wijze eengemaakte wereld, in het bijzonder voor wat betreft het definiëren en toeschrijven van oorlogshandelingen en de toepasselijkheid van het internationale recht in de context van cyberoorlogvoering? Zo niet, waarom niet?
9. Hoe wil de Raad een evenwicht vinden tussen de veiligstelling van digitale vrijheden enerzijds, zoals beschreven in de resolutie van het Europees Parlement van 11 december 2012 over een strategie voor digitale vrijheid in het buitenlands beleid van de EU, en cyberveiligheid en -defensie anderzijds?

Antwoord
 (9 juli 2013)

Het handboek van Tallinn is door onafhankelijke internationale deskundigen opgesteld op verzoek van het Cooperative Cyber Defence Centre of Excellence van de NAVO. Het handboek, dat geen officiële status heeft en evenmin de standpunten van de NAVO weerspiegelt, behelst een analyse door deskundigen van de toepasselijkheid van het bestaande internationale recht inzake cyber-oorlogvoering.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.theverge.com/2013/3/21/4130740/tallin-manual-on-the-international-law-applicable-to-cyber-warfare>

⁽²⁾ http://issuu.com/nato_ccd_coe/docs/tallinmanual?mode=embed&layout=http%3A%2F%2Fskin.issuu.com%2Fv%2Fflight%2Flayout.xml&showFlipBtn=true

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/policies/eu-cyber-security/cybsec_comm_en.pdf

Geen enkele EU-instelling is betrokken of geraadpleegd bij de opstelling van het handboek van Tallinn.

In het kader van het gemeenschappelijk veiligheids- en defensiebeleid (GVDB) heeft het Europees Defensieagentschap (EDA) een projectteam voor cyberverdediging ingesteld, dat bestaat uit EDA-personeel en vertegenwoordigers uit de deelnemende lidstaten, en dat als taak heeft om in verband met het GVDB vermogens op het gebied van cyberverdediging te ontwikkelen. Daarnaast heeft het Militair Comité van de EU in 2012 zijn goedkeuring gehecht aan een „EU-concept voor cyber-verdediging voor door de EU geleide operaties”.

In de gezamenlijke mededeling van de HV en de Commissie van 7 februari 2013 over de EU-strategie inzake cyberbeveiliging: een open, veilige en beveiligde cyberspace, wordt nader ingegaan op de vraag hoe er kan worden gezorgd voor een veilige digitale omgeving waarbij de grondrechten worden geëerbiedigd en bevorderd en de vrijheden in de digitale wereld worden beschermd. De Raad beraadt zich momenteel op basis van die mededeling op de problematiek van cyberbeveiliging, en kan de vragen van het geachte Parlementslid dan ook niet beantwoorden zolang de besprekingen niet zijn afgerond.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003334/13
to the Council
Marietje Schaake (ALDE)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: NATO cyber warfare manual and the EU's cybersecurity strategy

On 21 March 2013 the website 'The Verge' reported ⁽¹⁾ on a new NATO document on cyber defence, the Tallinn Manual on the International Law Applicable to Cyber Warfare ⁽²⁾. The Tallinn Manual identifies the international law applicable to cyber warfare and includes recommendations for retaliatory conduct, including the use of traditional weapons, and attacks against hackers who have perpetrated attacks. On 7 February 2013 the Commission presented the Cybersecurity Strategy of the European Union ⁽³⁾, a joint effort by the Commissioner for the Digital Agenda, the Commissioner for Home Affairs and the Vice-President/High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. In sharp contrast to the Tallinn Manual, the Cybersecurity Strategy does not include any concrete proposals concerning the EU's Common Security and Defence Policy or the development of offensive cyber defence capabilities or of rules of engagement for cyber warfare. Can the Council answer the following questions?

1. What is the status of the Tallinn Manual?
2. Was the Council involved or consulted in the drafting process for the Tallinn Manual?
3. In view of the strategic partnership between the EU and NATO, what is the significance of the Tallinn Manual for the EU?
4. Will the Council suggest including the Tallinn Manual as an integral part of the Cybersecurity Strategy? If not, how do the two documents relate to one another?
5. Does the Council agree that, since most of the Member States are also members of NATO, the Tallinn Manual will heavily influence the cyber defence, warfare and security policies of the dual-membership states and therefore of the EU as a whole?
6. What is the Council's assessment of the statement that 'killing hackers in cyber warfare is justified'?
7. Does the Council agree that the Member States should develop offensive or retaliatory policies in the context of cyber security and defence?
8. Is the Council willing to adopt conclusions on the applicability of traditional concepts of jurisdiction online, in the context of the globally digital connected world, and especially in terms of attribution, the definition of acts of war and the applicability of international law in cyber warfare? If not, why not?
9. How will the Council strike a balance between securing digital freedoms, as set out in Parliament's resolution of 11 December 2012 on a digital freedom strategy in EU foreign policy, and cyber security and defence?

**Reply
(9 July 2013)**

The Tallinn Manual has been prepared by independent international experts at the invitation of the NATO Cooperative Cyber Defence Centre of Excellence. This manual, which has no official status and does not represent NATO's views, constitutes an expert analysis of the applicability of existing international law to cyber warfare.

No EU institution was involved or consulted in the process of drafting the Tallinn Manual.

Within the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP), the European Defence Agency (EDA) has set up a Cyber Defence Project Team which includes EDA staff and representatives of participating Member States and aims to develop cyber defence capabilities related to CSDP. In addition, in 2012 the EU Military Committee approved an 'EU Concept for Cyber Defence for EU-led military operations'.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.theverge.com/2013/3/21/4130740/tallin-manual-on-the-international-law-applicable-to-cyber-warfare>

⁽²⁾ http://issuu.com/nato_ccd_coe/docs/tallinmanual?mode=embed&layout=http%3A%2F%2Fskin.issuu.com%2Fv%2Fflight%2Flayout.xml&showFlipBtn=true

⁽³⁾ http://ceas.europa.eu/policies/eu-cyber-security/cybsec_comm_en.pdf

The joint HR/Commission Communication on the EU Strategy on Cybersecurity: An Open, Safe and Secure Cyberspace, adopted on 7 February 2013, addresses the issue of how to ensure a secure digital environment while respecting and promoting fundamental rights and the protection of freedoms online. The Council is currently discussing the issue of Cybersecurity on the basis of this communication, and cannot therefore respond to the issues raised in the Honourable Member's question until these discussions have been concluded.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003335/13
aan de Commissie
Marietje Schaake (ALDE)
(25 maart 2013)

Betref: NAVO-handboek inzake cyberoorlogvoering en de EU-strategie inzake cyberveiligheid

Op 21 maart 2013 werd er op de website „The Verge” melding gemaakt ⁽¹⁾ van een nieuw document van de NAVO over cyberdefensie, namelijk het „Handboek van Tallinn over het internationale recht toepasbaar op cyberoorlogvoering” ⁽²⁾ (het handboek van Tallinn). Hierin wordt het internationale recht vermeld dat van toepassing is op cyberoorlogvoering en worden aanbevelingen gedaan voor vergeldingsacties — onder meer met gebruik van traditionele wapens — en aanvallen tegen hackers die pogingen hebben gedaan om in computernetwerken in te breken. Op 7 februari 2013 stelde de Commissie de cyberveiligheidsstrategie van de Europese Unie (de cyberstrategie) ⁽³⁾ voor, opgesteld door de commissaris voor de digitale agenda, de commissaris voor binnenlandse zaken en de vicevoorzitter van de Commissie/hoge vertegenwoordiger van de Unie voor buitenlandse zaken en veiligheidsbeleid. In scherpe tegenstelling met het handboek van Tallinn omvat de cyberstrategie geen enkel concreet voorstel met betrekking tot het gemeenschappelijk veiligheids- en defensiebeleid van de EU noch betreffende de ontwikkeling van offensieve cyberverdedigingscapaciteiten of regels inzake het in de aanval gaan in het kader van cyberoorlogvoering. Kan de Commissie antwoord geven op de volgende vragen?

1. Wat is de rechtspositie van het handboek van Tallinn?
2. Was de Commissie en met name de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger betrokken bij de opstelling van het handboek van Tallinn of is de Commissie en met name de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger in het kader van de opstelling van dit handboek geraadpleegd?
3. Wat is de betekenis van het handboek van Tallinn voor de EU in het licht van het strategische partnerschap tussen de EU en de NAVO?
4. Is de Commissie van plan om het handboek van Tallinn integraal in de cyberstrategie op te nemen? Zo niet, wat is dan het verband tussen de twee documenten?
5. De meeste lidstaten van de EU zijn eveneens lid van de NAVO. Is de Commissie het eens met de stelling dat het handboek van Tallinn een grote impact zal hebben op het beleid inzake cyberdefensie, -oorlogvoering en -veiligheid van de landen die zowel lid zijn van de EU als van de NAVO, en bijgevolg op het desbetreffende beleid van de EU als geheel?
6. Wat vindt de Commissie van de stelling dat „het doden van hackers in de context van cyberoorlogvoering gerechtvaardigd is”?
7. Is de Commissie van mening dat de EU-lidstaten op het vlak van cyberveiligheid en -defensie een offensief beleid en vergeldingsmaatregelen moeten uitwerken? Indien ja, waarom heeft de Commissie dan geen concrete voorstellen hiertoe gedaan in de cyberstrategie?
8. Is de Commissie bereid een mededeling op te stellen over de toepasselijkheid van traditionele juridische concepten op het internet, in de context van de op digitale wijze eengemaakte wereld, in het bijzonder voor wat betreft het definiëren en toeschrijven van oorlogshandelingen en de toepasselijkheid van het internationale recht in de context van cyberoorlogvoering? Zo niet, waarom niet?
9. Hoe wil de Commissie een evenwicht vinden tussen de veiligstelling van digitale vrijheden enerzijds, zoals beschreven in de resolutie van het Europees Parlement van 11 december 2012 over een strategie voor digitale vrijheid in het buitenlands beleid van de EU, en cyberveiligheid en -defensie anderzijds?

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.theverge.com/2013/3/21/4130740/tallin-manual-on-the-international-law-applicable-to-cyber-warfare>

⁽²⁾ http://issuu.com/nato_ccd_coe/docs/tallinmanual?mode=embed&layout=http%3A%2F%2Fskin.issuu.com%2Fv%2Fflight%2Flayout.xml&showFlipBtn=true

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/policies/eu-cyber-security/cybsec_comm_en.pdf

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(11 juni 2013)

Het Handboek van Tallinn is door onafhankelijke deskundigen opgesteld op verzoek van het Cooperative Cyber Defence Centre of Excellence van de Noord-Atlantische Verdragsorganisatie (NAVO). Dit handboek heeft geen officiële status en bevat een academische analyse van de toepasselijkheid van het bestaande internationale humanitaire recht op cyberoorlogsvoering.

Bij de opstelling van het Handboek van Tallinn werd geen EU-instelling betrokken of geraadpleegd. De definities van de begrippen „gebruik van geweld” en „jurisdictie in de cyberruimte” worden in de lidstaten door deskundigen op het gebied van internationaal recht geanalyseerd. Indien de lidstaten daarom verzoeken en indien zij een mandaat krijgen van de Raad, kunnen de Commissie en de Europese Dienst voor extern optreden (EDEO) in de toekomst aan dergelijke discussies deelnemen.

Binnen het gemeenschappelijk veiligheids- en defensiebeleid (GVDB) heeft het Europees Defensieagentschap een cyberdefensieteam samengesteld dat wordt voorgezeten door en bestaat uit de lidstaten en dat is gericht op de ontwikkeling van capaciteit inzake cyberverdediging met betrekking tot het GVDB.

In het Handboek van Tallinn staat niet het probleem van hackers centraal, maar wordt onder meer de behandeling van strijders tijdens gewapende conflicten overeenkomstig de beginselen van het internationale humanitaire recht besproken.

De gezamenlijke mededeling van de hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter en de Commissie over de „Strategie inzake cyberbeveiliging van de Europese Unie: Een open, veilige en beveiligde cyberspace” (*) die op 7 februari 2013 is aangenomen, is gericht op het waarborgen van een veilige digitale omgeving waarin de grondrechten en de bescherming van de vrijheden online worden gerespecteerd en bevorderd. Het grondrechtenaspect wordt eveneens in de GVDB-gerelateerde activiteiten op de voet gevolgd.

(*) JOIN(2013) 1 final.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003335/13
to the Commission
Marietje Schaake (ALDE)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: NATO cyber warfare manual and the EU's cybersecurity strategy

On 21 March 2013 the website 'The Verge' reported ⁽¹⁾ on a new NATO document on cyber defence, the Tallinn Manual on the International Law Applicable to Cyber Warfare ⁽²⁾. The Tallinn Manual identifies the international law applicable to cyber warfare and includes recommendations for retaliatory conduct, including the use of traditional weapons, and attacks against hackers who have perpetrated attacks. On 7 February 2013 the Commission presented the Cybersecurity Strategy of the European Union ⁽³⁾, a joint effort by the Commissioner for the Digital Agenda, the Commissioner for Home Affairs and the Vice-President/High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. In sharp contrast to the Tallinn Manual, the Cybersecurity Strategy does not include any concrete proposals concerning the EU's Common Security and Defence Policy or the development of offensive cyber defence capabilities or of rules of engagement for cyber warfare. Can the Commission answer the following questions?

1. What is the status of the Tallinn Manual?
2. Was the Commission, and in particular the Vice-President/High Representative, involved or consulted in the drafting process for the Tallinn Manual?
3. In view of the strategic partnership between the EU and NATO, what is the significance of the Tallinn Manual for the EU?
4. Will the Commission include the Tallinn Manual as an integral part of the Cybersecurity Strategy? If not, how do the two documents relate to one another?
5. Does the Commission agree that, since most of the Member States are also members of NATO, the Tallinn Manual will heavily influence the cyber defence, warfare and security policies of the dual-membership states and therefore of the EU as a whole?
6. What is the Commission's assessment of the statement that 'killing hackers in cyber warfare is justified'?
7. Does the Commission agree that the Member States should develop offensive or retaliatory policies in the context of cyber security and defence? If so, why has it not proposed any concrete measures in the Cybersecurity Strategy?
8. Is the Commission willing to draft a communication on the applicability of traditional concepts of jurisdiction online, in the context of the globally digital connected world, and especially in terms of attribution, the definition of acts of war and the applicability of international law in cyber warfare? If not, why not?
9. How will the Commission strike a balance between securing digital freedoms, as set out in Parliament's resolution of 11 December 2012 on a digital freedom strategy in EU foreign policy, and cyber security and defence?

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

The Tallinn Manual has been prepared by independent international experts at the invitation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) Cooperative Cyber Defence Centre of Excellence. This manual, which has no official status, represents an academic analysis on the applicability of existing international humanitarian law to cyber warfare.

No EU institution was involved or consulted in the drafting process of the Tallinn Manual. The definitions of use of force and jurisdiction in cyberspace are analysed by international law experts in Member States. If asked by the Member States and given the mandate by the Council, the Commission and the European External Action Service (EEAS) could participate in such discussions in the future.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.theverge.com/2013/3/21/4130740/tallin-manual-on-the-international-law-applicable-to-cyber-warfare>

⁽²⁾ http://issuu.com/nato_ccdcoe/docs/tallinmanual?mode=embed&layout=http%3A%2F%2Fskin.issuu.com%2Fv%2Fflight%2Flayout.xml&showFlipBtn=true

⁽³⁾ http://eeas.europa.eu/policies/eu-cyber-security/cybsec_comm_en.pdf

Within the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) the European Defence Agency has composed a Cyber Defence Project Team that is chaired by and consists of the Member States and aims to develop cyber defence capabilities related to CSDP.

Tallinn Manual does not concentrate on the issue of hackers, but discusses among other issues the treatment of combatants during armed conflicts according to the principles established by International Humanitarian Law.

The joint HRVP/Commission Communication on the EU Strategy on Cybersecurity: An Open, Safe and Secure Cyberspace^(†), adopted on 7 February 2013, aims at ensuring a secure digital environment while respecting and promoting fundamental rights and the protection of freedoms online. The fundamental rights aspect is also closely followed in the CSDP-related activities.

^(†) JOIN(2013) 1 final.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003336/13
à la Commission
Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(25 mars 2013)

Objet: Projet d'accord bilatéral UE/États-Unis

La Commission européenne étudie actuellement un traité de libre-échange entre les États-Unis et l'UE. Cet accord de libre-échange va transformer en profondeur la politique commerciale de l'UE, qui sera couverte en majorité par des accords bilatéraux. Or, l'UE avait toujours investi dans des négociations multilatérales dans le cadre de l'OMC. À l'heure où les négociations du cycle de Doha sont au point mort, ce changement de cap en faveur du bilatéralisme pose question.

La Commission pourrait-elle expliquer pourquoi elle a modifié son approche en faveur du bilatéralisme pour les négociations de sa politique commerciale?

Réponse donnée par M. De Gucht au nom de la Commission
(3 mai 2013)

L'Union européenne a déjà négocié et continue à négocier des accords de libre-échange avec plusieurs partenaires; elle considère qu'ils sont complémentaires de son engagement ferme en faveur du multilatéralisme et non en contradiction avec celui-ci. Les négociations avec les États-Unis n'affaibliraient en aucun cas l'engagement de l'UE vis-à-vis de l'OMC et du cycle de Doha. Une initiative bilatérale ambitieuse témoignerait incontestablement de la volonté commune de l'UE et des États-Unis d'ouvrir les marchés des biens et services et de s'attaquer à des questions de réglementation complexes, et pourrait également donner un nouveau souffle aux négociations à Genève. L'UE continue à assurer, comme dans le passé, le même rôle moteur dans les enceintes internationales. Dans cette optique, la Commission participe actuellement à la préparation de la 9^e conférence ministérielle de l'OMC, prévue en décembre 2013. Elle estime qu'un résultat positif lors de cette conférence est nécessaire pour ouvrir la voie à un accord multilatéral global. Au-delà de cet objectif, la Commission reste résolument déterminée à faire avancer les négociations sur les derniers éléments du programme de Doha pour le développement, en vue de conclure le cycle dans son ensemble. Le commissaire au commerce s'est récemment exprimé en détail sur le rapport entre les négociations bilatérales avec les États-Unis et le programme multilatéral plus large ⁽¹⁾.

(1) http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2013/april/tradoc_151041.pdf

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003336/13
to the Commission
Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: Draft EU-US bilateral agreement

The Commission is currently considering a free trade deal between the United States and the European Union. This free trade agreement will result in a radical change in the EU's trade policy, which will be covered mainly by bilateral agreements. Historically, however, the EU has always participated in multilateral negotiations within the framework of the WTO. As the Doha Round is now stalled, this change of direction towards bilateralism raises certain questions.

Could the Commission explain why it now favours a bilateral approach to trade policy negotiations?

**Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(3 May 2013)**

The EU has been and continues to negotiate Free Trade Agreements with several partners, and considers these as complementary and not contradictory to our firm multilateral commitment. Negotiations with the US would in no way weaken the EU commitment to the WTO or the Doha Round. An ambitious bilateral initiative would be a clear signal of EU/US joint willingness to open markets on goods and services as well as tackling complex regulatory issues, and may also have the potential to re-energise negotiations in Geneva. The EU continues to show the same degree of leadership in the multilateral fora as it has done in the past. To that end, the Commission is currently active in the preparations for the 9th WTO Ministerial Conference (MC9), scheduled for December 2013. The Commission believes that a successful outcome at MC9 is needed to pave the way to an overall multilateral agreement. Looking forward and beyond the successful MC9, the Commission remains fully committed to furthering negotiations on the remaining elements of the DDA with a view to concluding the entire round. The Commissioner for Trade recently spoke in detail about the relationship between the bilateral negotiations with the US and the broader multilateral agenda ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2013/april/tradoc_151041.pdf

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003337/13
à la Commission
Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(25 mars 2013)

Objet: Exportabilité des allocations de sécurité sociale dans les pays européens

Le règlement (CE) n° 883/2004 vise à la coordination des systèmes de sécurité sociale des États membres. Une allocation d'invalidité, de retraite (ou autre) devrait donc pouvoir continuer à s'appliquer en cas de déplacement de la personne dans un autre État membre, ce dernier prenant le relai du versement de l'aide.

Il s'avère pourtant que ce n'est pas le cas, plusieurs pétitions parvenues à la commission des pétitions du Parlement européen montrent que les États refusent de payer les allocations des ressortissants d'autres pays qui viennent s'installer sur leur territoire. Cette situation empêche donc les bénéficiaires de se déplacer librement dans l'UE sous peine de voir leur assistance financière prendre fin.

La Commission estime-t-elle que la non-exportabilité des allocations entre les États membres est une entrave à la libre circulation des personnes?

Dans le nouveau rapport sur la citoyenneté de l'Union prévu pour fin 2013, la Commission compte-t-elle discuter de ce sujet?

Réponse donnée par M. Andor au nom de la Commission
(8 mai 2013)

La règle générale en matière de coordination des systèmes de sécurité sociale édictée à l'article 7 du règlement (CE) n° 883/2004 dispose que le paiement de prestations en espèces, telles que les allocations de retraite et d'invalidité mentionnées par l'Honorable Parlementaire, ne saurait être supprimé ou réduit du fait que le bénéficiaire ou les membres de sa famille résident dans un État membre autre que celui où se trouve l'institution débitrice. La responsabilité de l'État membre débiteur ne cesse pas simplement parce que le bénéficiaire de prestations se rend dans un autre État membre.

Un nombre limité de prestations spéciales en espèces à caractère non contributif ne sont pas dues en dehors de l'État membre compétent pour le versement des prestations. Néanmoins, elles doivent être fournies sur une base égale aux personnes résidant dans l'État membre en question. La non-exportabilité de ces prestations n'influe pas dans un sens défavorable sur la libre circulation des personnes, étant donné que ces prestations spéciales — qui sont soit des prestations de subsistance minimale complétant une prestation de sécurité sociale, soit des prestations destinées à encourager l'indépendance ou l'intégration sociale des personnes handicapées — sont étroitement liées à la situation socio-économique dans l'État membre compétent pour le versement des prestations. La Cour a confirmé la légalité de ces dispositions à plusieurs reprises.

Comme les années précédentes, le rapport 2013 sur la citoyenneté de l'Union examinera les moyens d'améliorer les droits en matière de sécurité sociale des citoyens de l'UE qui se rendent dans un autre État membre.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003337/13
to the Commission
Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: Exportability of social security benefits across EU Member States

The purpose of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 is to coordinate the social security systems of Member States. Entitlement to disability allowances, pensions and other benefits should therefore remain valid if a person moves to another Member State, which would then become responsible for paying the benefit.

It has emerged, however, that this is not the case. Parliament's Committee on Petitions has received a number of petitions indicating that Member States are refusing to pay benefits to foreign nationals who have relocated to their territory. Beneficiaries cannot therefore move freely within the EU without losing their financial support.

Does the Commission consider that the non-exportability of benefits across Member States represents an obstacle to the free movement of persons?

Does the Commission intend to deal with this matter in the new EU Citizenship Report due at the end of 2013?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(8 May 2013)**

The general rule on social security coordination in Article 7 of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 is that payment of cash benefits, such as the old age and invalidity pensions mentioned by the Honourable Member, cannot be withdrawn or reduced because the beneficiary or their family members reside in a Member State other than that of the institution responsible for paying the benefits. The Member State responsible for payment does not stop being responsible simply because the recipient moves to another Member State.

A limited number of special, non-contributory cash benefits are not payable outside the Member State responsible for payment. They must, however, be provided on an equal basis to people residing within that Member State. The non-exportability of such benefits does not adversely affect the free movement of persons, because such special benefits, which are either minimum subsistence benefits supplementing a social security benefit or benefits to promote the social independence or social integration of disabled persons, are closely linked to the socioeconomic situation in the Member State responsible for payment. The Court has confirmed the legality of these provisions on a number of occasions.

As in previous years, the 2013 Citizenship Report will consider ways in which the social security rights of EU citizens who move to another Member State can be improved.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003338/13
à la Commission
Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(25 mars 2013)

Objet: Chargeur universel pour téléphones mobiles

Chaque marque de téléphone mobile est caractérisée par une forme et un embout de chargeur différent afin d'obliger le consommateur qui veut changer de téléphone mobile à changer de la même façon le chargeur. Ces différents modèles entraînent de ce fait des contraintes supplémentaires (difficulté de trouver un chargeur à emprunter de la même marque lorsque le téléphone est déchargé), des frais supplémentaires à l'achat d'un nouveau téléphone et des déchets supplémentaires puisqu'il n'utilisera plus l'ancien chargeur.

Un chargeur universel permettrait ainsi de répondre aux attentes des consommateurs, mais aussi des associations pour l'environnement.

La Commission envisage-t-elle d'encourager le projet de chargeur universel sur toutes les marques de téléphone mobile afin de faciliter la vie du consommateur et d'éviter les déchets inutiles?

Réponse donnée par M. Tajani au nom de la Commission
(15 mai 2013)

À la demande de la Commission, les principaux producteurs de téléphones portables ont accepté de signer un protocole d'accord en vue d'harmoniser les chargeurs des téléphones portables informatisés vendus dans l'UE. Ce protocole d'accord a été approuvé par le commissaire chargé des entreprises et de l'industrie lors d'une conférence de presse en juin 2009.

Un récent rapport d'avancement fourni par les signataires du protocole d'accord a montré qu'ils avaient rempli leurs obligations au titre de ce dernier. Il est estimé actuellement que 90 % des nouveaux appareils mis sur le marché par les signataires du protocole d'accord et les autres fabricants à la fin de 2012 sont compatibles avec le chargeur universel, ce qui donne à penser que l'accord volontaire a été profitable aux citoyens.

La Commission est convaincue que les consommateurs et les fabricants peuvent profiter d'une extension de l'initiative d'harmonisation des chargeurs à de nouvelles catégories de produits, telles que la nouvelle génération de téléphones portables, tout en prenant en considération les innovations technologiques et d'autres petits appareils électroniques portables tels que les appareils photo numériques, les tablettes et les baladeurs. La Commission prépare donc le lancement d'une étude évaluant les résultats obtenus par le protocole d'accord et envisagera des options pour un suivi approprié comportant un accord volontaire et des mesures législatives.

La Commission invite également l'Honorable Parlementaire à se reporter aux réponses qu'elle a données aux questions écrites E-001685/2013 de M^{me} Olga Sehnalová et E-002977/2013 de M. Tadeusz Zwiefka.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003338/13
to the Commission**

Philippe Boulland (PPE)

(25 March 2013)

Subject: Standard charger for mobile phones

The shape and charger connectors of each brand of mobile phone are different. This means that consumers who want to replace their mobile phone also have to replace their charger. The variety of models leads to further inconvenience. It can be difficult to borrow the right brand of charger when a phone has run out of battery; there is additional expense when purchasing a new phone and extra waste if the old charger can no longer be used.

A standard charger would meet the requirements of both consumers and environmental groups.

Does the Commission intend to support the plans to introduce standard chargers for all mobile telephone brands, so as to make life easier for consumers and avoid needless waste?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission

(15 May 2013)

Following a request from the Commission, major producers of mobile phones agreed to sign a memorandum of understanding (MoU) to harmonise chargers for data-enabled mobile phones sold in the EU. The MoU was endorsed by the Commissioner responsible for Enterprise and Industry at a press conference in June 2009.

A recent progress report provided by the MoU signatories has shown that they have met their obligations under the MoU. It is now estimated that 90% of the new devices put on the market by the MoU signatories and other manufacturers by the end of 2012 support the common charging capability. This indicates that the voluntary agreement has been successful in delivering benefits for citizens.

The Commission is convinced that consumers and manufacturers can benefit from an extension of the initiative on harmonisation of chargers to new categories of products such as the new generation of mobile phones while taking into account technological innovations and other small portable electronic devices, such as digital cameras, tablets and music players. Therefore the Commission is preparing the launch of a study evaluating the results achieved with the MoU, and will consider options for appropriate follow-up including a voluntary agreement and legislation.

The Commission would also like to refer the Honourable Member to its answers to written questions E-001685/2013 by Ms Olga Sehnalová and E-002977/2013 by Mr Tadeusz Zwiefka.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003339/13
à la Commission
Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(25 mars 2013)

Objet: Des sanctions pour la non-récupération des déchets électriques et électroniques par les magasins

La directive européenne 2002/96/CE a pour objectif prioritaire la prévention, la réutilisation, le recyclage et la valorisation des déchets électriques et électroniques. Le principe est que le distributeur de ces produits doit être en mesure d'en assurer la récupération, afin qu'ils puissent être correctement recyclés.

Au vu de récentes enquêtes sur la récupération des ampoules basses consommation dans les supermarchés en France (source: association de consommateurs «UFC que choisir»), force est de constater que sur 3 155 magasins visités en France, 44 % sont hors la loi et n'ont rien mis en place pour la récupération des ampoules basse consommation usagées.

La Commission envisagerait-elle de durcir les sanctions vis-à-vis des États membres qui ne veillent pas suffisamment à la bonne application de la directive européenne?

Réponse donnée par M. Potočnik au nom de la Commission
(16 mai 2013)

La directive 2002/96/CE relative aux déchets d'équipements électriques et électroniques (DEEE) ⁽¹⁾ prévoit la collecte, la valorisation et le recyclage des DEEE, y compris de matériel d'éclairage tel que les ampoules basse consommation. Elle impose également aux distributeurs, lorsqu'ils fournissent un nouveau produit, de faire en sorte que ces déchets puissent leur être remis par les ménages gratuitement et sur une base de un pour un, pour autant que l'équipement soit de type équivalent. Le résumé de l'enquête mentionnée par l'honorable parlementaire ne fait pas apparaître clairement si, en l'occurrence, cette exigence particulière est enfreinte.

La refonte récente de la directive DEEE (directive 2012/19/UE ⁽²⁾) renforce les obligations imposées aux distributeurs de reprendre les DEEE: elle exige en effet que, dans les magasins de détail disposant d'une grande surface de vente, les distributeurs assurent la collecte des DEEE de très petite dimension (dont toutes les dimensions extérieures sont inférieures ou égales à 25 cm) gratuitement pour les utilisateurs finals et sans obligation d'acheter des DEEE de type équivalent.

Le délai de transposition de la directive 2012/19/CE expire le 14 février 2014. La Commission vérifiera que les mesures nationales de transposition soient conformes aux exigences posées par la directive.

Selon le dernier rapport transmis par la France au sujet des taux de collecte des DEEE, les objectifs actuels de collecte au niveau national ont été atteints.

⁽¹⁾ JO L 037 du 13.2.2003, p. 24.

⁽²⁾ JO L 197 du 24.7.2012, p. 38.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003339/13
to the Commission
Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: Penalties for outlets that fail to recover waste electrical and electronic equipment

The main aim of European Directive 2002/96/EC is the prevention, re-use, recycling and recovery of electrical and electronic waste. The principle is that distributors of such products must be able to ensure that they are recovered so that they can be properly recycled.

In light of recent research into the recovery of energy saving light bulbs in French supermarkets (source: 'UFC que choisir' consumers' association), it is clear that 44% the 3 155 outlets visited in France are breaking the law and do not have procedures in place to recover used energy saving light bulbs.

Is the Commission planning to introduce tougher penalties against Member States that are not doing enough to ensure that the European Directive is properly applied?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission
(16 May 2013)**

Directive 2002/96/EC on Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) ⁽¹⁾ provides for the collection, recovery and recycling of WEEE, including lighting equipment, such as energy saving light bulbs. It also requires that distributors when supplying new equipment, shall be responsible for ensuring that such waste from private households can be returned free of charge on a one-to-one basis as long as the equipment is of an equivalent type. From the summary of the study mentioned by the Honorable Member, it is unclear whether in this case this specific requirement is breached.

A recent recast of the WEEE Directive (Directive 2012/19/EU ⁽²⁾) strengthens the obligations on distributors to take back WEEE as it requires distributors at retail shops with large sales area to provide for the collection of very small WEEE (no external dimension more than 25cm) free of charge to end-users and with no obligation to buy EEE of an equivalent type.

The deadline for transposing Directive 2012/19/EU expires on 14 February 2014. The Commission will check that the national transposition measures are in line with the directive's requirements.

According to the last report on WEEE collection rates submitted by France, the national collection target in force has been achieved.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 037, 13.2.2003 p. 24.

⁽²⁾ OJ L 197, 24.7.2012, p. 38.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003341/13
à la Commission
Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(25 mars 2013)

Objet: Législation européenne sur une distance minimale entre les sièges d'avion

L'Agence Européenne de Sécurité Aérienne (AESA) certifie chaque avion lors de son immatriculation, appliquant les normes européennes de fabrication et de sécurité. Mais il n'existe aucune norme réglementant la distance minimale entre les sièges d'avion, ce qui conduit les compagnies aériennes à diminuer toujours plus l'espace entre les rangées de sièges pour augmenter leur nombre et donc augmenter leurs profits. Et ce, au détriment de la santé des usagers puisque le manque d'espace bloque la circulation sanguine.

La Commission envisagerait-elle d'étudier la mise en place d'une réglementation instaurant une distance minimale entre les sièges d'avion afin de préserver le confort et la santé des usagers?

Réponse donnée par M. Kallas au nom de la Commission
(14 mai 2013)

Pour ce qui est de la législation de l'Union européenne, les spécifications de certification ne définissent aucune donnée contraignante pour la distance minimale entre les sièges. La seule disposition existant à l'heure actuelle dans le droit de l'Union est une norme de sécurité selon laquelle la configuration de chaque cabine doit être approuvée par l'Agence européenne de la sécurité aérienne (AESA) sur la base du règlement (UE) n° 748/2012 ⁽¹⁾ et être conforme aux normes de sécurité applicables, qui exigent que l'appareil puisse être évacué en 90 secondes.

La Commission est consciente du nombre croissant de passagers se plaignant de ce que la distance entre les rangées de sièges semble avoir diminué mais, du point de vue de la sécurité, des démonstrations d'évacuation d'urgence ont prouvé que l'agencement approuvé permet une évacuation en 90 secondes. Chaque configuration en sièges fait l'objet d'une approbation et les transporteurs aériens sont conscients de leurs responsabilités en matière de respect des exigences applicables.

Il convient enfin de noter que, sur un marché concurrentiel, les transporteurs aériens sont libres de proposer différents niveaux de services et de leur associer différents prix; la disponibilité d'espace supplémentaire est l'un des éléments qui contribuent à établir une distinction entre les classes d'un vol.

La Commission est d'avis que les informations dont elle dispose actuellement ne suffisent pas à justifier l'adoption de nouvelles mesures législatives sur l'espacement entre sièges à l'échelle de l'UE. La Commission et l'AESA continuent toutefois de suivre cette question de près afin de veiller à ce que toute action relevant de leur compétence qui s'avérerait nécessaire soit prise en temps voulu et de manière adéquate.

⁽¹⁾ JO L 224 du 21.8.2012.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003341/13
to the Commission
Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: European legislation to establish a minimum distance between aeroplane seats

The European Aviation Safety Agency certifies all aircraft at registration in accordance with European manufacturing and safety standards. Those standards do not, however, specify a minimum distance between seats. This has allowed aviation companies to shorten the distance between seat rows time and time again, so as to add more rows and thus increase profits. This has been to the detriment of passenger health, since a lack of space between seats can result in blood circulation problems.

Does the Commission have any plans to introduce rules establishing a minimum distance between aeroplane seats in order to safeguard the comfort and health of passengers?

**Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(14 May 2013)**

As far as European Union (EU) legislation is concerned, there is no prescriptive data in the certification specifications for the minimum distance between seats. The only provision at present existing in Union law is a safety related rule according to which each cabin configuration must be approved by the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) on the basis of Regulation (EU) No 748/2012⁽¹⁾, and must comply with the applicable safety requirements which include standards for emergency evacuation within 90 seconds.

The Commission is aware that an increasing number of passengers complain that the distance between rows seems to have decreased but from a safety perspective, emergency evacuation demonstrations have evidenced that the approved cabin design allow for evacuation within 90 seconds. Each seating configuration is approved and operators are aware of their responsibilities in complying with applicable requirements.

Finally it is worth noting that in a competitive market, air carriers are free to offer different levels of services and to charge different fees for them; extra space is one of the features that contribute to differentiation between different classes on a flight.

The Commission is of the opinion that the data presently at its disposal is not sufficient to justify any legislative measure on seat pitch at EU level. However, the Commission and EASA continue to monitor carefully this issue in order to ensure timely and appropriate actions under its remit which could be necessary.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 224, 21.8.2012.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003343/13
à la Commission
Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(25 mars 2013)

Objet: Mention des marges sur les étiquettes des denrées alimentaires préemballées

Avec le scandale de la viande de cheval, le public a pris conscience du nombre élevé d'intermédiaires, de négociants qui gagnent de l'argent sur des produits de consommation courante. Avec la crise du lait, les citoyens ont été informés du faible revenu des producteurs de lait et de la marge des distributeurs.

Les règles en matière d'étiquetage sur les produits préemballés ont été harmonisées au niveau européen. Cependant, il n'est pas fait mention sur l'étiquette des différentes marges opérées sur le produit. Le consommateur n'a à aucun moment connaissance des marges dégagées par les différents intermédiaires entre le producteur et le vendeur final. Correctement informé, le consommateur pourrait modifier son comportement, ce qui remettrait en cause la pratique des marges excessives dans l'industrie agroalimentaire.

La Commission envisagerait-elle d'imposer sur les étiquettes des denrées alimentaires préemballées le prix d'achat au premier fabricant et les marges des intermédiaires en plus du prix final?

Réponse donnée par M. Tajani au nom de la Commission
(6 juin 2013)

La Commission considère qu'il ne serait pas utile de faire figurer les éléments constitutifs du prix d'achat au premier fabricant ou les marges des intermédiaires, en plus du prix final, sur les étiquettes des denrées alimentaires préemballées, notamment du fait que ni les coûts supportés à chaque niveau de la chaîne d'approvisionnement ni les stratégies commerciales des divers acteurs de cette chaîne ne seraient pris en compte. En outre, la plupart des matières premières agricoles, telles que le lait, sont transformées en plusieurs coproduits qui sont ensuite associés à d'autres ingrédients pour entrer dans la composition des produits finals.

Par ailleurs, l'établissement d'un cadre européen à caractère contraignant alourdirait considérablement la charge administrative pesant sur la chaîne d'approvisionnement, mènerait à une fragmentation encore plus importante du marché intérieur et entraînerait potentiellement une hausse des prix pour les consommateurs, ainsi qu'une éventuelle augmentation des marges des intermédiaires. Dès lors, la Commission n'envisage pas de telle initiative.

Dans le même temps, la Commission et les autorités nationales chargées de la concurrence sont disposées à examiner avec soin tout comportement anticoncurrentiel présumé qui pourrait provoquer, à terme, des hausses de prix pour les consommateurs européens. Comme le montre le rapport sur l'application du droit de la concurrence ⁽¹⁾, les autorités concernées ont déjà examiné plusieurs cas de ce genre au cours des dernières années.

⁽¹⁾ Rapport du REC sur l'application des règles de concurrence et les activités de surveillance du marché par les autorités européennes de la concurrence dans le secteur alimentaire (disponible en anglais uniquement): http://ec.europa.eu/competition/ecn/food_report_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003343/13
to the Commission
Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(25 March 2013)

Subject: Reference to mark-ups on the labels of pre-packaged foodstuffs

Through the horsemeat scandal, the public has become aware of the convoluted network of intermediaries who earn money from the trade in consumer goods. Through the milk crisis, the public learned just how little dairy producers earn and just how high the profit margins are that distributors enjoy.

Although the rules governing the labelling of pre-packaged products have been harmonised at EU level, labels make no reference to the mark-ups applied to a given product. At no point are consumers made aware of the profits enjoyed by intermediaries in the supply chain between the producer and the end retailer. If correctly informed, consumers might well change their purchasing habits, which might in turn prompt the agri-foodstuffs industry to reconsider the practice of applying excessive mark-ups.

Would the Commission consider including details of the price paid to the initial producer and the mark-ups applied by intermediaries, along with the final price, on the labels of pre-packaged foodstuffs?

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

The Commission considers that the inclusion of details of the price paid to the initial producer and the mark-ups applied by intermediaries, along with the final price, on the labels of pre-packaged foodstuffs would not be meaningful, notably because it does not take into account the costs incurred by each level in the chain or the marketing strategies of the various actors in the supply chain. In addition, most agricultural raw materials, such as milk, are processed into several co-products which in turn are used together with other ingredients in final products.

Furthermore, a compulsory EU framework would lead to a considerable administrative burden for the supply chain, to a further fragmentation of the internal market and potentially to higher prices for consumers and possibly to higher margins for intermediaries. Therefore, the Commission does not envisage such an initiative.

At the same time, the Commission and the national competition authorities stand ready to carefully investigate any alleged anti-competitive behaviour which would ultimately lead to price increases for the European consumers. As shown in the report on competition law enforcement ⁽¹⁾, the competition authorities have done so in a number of instances in the past few years.

⁽¹⁾ ECN Activities in the Food Sector — Report on competition law enforcement and market monitoring activities by European competition authorities in the food sector, http://ec.europa.eu/competition/ecnr/food_report_en.pdf

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003344/13
à la Commission
Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(25 mars 2013)

Objet: Uniformisation des prises électriques en Europe

L'un des objectifs de l'Union européenne est de faciliter au maximum la circulation des personnes entre les États membres. Cependant, les différentes formes de prise électrique dans les États obligent les citoyens européens à investir dans des adaptateurs universels pour pouvoir brancher les équipements provenant d'un État membre utilisant une forme de prise électrique différente. Ces contraintes techniques compliquent de ce fait les déplacements entre États membres.

La Commission estime-t-elle utile d'harmoniser les prises de courant dans l'Union européenne pour faciliter le déplacement des citoyens?

Réponse donnée par M. Tajani au nom de la Commission
(8 mai 2013)

L'harmonisation des fiches et prises de courant domestiques pourrait faciliter l'utilisation d'appareils électriques dans l'UE, mais il ne serait pas proportionné d'imposer cette harmonisation, pour les motifs exposés dans les réponses de la Commission aux questions écrites E-1731/05, E-0182/09, E-4123/09, E-5846/09 et E-5088/11.

En outre, il n'est pas démontré que l'utilisation de différentes fiches et prises de courant peut présenter un danger pour la santé et la sécurité des utilisateurs de petits appareils électriques portatifs (utilisés en voyage).

Dès lors, il serait préférable que toute solution à ce problème procède d'accords ou de normes adoptés sur une base volontaire. Dans la pratique, la plupart des États membres utilisent une fiche commune (la fiche européenne).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003344/13
to the Commission
Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: Standardising electrical plugs and sockets in Europe

One of the EU's objectives is to facilitate the movement of people between Member States to the greatest possible extent. The design of electrical plugs and sockets varies from one Member State to another, however, forcing people to buy universal adapters if they want to use electrical equipment when travelling. These technical constraints are making it more difficult for people to move freely between Member States.

Does the Commission think it would make sense to standardise electrical plugs and sockets in the EU in order to facilitate the movement of people?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(8 May 2013)**

Harmonisation of domestic plugs and sockets might facilitate the use of electrical products in the EU, however it would not be proportionate to force harmonisation, for the reasons given in the Commission's replies to written questions E-1731/2005, E-0182/09, E-4123/09, E-5846/09 and E-5088/11.

In addition, there is no evidence showing that the use of different plugs and sockets can endanger the health and safety of the users of small and mobile electrical equipment (used when travelling).

Thus, any solution for this issue can better be based on voluntary agreements or standards. In practice, most Member States use a common plug (the Europlug).

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003345/13
à la Commission
Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(25 mars 2013)**

Objet: Avenir du Royaume-Uni dans l'Europe

Devant la question du référendum pour ou contre le maintien du Royaume-Uni dans l'Europe, quelle est la part de citoyens britanniques travaillant au sein de la Commission?

Au cas où le Royaume-Uni sortirait de l'Union européenne, comment est envisagée la situation des fonctionnaires britanniques, qui ne seraient plus ressortissants européens?

Quelles mesures transitoires seraient mises en place pour les remplacer?

**Réponse donnée par M. Šefčovič au nom de la Commission
(13 mai 2013)**

Les chiffres relatifs aux effectifs de la Commission européenne sont disponibles sur le site internet Europa, sous l'onglet «Qui sommes-nous?», sur la page suivante: http://ec.europa.eu/civil_service/about/figures/index_fr.htm

La Commission invite l'Honorable Parlementaire à prendre connaissance de sa réponse à la question n° E-000232/2013.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003345/13
to the Commission
Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: Future of the United Kingdom in Europe

We know that the UK intends to hold a referendum on its future in the EU. With this in mind, can the Commission say what proportion of its officials are UK nationals?

If the United Kingdom were to leave the EU, what would happen to officials who are UK nationals, given that they would no longer be EU citizens?

What transitional measures would the Commission consider taking in order to replace them?

**Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(13 May 2013)**

Staff figures of the European Commission are available on the Europa website under the item 'About us' at the following link: http://ec.europa.eu/civil_service/about/figures/index_en.htm

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its reply to Question E-000232/2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003347/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(25 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Problema dell'esposizione a campi elettromagnetici nei paesi europei: quali misure?

L'esposizione a campi elettromagnetici dovuti alla presenza di antenne telefoniche, telefoni cellulari, WLAN, wi-fi, laptop e altre sorgenti tipiche dell'era in cui viviamo è un grave pericolo per la salute. I pazienti affetti da sensibilità multipla (SCM) sono vulnerabili all'inquinamento ambientale e i pazienti affetti da ipersensibilità elettromagnetica (EHS) alle radiazioni elettromagnetiche: l'esposizione ad aria e radiazioni comporta gravi rischi per la loro salute. I primi sintomi sono infatti nausea, bruciori, difficoltà a prendere sonno e a concentrarsi, dolori alla testa, alterazioni del ritmo cardiaco, del metabolismo e dei processi enzimatici e, nei casi più gravi, danneggiamenti delle proteine e delle membrane cellulari. Ad oggi non ci sono cure che permettano di affrontare questa malattia, ma è importante tutelare coloro che ne soffrono e riconoscerli come tali, nonché predisporre misure di sicurezza per i potenziali malati futuri.

Il Piano europeo per l'ambiente e la salute 2004-2010 (2007/2252(INI)) prevedeva una maggiore tutela di ambienti quali scuole, asili, case di riposo e istituti sanitari, ovvero luoghi con un alto tasso di frequentazione da parte di soggetti particolarmente vulnerabili (bambini e anziani). Oggigiorno in Italia i valori limite per l'esposizione ai campi elettromagnetici sono di 6 volt/metro per le alte frequenze e di 10 e 3 microtesla per frequenze più basse e recenti studi dimostrano che valori pari a 0,4 per le basse e 0,2 per le alte sono già molto pericolosi.

Le disparità sanitarie tra i vari Stati membri dovrebbero essere eliminate. In Svezia, ad esempio, la malattia dell'elettrosensibilità viene riconosciuta come una disabilità e coloro che ne sono affetti hanno diritto a un sostegno previdenziale. È importante che tutti gli Stati membri includano la SCM e l'EHS come malattie riconosciute dai sistemi sanitari nazionali.

Alla luce di quanto sopra può la Commissione far sapere se:

1. intende promuovere l'inserimento di dette malattie nella Classificazione statistica internazionale delle malattie e dei problemi sanitari correlati;
2. ritenga opportuno sollecitare gli Stati membri ad attuare le norme esistenti in materia di radiazioni elettromagnetiche ed esposizione a sostanze nocive, nonché ad applicare rigorosamente il principio di precauzione con efficaci misure in materia di salute e ambiente, al fine di proteggere tutte le persone che sono affette dalle malattie in parola?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(23 maggio 2013)

1. Anche se queste due malattie non dispongono di codici propri nella Classificazione internazionale delle malattie (ICD) — 10^a revisione, vi sono tuttavia alcuni codici per segnalare l'influenza dell'elettricità e delle sostanze chimiche sulla salute. L'Organizzazione mondiale della sanità (OMS) è l'unica istituzione responsabile della gestione e della revisione della Classificazione ICD. Attualmente è in preparazione l'11^a versione dell'ICD e gli Stati membri dell'UE, che sono anche Stati membri dell'OMS, hanno l'opportunità di contribuire al processo di revisione. La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole deputato al sito web dell'OMS dove potrà trovare ulteriori informazioni sullo stato attuale della revisione: <http://www.who.int/classifications/icd/revision/en/>

2. Per quanto concerne la seconda domanda, la Commissione rinvia l'onorevole deputato alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-002445/2013 (¹).

(¹) <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003347/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: Exposure to electromagnetic fields in European countries — what measures should be taken?

Exposure to electromagnetic fields due to the presence of phone masts, mobile phones, WLAN, Wi-Fi, laptops and other sources typical of the era in which we live, is a serious health hazard. Patients with multiple chemical sensitivity (MCS) are vulnerable to environmental pollution and patients suffering from electromagnetic hypersensitivity (EHS) to electromagnetic radiation: exposure to air and radiation poses serious risks to their health; in fact, the initial symptoms are nausea, tingling sensations, difficulty sleeping or concentrating, headaches, changes in heart rate, in the metabolism and in enzymatic processes and, in the most severe cases, damage to proteins and cell membranes. To date, there are no treatments to deal with this disease, but it is important to protect those who are suffering from it and to recognise their suffering, as well as to develop safety measures for potential future sufferers.

The mid-term review of the European Environment and Health Action Plan 2004-2010 (2007/2252 (INI)) provided greater protection for environments such as schools, kindergartens, nursing homes and healthcare institutions, i.e. places regularly attended by particularly vulnerable persons (such as children and the elderly). At present, in Italy, the limit values for exposure to electromagnetic fields are of 6 volts/metre for high frequencies and 10-3 microtesla for lower frequencies, while recent studies have shown that values of 0.4 for low frequencies and 0.2 for high frequencies are already very dangerous.

Health inequalities between Member States should be eliminated. In Sweden, for example, the illness of electrical hypersensitivity is recognised as a disability and those who suffer from it are entitled to social security support. It is important for all Member States to include MCS and EHS as diseases that are recognised by national health systems.

Can the Commission therefore say whether:

1. it intends to include these diseases in the International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems;
2. it agrees that Member States should be asked to implement existing rules relating to electromagnetic radiation and exposure to hazardous substances, and rigorously to apply the precautionary principle by taking effective health and environmental measures, in order to protect all those people who are affected by these illnesses?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(23 May 2013)**

1. Even if these two diseases do not have their own codes in the International Classification of Diseases (ICD) — 10th revision, some codes exist to report influence of electricity and chemicals on health. The World Health Organisation (WHO) is the only responsible institution to maintain and revise the ICD classification. The 11th version of the ICD is currently under preparation and Member States of the EU, which are also Member States of WHO, have the opportunity to contribute to the revision process. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to WHO's website for further information on the current state of this revision:
<http://www.who.int/classifications/icd/revision/en/>

2. Concerning question 2, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-002445/2013 ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html>

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003348/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**

Oreste Rossi (EFD)

(25 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Italia e India: scontro diplomatico — posizione dell'UE nella vicenda dei marò italiani e tutela giuridica da parte dell'UE nel rispetto della Convenzione di Vienna

Il caso del mancato rientro a New Delhi dei due marò italiani e della conseguente ingiustificata perdita dell'immunità diplomatica dell'ambasciatore italiano trattenuto in India ormai non è più solo una questione di politica estera nazionale, ma riveste i caratteri di una controversia internazionale, cui l'UE non può sottrarsi dal momento che l'Italia ne è Stato membro fondatore dal 1952 ed è stato uno dei primi paesi firmatari del trattato di Schengen del 1985. Il problema originario della vicenda — costituito dall'individuazione di quale Stato, l'Italia o l'India, avesse giurisdizione sull'incidente avvenuto a 20,5 miglia marine dalla costa indiana — va evidentemente risolto con il coinvolgimento della rappresentanza diplomatica europea nelle trattative e nella risoluzione della controversia.

In virtù della Convenzione delle Nazioni Unite sul diritto del mare, a cui sia l'India sia l'Italia aderiscono, i poteri sovrani dello Stato costiero si estendono solo sulle acque territoriali, ossia, fino a 12 miglia marine come limite massimo. Sulla zona economica esclusiva lo Stato costiero ha solo poteri funzionali alla conservazione e allo sfruttamento delle risorse naturali e non gode del potere di esercitare la sua giurisdizione penale. Sotto questo profilo, dopo le 12 miglia si entra in acque internazionali e la giurisdizione è esercitata in via esclusiva dallo Stato di bandiera della nave. Inoltre, sempre secondo il diritto internazionale consuetudinario, uno Stato non può esercitare la sua giurisdizione nei confronti degli organi di un altro Stato. Questo in virtù del principio che tra «pari», ossia tra enti egualmente sovrani, non ci si giudica. Ugualmente chiara è la lettura della Convenzione di Vienna del 1961 sulle relazioni diplomatiche, firmata sia dall'Italia che dall'India, per cui gli agenti diplomatici beneficiano d'immunità dalla giurisdizione dei giudici interni — dunque anche quella della Corte suprema. Inoltre, hanno pieno diritto di circolare liberamente nel paese e, se lo desiderano, di lasciarlo. Infatti, questi privilegi riguardano l'essenza stessa della funzione del diplomatico che è quella di assicurare, nella maniera più libera e completa, la rappresentanza e gli interessi dello Stato che lo invia nello Stato che lo riceve.

Chiedo pertanto all'Alto Rappresentante, la Baronessa Ashton, quale posizione assuma l'UE nel merito della vicenda e nel rispetto del diritto internazionale, nonché di riferire chiaramente sulle azioni legali che verranno intraprese dall'UE.

Risposta dell'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione

(30 maggio 2013)

L'Unione europea ha costantemente partecipato agli sforzi per risolvere lo spiacevole caso dei due marò detenuti in India. Si è astenuta dal fare commenti sugli aspetti legali del caso perché il procedimento giudiziario è in corso. L'UE ha espresso l'auspicio che la controversia possa essere risolta in conformità con il diritto internazionale.

Nella dichiarazione del 19 marzo 2013 (A 147/13), il portavoce dell'AR ha manifestato la preoccupazione dell'AR relativamente ai provvedimenti del 14 e del 18 marzo 2013 emessi dalla Corte suprema dell'India nei confronti dell'ambasciatore italiano. La Convenzione di Vienna del 1961 sulle relazioni diplomatiche è una base imprescindibile dell'ordinamento giuridico internazionale che deve essere rispettato in ogni momento.

Con il ritorno dei due marò in India, avvenuto il 23 marzo 2013, i provvedimenti sono stati revocati. Occorre trovare una soluzione accettabile per tutti attraverso il dialogo e nel rispetto del diritto internazionale.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003348/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

Oreste Rossi (EFD)

(25 March 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Diplomatic clash between Italy and India — EU position in the case of the Italian marines and legal protection from the EU with regard to compliance with the Vienna Convention

The case of the failure of the two Italian marines to return to New Delhi and the consequent unjustified loss of diplomatic immunity of the Italian Ambassador being held in India is now no longer simply a matter of national foreign policy, but has become an international dispute, which the EU cannot ignore given that Italy has been a founding Member State since 1952 and was one of the first signatories of the 1985 Schengen Treaty. The original problem — that of identifying which state, Italy or India, had jurisdiction over the incident which took place at 20.5 nautical miles from the coast of India — should clearly be solved with the involvement of EU diplomats in the negotiations to resolve the dispute.

Under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (Unclos), to which both India and Italy are party, the national sovereignty of the coastal state extends only over territorial waters, i.e. up to 12 nautical miles at the most. Regarding the exclusive economic zone, the coastal state only has powers that relate to the conservation and exploitation of natural resources and does not have the power to exercise criminal jurisdiction. In this respect, after 12 miles, a ship enters international waters and jurisdiction is exercised exclusively by the ship's flag nation. Furthermore, under customary international law, a state may not exercise its jurisdiction over the bodies of another state, by virtue of the principle that 'sovereign equals', i.e. entities that are equally sovereign, do not judge each other.

The interpretation of the 1961 Vienna Convention on diplomatic relations, signed by both Italy and India, is equally clear: diplomatic agents enjoy immunity from the jurisdiction of domestic courts — and therefore also from that of the Supreme Court. In addition, they are fully entitled to move freely around the country and, if they wish, to leave it. Indeed, these privileges concern the very essence of the role of diplomats, which is that of ensuring that they represent, as freely and fully as possible, the interests of the state which is sending them to the receiving state.

Can the High Representative, Baroness Ashton, therefore say what the EU's position is on the merits of the case and on compliance with international law, and can she clearly state what legal action will be taken by the EU?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(30 May 2013)

The European Union has systematically been associated with efforts to resolve the unfortunate case of the two marines detained in India. It has refrained from commenting on the legal merits of the case as these are the subject of judicial proceedings. The EU has expressed the hope that the dispute will be resolved in accordance with international law.

In the statement of 19 March 2013 (A 147/13) the spokesperson of the HR has expressed the concern of the HR with regard to the orders of 14 and 18 March 2013 of the Supreme Court of India to the Ambassador of Italy. The 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations is a cornerstone of the international legal order that needs to be respected at all times.

With the return of the two marines to India on 23 March 2013, the orders are superseded. A mutually acceptable solution should be found through dialogue and in respect of international law.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003349/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(25 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Nuove dipendenze e salute mentale in tempi di crisi: quali misure a livello europeo?

Quando si parla di salute mentale, si intende uno stato di benessere che permette a ciascun individuo di sfruttare al meglio le proprie potenzialità, affrontare le difficoltà della vita quotidiana, rendere dal punto di vista lavorativo e dare un contributo significativo alla comunità. La crisi economica e la crescente incertezza che ne deriva hanno avuto un impatto notevole sulla qualità di vita e sulla salute mentale delle persone. La depressione sembra essere uno dei principali elementi responsabili del carico globale di malattie, seguito da attacchi di panico, consumo di alcool, droghe e gioco d'azzardo. Grazie ai sistemi di monitoraggio delle prescrizioni mediche si stima che, tra il 2000 e il 2011, l'utilizzo di psicofarmaci sia aumentato del 340 %. Nei casi più gravi, l'indebitamento e la costante preoccupazione di non riuscire a far fronte al mantenimento economico della propria famiglia possono portare al suicidio: nel 2012 in Italia sono stati registrati 3048 suicidi, di cui 1412 per malattia, 324 per cause affettive e 187 per motivi economici.

Considerato che:

- il 7 aprile 2013 ricorre il World Health Day;
- i dati statistici rilevano uno squilibrio tra le richieste dei cittadini e i riscontri ricevuti per la sanità mentale: in Italia, solo il 3,4 % del budget sanitario viene stanziato per la salute mentale;
- campagne d'informazione efficaci devono essere accompagnate da interventi volti a sensibilizzare un cambiamento comportamentale, che possa essere concretizzato grazie al supporto di specialisti in materia (psichiatri e psicoterapeuti);
- la spesa pro capite media di un italiano per i videopoker o le macchinette da gioco è di 99 euro al mese e i luoghi dove si può giocare ininterrottamente stanno proliferando sul territorio europeo;

può dire la Commissione se non ritenga necessario:

1. effettuare una revisione delle linee guida sul trattamento delle patologie correlate alla salute mentale, in modo da migliorare l'efficacia dei sistemi sanitari europei e permettere ai cittadini di conoscere i servizi offerti dalle strutture presenti sul territorio che possano fornire supporto in momenti di crisi;
2. definire linee guida precise a tutela delle persone affette da gioco d'azzardo patologico, nonché di quelle vittime impotenti che sono i familiari, per porre un regolamento e un limite a ogni forma di gioco d'azzardo in Europa e predisporre programmi di recupero terapeutico mirato per questa nuova dipendenza, spesso volano di situazioni psichiche critiche?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(23 maggio 2013)

L'elaborazione e il riesame delle linee guida per il trattamento dei disturbi mentali e del gioco d'azzardo patologico non rientrano tra le responsabilità della Commissione, ma sono di competenza degli Stati membri e delle organizzazioni dei professionisti sanitari.

Il sostegno agli Stati membri affinché i sistemi sanitari nazionali offrano un supporto alle persone che soffrono di problemi di salute mentale, siano in grado di prevenire questo tipo di disturbi e promuovano la buona salute mentale è l'obiettivo dell'azione congiunta sulla salute e sul benessere mentale, lanciata nel febbraio 2013, nell'ambito del programma dell'UE per la salute. Tale azione, che avrà una durata di tre anni, coinvolge 24 Stati membri e tre paesi associati e intende, fra l'altro, definire un quadro comune d'azione in materia di salute mentale.

La Commissione finanzia inoltre attività di progetto per sostenere gli interventi delle regioni contro la depressione e i suicidi. Tra queste figurano il progetto Euregenas — *European regions enforcing actions against suicide* ⁽¹⁾ (Interventi delle regioni europee contro i suicidi) nell'ambito del programma dell'UE per la salute e il progetto del Settimo programma quadro di ricerca OSPI-Europe — *Optimising Suicide Prevention Programs and their Implementation in Europe* ⁽²⁾ (Ottimizzazione dei programmi di prevenzione dei suicidi e loro attuazione in Europa).

Gli Stati membri, secondo la giurisprudenza pertinente della Corte di giustizia dell'UE, stabiliscono il quadro normativo per l'offerta di servizi di gioco d'azzardo e definiscono gli obiettivi della propria politica in materia di gioco d'azzardo come pure il livello di tutela perseguito nell'interesse generale. Pertanto, spetta innanzitutto alle autorità nazionali valutare il potenziale di dipendenza dei vari giochi d'azzardo. Sono tuttavia necessarie ulteriori ricerche in questo settore per una migliore comprensione dei termini utilizzati, dei comportamenti, dei fattori e delle cause collegate. Il progetto «ALICE-RAP» studia il fenomeno delle dipendenze in Europa, tra cui la dipendenza dal gioco d'azzardo ⁽³⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.euregenas.eu>

⁽²⁾ <http://www.ospi-europe.com>

⁽³⁾ ALICE-RAP (Ridefinire le dipendenze e gli stili di vita nell'Europa di oggi) è un progetto quinquennale transitorio e interdisciplinare, finanziato nell'ambito del Settimo programma quadro, che intende dare un contributo al dibattito sulle norme attuali e sulle implicazioni future delle dipendenze e degli stili di vita in Europa nei prossimi 20 anni.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003349/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: New addictions and mental health at times of crisis — what measures are being taken at EU level?

Mental health means a state of well-being that allows each individual to make the most of their potential, to cope with the difficulties of daily life, to perform well at work and to make a significant contribution to the community. The economic crisis and the growing uncertainty arising from it have had a significant impact on people's quality of life and mental health. Depression seems to be one of the main overall diseases, followed by panic attacks, consumption of alcohol, drugs and gambling. Thanks to the system of prescription monitoring it is estimated that between 2000 and 2011, the use of psychotropic drugs increased by 340%. In the most severe cases, debt problems and the constant worry of not being able to support one's family can lead to suicide. In 2012, 3 048 suicides were recorded in Italy, 1 412 of which due to illness, 324 for emotional reasons and 187 for economic reasons.

Given that:

- 7 April 2013 is World Health Day;
- the statistics reveal an imbalance between the demands of citizens and the response they receive in terms of mental health: in Italy, only 3.4% of the health budget is allocated to mental health;
- effective information campaigns need to be backed up by measures to raise awareness and change behaviour, through the support of specialists (psychiatrists and psychotherapists);
- an Italian's average per capita expenditure on video poker or slot machines is EUR 99 per month, and places where people can play continuously are proliferating in the EU;

can the Commission therefore answer the following questions:

1. Should it not review the guidelines on the treatment of mental health illnesses, in order to improve the effectiveness of European health systems and enable citizens to learn about the services offered by local facilities that can provide support at times of crisis?
2. Should it not establish clear guidelines to protect people suffering from pathological gambling, as well as those helpless victims that are their family members, with a view to regulating and limiting all forms of gambling in Europe and developing targeted therapeutic rehabilitation programmes for this new addiction, which often leads to critical psychological situations?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(23 May 2013)**

The development or review of guidelines for the treatment of mental disorders and of pathological gambling does not fall under the responsibility of the Commission, but under that of Member States and health professionals' organisations.

Supporting Member States in enabling their health systems to provide support to people with mental health problems, to prevent them and to promote good mental health, is the aim of a Joint Action on Mental Health and Well-being under the EU-Health Programme which was launched in February 2013. It involves 24 Member States and three associated countries and will run over three years. One of its objectives is to develop a common framework of action on mental health.

In addition, the Commission is funding project activities which support regions in acting against depression and suicides. These include the projects 'European regions enforcing actions against suicide (Euregenas)' ⁽¹⁾ under the EU-Health Programme as well as the Research Framework Programme 7-project 'Optimising Suicide Prevention Programs and their Implementation in Europe (OSPI-Europe)' ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.euregenas.eu/>

⁽²⁾ <http://www.ospi-europe.com/>

Member States, in accordance with the relevant case-law of the Court of Justice of the EU, establish the regulatory framework for the offering of gambling services, and set the objectives of their gambling policy and the level of protection sought in the public interest. The assessment of the potential for addiction of different games of chance is thus primarily the responsibility of national authorities. However, further research in this area is required for a better understanding of the terms used, the behavioural attitudes and the factors and causes linked to this. 'ALICE-RAP' is studying the phenomenon of addiction in Europe, including gambling ⁽³⁾.

⁽³⁾ ALICE-RAP (Addiction and lifestyles in contemporary Europe -reframing addictions project) is a 5-year transitional and interdisciplinary project funded through the 7th Framework Programme aimed at contributing to the debate on current norms and future implications of addiction and lifestyles in Europe over the next 20 years.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003350/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(25 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Quale futuro per la realizzazione e applicazione di retine artificiali?

Recentemente in Italia la collaborazione tra due all'avanguardia nello studio di nuove tecnologie ha portato alla realizzazione della prima retina artificiale fatta con materiali organici e dunque biocompatibili. Il suo funzionamento assomiglia a quello di una minuscola cella solare. Contrariamente a quanto accadeva in passato questa innovativa retina è realizzata senza semiconduttori inorganici quali il silicio. Le persone con retine diventate poco sensibili alla luce — a causa di malattie quali la retinite pigmentosa che possono comportare anche la cecità totale — trarrebbero un enorme vantaggio da questa scoperta. Di fatto, il materiale organico utilizzato, un polimero semiconduttore, si è rivelato di estrema importanza in quanto possiede una proteina simile a quella sensibile alla luce nella nostra retina. I ricercatori hanno posto una retina di ratto con organelli danneggiati su un substrato di vetro rivestito da un metallo trasparente, vale a dire l'ossido d'indio-stagno, e dal polimero organico. Quest'ultimo, stimolato dalla luce, ha stimolato a sua volta i neuroni della retina.

Considerato che:

- questa nuova retina artificiale e autonoma non necessita di alcuna fonte di alimentazione ma stimola i neuroni;
- la rapidità con cui sono state iniziate le sperimentazioni sugli animali e i risultati riscontrati finora fanno pensare che nel giro di alcuni anni potrebbero avere inizio anche gli studi sull'uomo;
- la cecità è un grave problema della società moderna e va contrastato con le misure più efficaci;

può dire la Commissione:

1. se ritiene importante incentivare tale sperimentazione in modo da ottenere risultati sempre migliori;
2. se reputa necessario finanziare studi che comportino un miglioramento della qualità della vita per coloro che sono affetti da cecità;
3. se intende promuovere ulteriori campagne di sensibilizzazione dei cittadini ai controlli periodici della vista per prevenire eventuali problemi futuri?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(17 maggio 2013)

1. La Commissione conviene sulla grande importanza della ricerca scientifica nel campo delle menomazioni della vista, quale ad esempio la retinite pigmentosa. La messa a punto di una retina artificiale costituirebbe un grande traguardo.

L'esecuzione di studi «in vivo» sarebbe effettivamente decisiva per trasformare in potenziale cura la scoperta fatta dagli scienziati in Italia.

2. Nell'ambito del Settimo programma quadro di ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico (7° PQ, 2007-2013), la Commissione sta finanziando diversi progetti di ricerca relativi alle menomazioni della vista, compresa la «retinite pigmentosa». Il progetto DRUGSFORD⁽¹⁾ si propone di sviluppare composti che cercano di prevenire la degenerazione dei fotorecettori. Il progetto VISION⁽²⁾ mira a sviluppare un approccio terapeutico inteso ad arrestare la morte delle cellule neuronali grazie all'uso di un impianto intraoculare biodegradabile di nuova generazione. L'azione di coordinamento EUROVISIONNET⁽³⁾, già conclusa, aveva come obiettivo una migliore integrazione della

⁽¹⁾ www.drugsford.eu

⁽²⁾ <http://fp7-vision.eu/>

⁽³⁾ www.vision-research.eu/index.php?id=728

ricerca europea in materia di menomazioni della vista. Per quanto riguarda le tecnologie future ed emergenti, OPTONEURO ⁽⁴⁾ studia nuove modalità di percezione visiva e tecniche di protesi retiniche per i non vedenti: grazie a tecniche di ingegneria genetica, le cellule nervose contenute nella retina vengono rese sensibili alla luce. SEEBETTER ⁽⁵⁾ e i due recenti progetti RENVISION ⁽⁶⁾ e VISUALIZE ⁽⁷⁾ lavorano su sistemi artificiali che imitano il modo in cui la retina elabora le informazioni da integrare nelle nuove protesi retiniche utilizzate per ripristinare le funzioni visive perse a causa di malattie degenerative quali la retinite pigmentosa.

3. L'azione di coordinamento di cui sopra ha promosso la sensibilizzazione nei confronti della cecità e la collaborazione tra gli enti pubblici e privati attivi in questo campo. Generalmente, tutti i progetti mirano a sensibilizzare il pubblico sul lavoro da essi svolto e sui problemi da essi affrontati.

⁽⁴⁾ www.optoneuro.eu

⁽⁵⁾ <http://www.seebetter.eu/>

⁽⁶⁾ <http://www.renvision-fp7.eu/>

⁽⁷⁾ http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/106346_it.html

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003350/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: What does the future hold for producing and using artificial retinas?

Recently in Italy, cooperation between two scientists in the forefront of research into new technologies has resulted in producing the first artificial retina made from organic and, therefore, biocompatible materials. It operates in a similar manner to a tiny solar cell. Unlike the retinas produced in the past, this innovative retina has been made without using inorganic semiconductors such as silicon. This discovery would be hugely beneficial to people whose retinas have developed a low sensitivity to light due to conditions such as *retinitis pigmentosa*, which can also lead to total blindness. In actual fact, the organic material used, a semiconductor polymer, has turned out to be extremely important as it has a protein similar to the protein in our retina that is sensitive to light. The researchers placed a retina from a rat with damaged organelles on a glass substrate coated with a transparent metal, indium tin oxide, and the organic polymer. The latter, stimulated by light, stimulated in turn the retina's neurons.

Given that:

- this new independent, artificial retina does not require a power source, but actually stimulates the neurons;
- animal testing has got under way promptly and the results encountered so far imply that studies involving humans could be initiated in a few years;
- blindness is a serious issue in modern society and is being tackled using the most effective measures;

can the Commission state:

1. whether it considers it important to encourage such testing in order to obtain increasingly better results;
2. whether it considers it necessary to finance studies which help improve the quality of life of those affected by blindness;
3. whether it will promote further campaigns aimed at raising public awareness about having regular sight checks to prevent potential problems in the future?

**Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(17 May 2013)**

1. The Commission agrees that scientific research to address visual impairment such as *retinitis pigmentosa* is very important. The development of an artificial retina would be a milestone in this effort.

The performance of *in vivo* studies will indeed be critical for the translation of the finding by the scientists in Italy to a potential treatment.

2. The Commission is financing, under the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013), several research projects which tackle visual impairment, including *retinitis pigmentosa*. DRUGSFORD ⁽¹⁾ is to find compounds that target the prevention of photoreceptor damage. VISION ⁽²⁾ intends to develop a therapeutic approach to stop death of neural cells by using a novel intraocular biodegradable implant. The already finalised coordination action EUROVISIONNET ⁽³⁾, has aimed at a better integration of the European research on vision. In the area of Future and Emerging Technologies, OPTONEURO ⁽⁴⁾ explores new ways of visual perception and retina prosthetics for the blind through the genetic re-engineering of nerve cells in the retina in order to be sensitive to light. SEEBETTER ⁽⁵⁾, and recently started RENVISION ⁽⁶⁾ and VISUALISE ⁽⁷⁾ work on artificial systems that mimic the way in which the retina processes information to be integrated in new classes of retinal prostheses to restore vision lost from degenerative diseases such as *retinitis pigmentosa*.

⁽¹⁾ www.drugsford.eu

⁽²⁾ <http://fp7-vision.eu/>

⁽³⁾ www.vision-research.eu/index.php?id=728

⁽⁴⁾ www.optoneuro.eu

⁽⁵⁾ <http://www.seebetter.eu/>

⁽⁶⁾ <http://www.renvision-fp7.eu/>

⁽⁷⁾ http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/106346_en.html

3. The abovementioned coordination action has increased awareness about blindness and promoted the collaboration of public and private institutions active in the field. Generally all projects are encouraged to raise public awareness of their work and the problems addressed.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003351/13
aan de Commissie
Bastiaan Belder (EFD)
(25 maart 2013)

Betreft: Aanpak oneerlijke handelspraktijken in de voedingsmiddelenketen

Stakeholders vertegenwoordigd in het deskundigenplatform van het „Forum op hoog niveau over een beter functionerende voedselvoorzieningsketen” bereikten consensus over beginselen inzake goede praktijken, maar werden het niet eens over het raamwerk voor handhaving van die beginselen.

1. In haar brief van 20 juli 2012 aan het deskundigenplatform benadrukte de Commissie nog het cruciale belang van het vinden van consensus over het raamwerk voor handhaving. Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie in dat licht het feit dat 8 van de 11 deelnemende partijen hebben aangekondigd een raamwerk voor handhaving te gaan implementeren, terwijl er geen overeenstemming is over de manier van handhaven? Een van de partijen die het raamwerk niet heeft kunnen ondertekenen omdat ze voor haar belangrijke punten niet verwezenlijkt zag, is immers vertegenwoordiger van de primaire producenten.

Denkt de Commissie dat oneerlijke handelspraktijken aangepakt kunnen worden tot tevredenheid van alle partijen, terwijl over het raamwerk voor handhaving geen consensus mogelijk bleek?

2. De Commissie schrijft in haar Groenboek inzake oneerlijke handelspraktijken (31 januari 2013) dat de „angstfactor” een „van de voornaamste punten is die moeten worden onderzocht bij de beoordeling of een handhavingsmechanisme geschikt is”.

In het raamwerk voor handhaving (versie 25 januari) is een anonieme klacht slechts mogelijk voor geaggregeerde gebundelde klachten over een oneerlijke handelspraktijk of voor individuele klachten over procesmatige zaken. Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie het feit dat in het raamwerk geen mogelijkheid is opgenomen om anoniem een individuele klacht in te dienen over een oneerlijke handelspraktijk?

3. Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie het feit dat in het raamwerk slechts is voorzien in een sanctie voor niet-nakoming van procesmatige vereisten, maar niet is voorzien in een sanctie bij inhoudelijke schending van de beginselen inzake goede praktijken?

4. Wat doet de Commissie eraan om een representatieve respons te verkrijgen op de openbare raadpleging naar aanleiding van het Groenboek?

Antwoord van de heer Tajani namens de Commissie
(3 juni 2013)

1.-3. De Commissie onderzoekt momenteel verschillende opties om oneerlijke handelspraktijken tussen ondernemingen aan te pakken en verricht daartoe een effectbeoordeling. In dit verband zal de Commissie onder andere de kwestie van sancties en anonieme individuele klachten onderzoeken en nagaan of die opties geïntroduceerd zouden moeten worden in een raamwerk voor handhaving dat oneerlijke handelspraktijken tussen de betrokkenen in alle schakels van de voedselketen aanpakt. In dit stadium onthoudt de Commissie zich van een definitief oordeel over de effectiviteit van de vrijwillige gedragscode waarnaar het geachte Parlementslid verwijst.

De Commissie wenst een ruimere overeenkomst tussen belanghebbenden uit de voedingsmiddelenketen en heeft de partners in de voedingsmiddelenketen gevraagd om in deze richting verder te werken. Zij verwelkomt echter elk initiatief dat in een deelakkoord voorziet dat gericht is op het verbeteren van de relaties tussen ondernemingen. De Commissie zal de resultaten van dit vrijwillige initiatief nauwlettend in de gaten houden terwijl zij de effectbeoordeling verricht.

De effectieve realisatie van dit initiatief zou een aanwijzing moeten vormen voor de resultaten die de sector ervan verwacht. Het aantal ondernemingen dat zich in de komende maanden zal aansluiten, zal daarvoor een eerste beoordelingscriterium zijn.

4. De Commissie heeft op haar website⁽¹⁾ een raadpleging gepubliceerd over het groenboek inzake oneerlijke handelspraktijken tussen ondernemingen in de food- en non-foodtoeleveringsketen en moedigt alle geïnteresseerde belanghebbenden aan om feedback te geven. Informatie over de start van de raadpleging werd op grote schaal verspreid door middel van een persbericht.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/consultations/2013/unfair-trading-practices/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003351/13
to the Commission
Bastiaan Belder (EFD)
(25 March 2013)

Subject: Tackling unfair trade practices in the food chain

The stakeholders represented in the expert platform of the High Level Forum on a Better Functioning Food Supply Chain have reached consensus on the principles of good practice, but have not been able to agree on the framework for the enforcement of those principles.

1. In its letter to the expert platform of 20 July 2012, the Commission emphasised the crucial importance of finding consensus on a framework for enforcement. How does the Commission, in light of this, view the fact that 8 out of the 11 stakeholders have announced that they would start implementing an enforcement framework when there is no agreement about the way in which this should be done? Indeed, one of the parties that was unable to sign the framework because it did not see in the framework the points it considers necessary is a representative of the primary producers.

Does the Commission believe that unfair commercial practices can be addressed to the satisfaction of all parties when no consensus on the framework for enforcement seems possible?

2. The Commission writes in its Green Paper on Unfair Commercial Practices (31 January 2013) that 'the fear factor' is 'one of the most important issues to be examined when assessing the appropriateness of an enforcement mechanism'.

The enforcement framework (the version of 25 January) allows an anonymous complaint to be made only in the case of aggregated bundled complaints about an unfair trade practice or in the case of individual complaints about process-related matters. How does the Commission view the fact that no provision for filing an anonymous individual complaint about an unfair trade practice has been included in the framework?

3. How does the Commission view the fact that the framework only provides for a sanction for non-compliance with process-related requirements while failing to provide for a sanction for substantive violation of the principles of good practice?

4. What is the Commission doing about obtaining a representative response to the public consultation on the Green Paper?

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

1-3. The Commission is currently assessing various options to address unfair business-to-business trading practices and is carrying out an impact assessment to that effect. In this context, the Commission will, among others, analyse the issues of sanctions and individual anonymous complaints, and whether such possibilities should be introduced into an enforcement framework which would address unfair practices between actors at each supply chain level. At this stage, the Commission reserves its final judgment on the effectiveness of the voluntary code of good practice the Honourable Member is referring to.

The Commission would wish for a broader agreement between food supply chain stakeholders and has asked food chain partners to work in this direction. Yet, it welcomes any initiative including a partial agreement which aims at improving business-to-business relationships. The Commission will follow closely the results of this voluntary initiative, while working on the impact assessment in parallel.

The actual uptake of this initiative should provide an indication on the results the sector is expecting from it. The coverage of the companies that will sign up in the coming months will provide a first element of assessment in this respect.

4. The Commission published the consultation on the Green Paper on unfair trading practices in the business-to-business food and non-food supply chain on its website ⁽¹⁾ and has encouraged the feedback of all interested stakeholders. Information on the launch of the consultation was broadly disseminated through a press release.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/consultations/2013/unfair-trading-practices/index_en.htm

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003352/13
aan de Commissie (Vicevoorzitter / Hoge Vertegenwoordiger)
Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)
(25 maart 2013)**

Betref: VP/HR — Wapenexport vanuit de EU naar Israël

Het Gemeenschappelijk Standpunt 2008/944/GBVL van de Raad bevat 8 criteria waaraan moet voldaan zijn bij de export van wapens uit de EU. Dit standpunt is bindend voor alle EU-lidstaten. Voor een zeventiental landen, waaronder China, Wit-Rusland en Libanon, geldt een wapenembargo omdat ze aan deze criteria niet voldoen.

Tegen Israël is er momenteel geen wapenembargo. De wapenexport vanuit de EU bedroeg over de periode 2003-2011 ruim 1,4 miljard euro. Toch zijn er talrijke duidelijke redenen om aan te nemen dat Israël helemaal niet voldoet aan de 8 criteria in het Gemeenschappelijk Standpunt, zelfs niet wanneer een minimale interpretatie van deze vaag verwoorde criteria gevolgd wordt. Voorbeelden hiervan zijn operatie Gegoten Lood, de bouw van nederzettingen en de muur, de aanval op Freedom Flotilla en de levering van nucleaire onderzeeboten door Duitsland. Deze lijst voorbeelden van grove schendingen van de 8 criteria roept volgende dringende vragen op:

1. Gemeenschappelijke Standpunt 2008/944/GBVL wordt niet nageleefd. Wat zijn, gezien het bindend karakter van dit document, de mogelijke juridische of andere gevolgen voor de lidstaten die blijven wapens exporteren naar Israël?
2. Welke argumenten rechtvaardigen de wapenexport naar Israël en het uitblijven van een wapenembargo tegen dit land?
3. Waarom is er geen consequent wapenexportbeleid? Op welke eenduidige grond wordt er voor sommige landen die beschuldigd worden van mensenrechtenschendingen, zoals China, beslist om een wapenembargo in te stellen, terwijl de export naar Israël, dat ook van schendingen beschuldigd wordt, gewoon kan door gaan?

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

Overeenkomstig Gemeenschappelijk Standpunt 2008/944/GBVB betreffende de controle op de uitvoer van militaire goederen blijft de beslissing over het al dan niet toestaan van de uitvoer van wapens een bevoegdheid van de lidstaten. Wapenuitvoervergunningen die door EU-lidstaten worden beoordeeld, worden getoetst aan de 8 criteria die in het Gemeenschappelijk Standpunt zijn vastgesteld en d lidstaten moeten rekening houden met mogelijke weigeringen van andere lidstaten voor soortgelijke transacties.

Vraagstukken die rijzen bij de uitvoering van het Gemeenschappelijk Standpunt, worden besproken in de regelmatige vergaderingen van de werkgroep van de Raad voor de export van conventionele wapens (COARM). In COARM wisselen lidstaten standpunten en informatie uit over specifieke bestemmingen met het oog op een betere samenhang van hun beleid inzake wapenuitvoer ten aanzien van de bestemmingen in kwestie. Zij bespreken eveneens de toepassing van de criteria van het Gemeenschappelijk Standpunt op de bestemming die wordt behandeld.

Ook transparantie speelt een belangrijke rol in het Gemeenschappelijk Standpunt van de EU, zoals wordt aangetoond met het jaarverslag van de EU over wapenuitvoer dat in het *Publicatieblad van de EU* wordt bekendgemaakt⁽¹⁾. Deze verslagen bevatten eveneens informatie over het aantal wapenuitvoerweigeringen (en de criteria waarop deze zijn gebaseerd) voor iedere bestemming. Aan de hand van het aantal weigeringen kan de mate van beperking van het beleid inzake wapenuitvoer worden beoordeeld. Voor het land dat in de vraag is vermeld, wordt in recente verslagen melding gemaakt van een belangrijk aantal wapenuitvoerweigeringen.

Voor elk besluit van de Raad tot instelling van een wapenembargo wordt rekening gehouden met de reikwijdte van de mensenrechtenschendingen en met name de vraag op welke schaal en hoe systematisch de mensenrechten worden geschonden. Om een wapenembargo in te stellen, is unanimititeit van de lidstaten vereist.

⁽¹⁾ Alle verslagen zijn te vinden op:
http://www.ceas.europa.eu/non-proliferation-and-disarmament/arms-export-control/index_nl.htm

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003352/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: VP/HR — Arms exports from the EU to Israel

The Council Common Position 2008/944/CFSP contains 8 criteria that must be met when exporting arms from the EU. This position is binding on all EU Member States. An arms embargo applies to around seventeen countries, including China, Belarus and Lebanon, because they do not meet these criteria.

There is currently no arms embargo on Israel. Arms exports from the EU amounted to more than EUR 1.4 billion during the 2003-2011 period. However, there are numerous obvious reasons to assume that Israel is absolutely not complying with the 8 criteria in the Common Position, even if we allow a minimal interpretation of these vaguely worded criteria. Examples include Operation Cast Lead, the building of settlements and the Israeli West Bank barrier, the attack on the Freedom Flotilla and the supply of nuclear submarines by Germany. This list of examples of major violations of the 8 criteria raises the following urgent questions:

1. The Council Common Position 2008/944/CFSP is not being observed. Given the binding nature of this document, what are the possible legal or other consequences for those Member States that continue to export weapons to Israel?
2. What are the arguments that justify arms exports to Israel and the EU's failure to impose an arms embargo on the country?
3. Why is there no consistent arms export policy? On what unambiguous grounds has it been decided to impose an arms embargo on some countries accused of human rights violations, such as China, while exports to Israel, which has also been accused of violations, are simply allowed to go on?

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

Under Common Position 2008/944/CFSP on the control of export of military equipment, decisions on whether to authorise or deny arms exports remain a national responsibility of Member States. Arms export licences reviewed by EU Member States are assessed against the eight criteria laid down in the Common Position and Member States have to take into account denials possibly issued by other Member States for similar transactions.

Issues raised by implementation of the Common Position are discussed in regular meetings of the Council Working Group on conventional arms exports (COARM). Member States exchange in COARM views and information on specific destinations with a view to achieving greater consistency of their arms export policy towards the destinations in question. They also discuss the application of the criteria of the Common Position to the destination under discussion.

Transparency is also key to the EU Common Position as exemplified by the EU annual report on arms exports published in the EU official journal⁽¹⁾. Those reports also inform on the number of arms export denials (and the criteria on which they are based) vis-à-vis any destination. This number of denials enables to assess the degree of restriction of arms export policies. For instance vis-à-vis the country referred to in the question, recent reports inform of a significant number of arms export denials.

The extent of human rights violations and notably how widespread and systematic these violations are considered in any Council decision to impose an arms embargo. The decision to impose an arms embargo requires unanimity among the Member States.

⁽¹⁾ All reports are accessible at: http://www.eas.europa.eu/non-proliferation-and-disarmament/arms-export-control/index_en.htm

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003353/13
aan de Commissie
Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)
(25 maart 2013)

Betref: Samenwerking met Israël binnen FP7

Israël is het enige niet-Europees land dat geassocieerd is met het Zevende Kaderprogramma voor Onderzoek en Technologische Ontwikkeling (FP7).

1. Aan welke criteria moet een entiteit voldoen om te kunnen aansluiten bij het Kaderprogramma en zo financiële steun te ontvangen? Welk controleorgaan houdt toezicht op de naleving van deze criteria?
2. Kan de Commissie een overzicht geven van de bedragen die Israël sinds 2000 jaarlijks heeft ontvangen uit dit en voorgaande Kaderprogramma's? In hoeveel van de FP7-projecten zijn Israëlische defensie- en beveiligingsbedrijven betrokken en welke bedragen zijn hier telkens mee gemoeid per bedrijf? Welke argumenten rechtvaardigen de transfer van Europees onderzoeksgeld naar deze bedrijven?

Antwoord van mevrouw Geoghegan-Quinn namens de Commissie
(17 mei 2013)

Deelname aan het zevende kaderprogramma voor onderzoek, technologische ontwikkeling en demonstratieactiviteiten (KP7, 2007-2013) staat open voor rechtspersonen uit de hele wereld. Bij de meeste KP-projecten gaat het om een samenwerkingsverband waarbij de deelname van minimaal drie juridische entiteiten uit verschillende EU-lidstaten of geassocieerde landen wordt verlangd. Projecten worden geselecteerd op basis van wetenschappelijke kwaliteit en de beoordeling wordt uitgevoerd door onafhankelijke experts. De governance-regelingen voorzien in programmacomités met vertegenwoordigers uit de lidstaten.

Het overzicht van toezeggingen aan de Israëlische juridische entiteiten die in de periode 2000-2013 aan KP-projecten deelnemen vindt u in de bijgevoegde tabel. Defensie-onderzoek wordt niet door het KP ondersteund. Hoewel er geen specifieke NACE-code ⁽¹⁾ voor de beveiligingsindustrie bestaat, nemen 23 Israëlische entiteiten voor een totaalbedrag van 26 miljoen EUR deel aan 49 KP7-projecten met het thema beveiliging.

Onder de voorwaarden van de internationale overeenkomst waarbij Israël bij het KP7 betrokken wordt, betaalt het een financiële bijdrage aan het programma en ontvangen Israëlische juridische entiteiten in dit kader financiering op dezelfde basis als EU lidstaten.

⁽¹⁾ [http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Glossary:Statistical_classification_of_economic_activities_in_the_European_Community_\(NACE\)](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Glossary:Statistical_classification_of_economic_activities_in_the_European_Community_(NACE)).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003353/13
to the Commission
Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: Cooperation with Israel within FP7

Israel is the only non-European country that is associated with the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7).

1. What criteria does an entity have to meet in order to join the framework Programme and, thus, receive financial support? What supervisory body oversees compliance with these criteria?
2. Can the Commission provide an overview of the amounts that Israel has received annually from this and previous Framework Programmes since 2000? In how many of the FP7 projects are Israeli defence and security companies involved and what are the amounts paid per company in each case? What are the arguments that justify the transfer of European research money to these companies?

**Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(17 May 2013)**

The Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013) is open to the participation of legal entities from all over the world. Most FP projects are of a collaborative nature requiring the participation of a minimum of three legal entities from different EU Member States or Associated Countries. Projects are selected on the basis of scientific excellence and the evaluation is carried out by independent experts. The governance arrangements include programme committees with representatives from the Member States.

The overview of commitments to Israeli legal entities participating in FP projects in the years 2000-2013 is provided in an enclosed table. FP7 does not support defence research. While there is no specific NACE code ⁽¹⁾ for the security industry, 23 Israeli entities participate in 49 FP7 projects of the Security theme, with a total contribution of EUR 26 million.

Under the terms of the international agreement associating Israel to FP7, Israel provides a financial contribution to the programme and Israeli legal entities receive funding from it on the same basis as legal entities from EU Member States.

⁽¹⁾ [http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Glossary:Statistical_classification_of_economic_activities_in_the_European_Community_\(NACE\)](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Glossary:Statistical_classification_of_economic_activities_in_the_European_Community_(NACE)).

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-003355/13
adresată Comisiei
Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)
(25 martie 2013)

Subiect: Acordul cu Republica Moldova referitor la protecția indicațiilor geografice ale produselor agricole și alimentare

În 15 ianuarie 2013 a fost publicat în Jurnalul Oficial al Uniunii Europene Acordul dintre Uniunea Europeană și Republica Moldova cu privire la protecția indicațiilor geografice ale produselor agricole și alimentare.

În Anexa III a acordului privind produsele agricole și alimentare din Uniunea Europeană, altele decât vinurile, băuturile spirtoase și vinurile aromatizate, care urmează să fie protejate în Republica Moldova, indicația geografică protejată „Magiun de Topoloveni” a fost omisă.

Cum poate Comisia justifica această omitere?

Răspuns dat de dl Ciołoș în numele Comisiei
(6 mai 2013)

Lista indicațiilor geografice (GI) ale UE, protejate în baza acordului privind protecția indicațiilor geografice ale produselor agricole și alimentare ⁽¹⁾ încheiat între Uniunea Europeană și Republica Moldova, include denumirile înregistrate până la data de 11 mai 2010.

Denumirea „Magiun de prune Topoloveni” nu a fost inclusă în listă, fiind înregistrată în UE de abia la data de 8 aprilie 2011.

În același timp, acordul menționat prevede, la articolul 3, o procedură simplificată de actualizare, de ambele părți, a listei denumirilor protejate; actualizarea se va face prin decizia comitetului mixt care urmează a fi creat în baza acordului. Prima reuniune a comitetului va avea loc până la sfârșitul anului 2013/începutul anului 2014. În acest context, „Magiun de prune Topoloveni” va fi printre primele denumiri analizate în vederea protejării în Moldova.

(¹) JO L 10, 15.1.2013.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003355/13
to the Commission**

Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)

(25 March 2013)

Subject: Agreement with the Republic of Moldova on the protection of geographical markings on agricultural products and foodstuffs

On 15 January 2013 the Agreement between the European Union and the Republic of Moldova on the protection of geographical markings on agricultural products and foodstuffs was published in the EU Official Journal.

In Annex III of the agreement on agricultural products and foodstuffs of the European Union with the exception of wines, spirits and aromatised wines to be protected in the Republic of Moldova, the protected geographical marking 'Magiun de Topoloveni' was omitted.

How can the Commission justify this omission?

Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission

(6 May 2013)

The list of the EU Geographical Indications (GIs) protected under the Agreement between the European Union and the Republic of Moldova on the protection of geographical indications of agricultural products and foodstuffs ⁽¹⁾ includes designations registered before 11 May 2010.

Magiun de prune Topoloveni was not included in this list as it was registered in the EU only on 8 April 2011.

At the same time the Agreement (Article 3 thereof) foresees a simplified procedure to update the list of protected designations from both sides; the update will be done by a decision of the Joint Committee to be set up under the Agreement. The first meeting of the Joint Committee should take place by the end of 2013/early 2014. In this context, Magiun de prune Topoloveni will be one of the first denominations to be examined for the protection in Moldova.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L10, 15.1.2013.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-003356/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(25 martie 2013)

Subiect: Negocierile TTIP și impactul lor asupra agriculturii

În vara acestui an, Uniunea Europeană și Statele Unite ale Americii vor începe discuții oficiale cu privire la Parteneriatul Transatlantic de Schimb și Investiții (Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership — TTIP), cu obiectivul de a încheia un acord până la sfârșitul anului 2014.

Este prevăzut ca discuțiile să aibă ca obiect, printre altele, sistemele de cote agricole, subvențiile la export etc.

Comisia este rugată să răspundă la următoarele întrebări:

1. Care sunt obiectivele pe care și le propune în domeniul schimburilor cu produse agricole?
2. Care vor fi efectele prevăzute ale acordului asupra agriculturii europene?
3. Care va fi poziția de negociere a Comisiei în ceea ce privește organismele modificate genetic?
4. Care va fi poziția de negociere a Comisiei în ceea ce privește respectarea standardelor de mediu și de bunăstare a animalelor?

Răspuns dat de dl Ciolos în numele Comisiei
(22 mai 2013)

Uniunea Europeană beneficiază de o balanță comercială pozitivă semnificativă cu Statele Unite ale Americii în sectorul agricol, în special datorită exportului de produse cu valoare ridicată. Comisia consideră că Parteneriatul Transatlantic de Schimb și Investiții (TTIP) va fi benefic pentru UE la nivel global și va crește cota de piață pentru produsele UE pe piața Statelor Unite ale Americii, garantându-se în același timp un rezultat echilibrat per ansamblu. Parteneriatul Transatlantic de Schimb și Investiții va oferi, de asemenea, un tratament specific pentru produsele cele mai sensibile. Comisia va lua în considerare sensibilitățile existente pe piețele agricole ale Uniunii Europene pentru a reduce la minimum orice impacturi negative.

Comisia va urmări, de asemenea, asigurarea unei protecții consolidate pentru indicațiile geografice ale Uniunii Europene în Statele Unite ale Americii; acesta este și un mijloc de a garanta un acces mai bun pe piață.

Aceste negocieri nu vor compromite sănătatea consumatorilor din Uniunea Europeană sau mediul pentru câștiguri comerciale. Legislația de bază, inclusiv în ceea ce privește organismele modificate genetic, nu va fi afectată de negocieri.

În cadrul viitoarelor negocieri, Comisia intenționează să abordeze și aspecte legate de bunăstarea animalelor.

Negocierile cu SUA vor urmări consolidarea coerenței normative și a compatibilității. Standardele de mediu vor fi abordate în acest context.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003356/13
to the Commission
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: TTIP negotiations and their impact on agriculture

This summer the European Union and the United States will initiate official discussions on the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP), with the aim of concluding an agreement by the end of 2014.

The discussions are expected to focus on agricultural quota schemes and export subsidies, amongst other things.

Can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. What additional objectives is it proposing with regard to the trade in agricultural products?
2. What will be the expected impact of the agreement on European agriculture?
3. What negotiating stance will the Commission adopt on genetically modified organisms?
4. What negotiating stance will the Commission adopt on compliance with environmental and animal welfare standards?

**Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission
(22 May 2013)**

The EU is benefiting from a significant positive trade balance with the US in the agricultural sector, notably due to its export of high value products. The Commission considers that the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) will be globally beneficial for the EU and will increase the market share for the EU products in the US market, while guaranteeing a balanced outcome overall. The TTIP will also provide specific treatment for the most sensitive products. The Commission will carefully take into account the sensitivities in the EU agricultural markets in order to minimise any negative impacts.

The Commission will also aim at securing enhanced protection for EU geographical indications in the US; this is also a means of guaranteeing improved market access.

These negotiations will not compromise the health of EU consumers or the environment for commercial gains. Basic legislation, including on the issue of GMOs, will not be affected by the negotiations.

In the framework of the forthcoming negotiations the Commission also intends to address animal welfare issues.

The negotiations with the US will aim at enhancing regulatory coherence and compatibility. Environmental standards will be addressed in that context.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003358/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE) y Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(25 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Nueva autoridad de la competencia

La Comisión Europea ha advertido a España que si no modifica el proyecto de ley para la creación de la nueva Comisión Nacional de Mercados y Competencia (CNMC) y lo adapta a las normas europeas abrirá un procedimiento de infracción contra el país, según se ha hecho eco la prensa.

Según parece, el Gobierno español ha hecho modificaciones al respecto, aunque la Comisión Europea aún no se ha posicionado al respecto. También se ha hecho eco la prensa de que los partidos políticos se encuentran en pleno mercadeo de las posiciones del Consejo de la nueva CNMC con el objetivo de colocar a personas cercanas o directamente parte de sus partidos políticos. Parece evidente que estas no son las mejores condiciones para asegurar la independencia del nuevo organismo.

¿Qué opinión tiene la Comisión sobre las modificaciones que ha hecho el Gobierno español para cumplir con las condiciones de la Comisión?

¿Cree la Comisión que es perjudicial para la independencia del CNMC el modo en que los partidos políticos quieren elegir a los consejeros que gobiernen el organismo?

Respuesta de la Sra. Kroes en nombre de la Comisión
(17 de mayo de 2013)

Como se indicaba en nuestra respuesta a la PQ E-002282/2013, la Comisión ha mantenido un estrecho contacto con las autoridades españolas en relación con la ley por la que se instituye la Comisión Nacional de Mercados y Competencia (CNMC) y ha expresado su preocupación sobre una serie de aspectos, incluido el nombramiento de los directivos, el régimen de financiación y la asignación efectiva de competencias en los sectores de las comunicaciones electrónicas y la energía a autoridades reguladoras nacionales.

El Gobierno de España ha asegurado a la Comisión que, en la versión final de la ley por la que se instituye la CNMC, se tendrán en cuenta los aspectos señalados; la Comisión tiene conocimiento de que, a raíz de las conversaciones mantenidas con las autoridades españolas, se han propuesto una serie de modificaciones en todo el proceso legislativo. El proyecto de ley se está debatiendo actualmente en el Senado ⁽¹⁾.

En lo relativo a los miembros del Consejo de la futura CNMC, la Comisión otorga gran importancia a los requisitos que impone el nuevo marco regulador de la UE en relación con la independencia de las autoridades reguladoras nacionales. Parece ser que el proyecto de ley refuerza la participación y el control del Parlamento en el nombramiento de los miembros del Consejo. En particular, dicho proyecto establece que tales miembros serán designados previa consulta del Parlamento, que tendrá un derecho de veto respecto a los candidatos propuestos.

Con el fin de asegurar que la legislación española se ajuste al Derecho de la UE, la Comisión se compromete a seguir de cerca la realización efectiva de esta reforma, dadas las repercusiones que puede tener sobre el funcionamiento de la economía, así como la finalización del proceso legislativo. Si procediera, abordará cualquier otro problema que pudiera presentarse.

⁽¹⁾ Proyecto de Ley de creación de la Comisión Nacional de los Mercados y la Competencia:
<http://www.senado.es/web/actividadparlamentaria/iniciativas/detalleiniciativa/index.html?legis=10&id1=621&id2=000031>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003358/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE) and Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: New competition authority

According to media reports, the Commission has warned Spain that if it does not amend its draft law creating the new National Markets and Competition Commission (CNMC) to comply with EU standards it will open infringement proceedings against the country.

The Spanish Government has apparently made changes in this regard, although the Commission has yet to adopt a position thereon. The press has also reported that political parties are advertising seats on the new CNMC board to try and secure them for those affiliated with or directly involved in these parties. These are clearly not optimal conditions for ensuring the new authority's independence.

What is the Commission's opinion regarding the changes made by Spanish Government to comply with EU standards?

Does it believe it that the CNMC's independence is jeopardised by the political parties' attempts to select its directors?

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

As indicated in our reply to PQ E-002282/2013, the Commission has been in regular contact with the Spanish authorities regarding the draft law creating the National Commission for Markets and Competition (CNMC) and has expressed its concerns on a number of issues, including the appointment of management positions, financing regime, and the effective attribution of competences in the electronic communications and energy sectors to national regulatory authorities in Spain.

The Commission has received the assurance from the Spanish Government that these concerns will be addressed in the final law creating the CNMC and is aware that following discussions with the Spanish authorities a number of amendments have been proposed throughout the legislative process. The draft law is currently under discussion in the Spanish Senate ⁽¹⁾.

Regarding the members of the Board of the future CNMC, the Commission attaches great importance to the requirements under the EU regulatory framework regarding the independence of national regulatory authorities. The draft law seems to reinforce the involvement and control of the Parliament in the appointment process of the members of the Board. In particular, the draft law foresees that the members of the Board will be appointed following consultation of the Parliament which will have the right to veto the proposed candidates.

The Commission is committed to follow-up closely the implementation of this reform, given its potential impact on the functioning of the economy, as well as the finalisation of the legislative process to ensure compliance of the Spanish legislation with EC law, and will address any remaining issues, as appropriate.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.senado.es/web/actividadparlamentaria/iniciativas/detalleiniciativa/index.html?legis=10&id1=621&id2=000031>

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003359/13
a la Comisión**

Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE)
(25 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Facilitación del comercio

La Unión Europea está realizando grandes esfuerzos para favorecer el libre comercio mediante la negociación y entrada en vigor de una amplia red de acuerdos. Con ellos se busca reducir los costes y la burocracia comercial para favorecer el comercio y fomentar el crecimiento económico y la creación de empleo.

Sin embargo, la Unión Europea sigue sin contar con un programa propio de facilitación comercial, por lo que muchas de las oportunidades que podrían surgir a raíz de este gran esfuerzo se pierden. De hecho, algunas empresas están encontrando dificultades para impulsar su desarrollo comercial, entre otras causas por la pérdida de nivel de calificación de los Estados miembros a los que pertenecen, lo que les lleva a perder oportunidades, por ejemplo en concursos de licitación pública, al no poder ser avaladas por los bancos localizados en dichos países.

Sabemos que el BEI ya está estudiando las posibilidades de establecer un programa de facilitación del comercio; sin embargo, esto implica un proceso largo. Por ello, ¿cómo vería la Comisión que, al igual que otros bancos de desarrollo, el BEI pudiera empezar estableciendo medidas intermedias factibles, como la posibilidad de garantizar los avales necesarios para que las empresas puedan aprovechar mejor los esfuerzos en materia de libre comercio que la UE está llevando a cabo?

Dada la importancia de una puesta en funcionamiento rápida, ¿cuándo cree la Comisión que podría ponerse en marcha un esquema operativo que permitiese salvar las dificultades en lo que respecta a los avales?

¿Considera la Comisión que el BEI podrá desarrollar un programa de facilitación del comercio sobre la base de este esquema aunque sea a más largo plazo?

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-003808/13
a la Comisión**

Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(8 de abril de 2013)

Asunto: Desarrollo de un Programa para Facilitar el Comercio (Trade Facilitation Programme — TFP)

Las rebajas en la calificación crediticia de los Estados miembros han afectado a sus instituciones financieras y también a familias y empresas, con independencia de su solvencia. Esta situación, que pretende corregirse con la Unión Bancaria, tiene un gran impacto en el acceso a garantías y avales a las empresas con vocación exportadora de los países cuya calificación crediticia ha sido rebajada.

La demanda de garantías y avales no ha sido cubierta por nuevos entrantes dada la falta de relación con los potenciales clientes y de familiaridad con sus mercados habituales. Estas empresas europeas ven bloqueada así su participación en concursos internacionales y su presencia en el exterior. Se impide de esta forma la corrección de los desequilibrios macroeconómicos, la consecución de los objetivos de la Estrategia Europa 2020 y, en el caso de operaciones en el ámbito europeo, provoca una seria anomalía en el funcionamiento del mercado interior.

En un informe de 2008 elaborado para el Banco Europeo de Inversiones sobre distintos mecanismos de financiación, se contemplan Programas de Facilitación de Comercio (Trade Facilitation Programmes — TFP) para ofrecer este tipo de garantías y avales. El Banco Europeo de Reconstrucción y Desarrollo (BERD) los viene desarrollando en su limitado ámbito desde 1997, siendo el 70 % de sus operaciones en apoyo de Pequeñas y Medianas Empresas.

La cumbre de líderes de la eurozona de 29 de junio de 2012 concluyó que «que es imperativo romper el círculo vicioso entre bancos y emisores soberanos». El establecimiento de un Programa para Facilitar el Comercio (Trade Facilitation Programme) es necesario para conseguirlo, y hacer efectivas las prioridades del Semestre Europeo.

¿Va a adoptarse alguna iniciativa para poner en marcha un Programa para Facilitar el Comercio (Trade Facilitation Programme), por parte del Banco Europeo de Inversiones o por otra vía, de conformidad con las conclusiones del Consejo Europeo, las recomendaciones del Consejo y las posiciones defendidas por la Comisión? Teniendo en cuenta lo beneficioso de esta medida para la economía real, ¿va a adoptarse con urgencia?

Respuesta conjunta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión*(3 de junio de 2013)*

La Comisión colabora estrechamente con el Grupo BEI, formado por el BEI y el Fondo Europeo de Inversiones, en uno de los ámbitos de acción prioritarios de la UE: la elaboración de instrumentos conjuntos en favor de las PYME. Por consiguiente, la Comisión acoge favorablemente aquellas iniciativas de financiación comercial del BEI destinadas a ayudar a las PYME de los Estados miembros vulnerables.

En diciembre de 2012, el Consejo de Administración del BEI aprobó un programa de fomento de la financiación comercial (TFEP, en sus siglas en inglés) que proporciona contraavales a los rendimientos de las entidades bancarias cuando estas no pueden encontrar socios internacionales para operaciones de financiación comercial iniciadas por PYME.

Aunque en principio dicho programa se está aplicando con carácter experimental en Grecia, no se descarta la posibilidad de ampliarlo a otros países que se enfrentan a los mismos problemas.

El programa TFEP debe ser considerado como una medida contra la crisis que viene a complementar la ayuda que a más largo plazo ya está proporcionando el BEI a las PYME, sobre todo a través de la concesión de préstamos. Dada la situación actual del mercado, el programa de fomento de la financiación comercial puede ayudar decisivamente a mitigar los riesgos sistémicos y los riesgos asociados a las operaciones de financiación a que se enfrentan los bancos extranjeros interesados en realizar intercambios comerciales con Grecia, así como a favorecer una recuperación económica basada en las exportaciones e impulsada en concreto por las PYME.

Asimismo, se están manteniendo conversaciones con otras instituciones públicas de los Estados miembros para estudiar si dichas entidades pueden aunar esfuerzos con el BEI a fin de desarrollar un plan específico de apoyo a la internacionalización de las PYME.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003359/13
to the Commission
Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: Trade facilitation

The EU is making significant efforts to promote free trade through the negotiation and entry into force of a comprehensive network of agreements. Through these agreements it aims to cut costs and trade bureaucracy thereby promoting trade and fostering economic growth and job creation.

However, the EU does not yet have its own trade facilitation programme, which means that many potential opportunities arising from these efforts are lost. In fact, some companies are finding it difficult to boost trade development, partly due to their Member States' credit ratings being downgraded. This results in missed opportunities, for instance in public tenders, as the banks located in these countries cannot provide guarantees.

We know that the European Investment Bank (EIB) is already examining the possibility of establishing a trade facilitation programme; however, this involves a long process. How, therefore, can the EIB, as well as other development banks, begin to establish feasible intermediate measures, such as the ability to ensure the guarantees needed for businesses to make better use of EU efforts on free trade?

Given that a solution must be implemented quickly, when does the Commission believe that an operating procedure could be put in place to overcome the difficulties regarding guarantees?

Does it believe that the EIB could develop a trade facilitation programme, albeit longer-term, based on this procedure?

**Question for written answer P-003808/13
to the Commission
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(8 April 2013)**

Subject: Development of a trade facilitation programme (TFP)

Downgrades in Member States' credit ratings have affected financial institutions as well as families and companies, regardless of the level of solvency involved. This situation, for which the banking union has been suggested as a solution, is having a major impact as regards access to guarantees and commitments for export companies in countries whose credit ratings have been revised downwards.

Demand for guarantees and commitments has not been met by new entrants owing to a lack of links with potential clients and insufficient familiarity with the usual markets. European companies are thus being prevented from taking part in international procurement procedures and their external presence is being eroded. It is therefore proving difficult to correct macroeconomic imbalances and attain the Europe 2020 strategy objectives. In addition, where transactions within Europe are concerned, this situation is causing a serious anomaly in the operation of the internal market.

A 2008 report by the European Investment Bank (EIB) on various funding mechanisms proposed trade facilitation programmes (TFPs) as a way of offering guarantees and commitments of this kind. The European Bank for Reconstruction and Development has been developing these within its limited remit since 1997: they account for 70% of its SME support operations.

The Eurozone leaders' summit of 29 June 2012 concluded that 'it is imperative to break the vicious circle between banks and sovereigns'. A trade facilitation programme needs to be set up in order to do this, and to put the European Semester priorities into effect.

Are there any plans to take action with a view to implementing a trade facilitation programme, via the EIB or by other means, in line with the European Council conclusions, the Council recommendations and positions taken by the Commission? Given the benefits this measure can bring to the real economy, will such action be taken as a matter of urgency?

Joint answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission*(3 June 2013)*

The Commission works closely with the EIB Group, including the EIB and the European Investment Fund, in joint instruments in support of SMEs, which is a key policy priority for the EU. Therefore, the Commission welcomes EIB trade finance initiatives supporting SMEs in vulnerable Member States.

In December 2012, the EIB Board of Directors approved a Trade Finance Enhancement programme ('TFEP') which provides counter-guarantees of banks' performance where they cannot find international counterparts for trade finance transactions initiated by SMEs.

Whereas this programme is initially being deployed on a pilot basis in Greece, consideration will be given to the possibility of extending the TFEP to other countries confronted with the same problems.

This programme has to be seen as an anti-crisis measure which complements the longer-term support for SMEs already being provided by the EIB through in particular the SME loans. Under current market conditions, the Trade Finance Enhancement Programme can play an important role in mitigating transaction and systemic risks of foreign banks interested in developing trade flows with Greece, and favouring an export-led economic recovery promoted in particular by SMEs.

In parallel, ongoing discussions are being held with some other Member States' public institutions to determine if those institutions can join forces with the EIB for a dedicated scheme to support the internationalization of SMEs.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003360/13
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(25. März 2013)

Betrifft: Freihandelszone China-Japan-Südkorea

Um ihre wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit auszubauen planen China, Japan und Südkorea die Errichtung einer Freihandelszone. Dazu gab es bereits Ende 2012 erste Verhandlungen, die nun weitergeführt werden sollen.

Welche Auswirkungen werden in diesem Zusammenhang von der Kommission hinsichtlich der Freihandelszonen-Strategie der EU erwartet?

Antwort von Herrn De Gucht im Namen der Kommission
(2. Mai 2013)

Die Kommission verfolgt Handelsinitiativen, an denen einige ihrer wichtigsten Partner in Asien beteiligt sind, aufmerksam; dazu gehören auch die Bemühungen Chinas, Japans und Südkoreas, ein trilaterales Freihandelsabkommen ihrer Länder abzuschließen.

Obwohl diese Initiative keine unmittelbaren Folgen für die Handelsstrategie der EU in der Region hat, begrüßt die Kommission diese Bemühungen um die Liberalisierung des Handels mit dem Ziel, Wachstum und Beschäftigung in der Region zu fördern. Es sei ferner darauf hingewiesen, dass die Europäische Union bereits ein Freihandelsabkommen mit Südkorea geschlossen hat, das seit 1. Juli 2011 in Kraft ist, und dass im März 2013 Verhandlungen mit Japan über ein bilaterales Freihandelsabkommen aufgenommen wurden.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003360/13
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: Free trade area China-Japan-South Korea

In order to enhance their economic cooperation, China, Japan and South Korea are planning to establish a free trade area. The first negotiations in this regard took place at the end of the 2012 and are now to be continued.

What effects does the Commission expect this to have with regard to the EU free trade area strategy?

**Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(2 May 2013)**

The Commission is closely monitoring trade initiatives in which some of its major partners in Asia are active, including the efforts by China, Japan and South Korea to establish a triangular Free Trade Agreement among themselves.

Although this initiative does not have a direct impact on the EU's free trade area strategy in the region, the Commission nevertheless welcomes these efforts towards trade liberalisation with the objective of fostering growth and jobs in the region. It should also be noted that the European Union already has a Free Trade Agreement with South Korea in force since 1 July 2011, and that negotiations with Japan for a bilateral free trade agreement were launched in March 2013.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003361/13
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(25. März 2013)

Betrifft: Banken-Pleite in Zypern trotz einwandfreiem Abschneiden bei Bankenstresstests

Laut dem im Juli 2011 veröffentlichten Ergebnis des von der Europäischen Bankenaufsichtsbehörde (EBA) und der Europäischen Zentralbank (EZB) durchgeführten Banken-Stresstests haben die Banken in Zypern diesen Stresstest einwandfrei bestanden. Nun, gut 18 Monate später, stehen eben diese Banken kurz vor der Pleite und sollten von den Bürgern mittels einer Teilenteignung gerettet werden.

1. Wie erklärt die Kommission den Umstand, dass der EU-Bankenstresstest den Instituten in Zypern ein gutes Zeugnis ausgestellt hat und diese nun vor der Pleite stehen?
2. Sind weitere Banken-Stresstests geplant?
3. Falls ja, welche Anpassungen der Stresstests sind vorgesehen?
4. Falls nein, warum nicht?

Antwort von Herrn Rehn im Namen der Kommission
(13. Mai 2013)

Aus den von der Europäischen Bankenaufsichtsbehörde (EBA) und der Europäischen Zentralbank (EZB) durchgeführten Banken-Stresstests, deren Ergebnis im Juli 2011 veröffentlicht wurde, ging hervor, dass die beiden größten zyprischen Banken eine weitere Stärkung ihres Kapitalpolsters benötigten. Aktualisierten Schätzungen der EBA vom Dezember 2011 zufolge benötigten die beiden Banken zusätzliches Kapital in Höhe von insgesamt 3,5 Mrd. EUR (Bank of Cyprus 1,56 Mrd. EUR und Marfin, jetzt Cyprus Popular Bank, 1,97 Mrd. EUR), um ihre Kernkapitalquote („Tier 1“) von 9 % zu erreichen.

Nach einer Pause im Jahr 2012 dürfte die EBA in diesem Jahr einen weiteren Stresstest durchführen. Weitere Informationen über die Methodik der Tests sind noch nicht bekannt.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003361/13
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: Bankruptcy of the banks in Cyprus despite passing the bank stress tests with flying colours

According to the results, published in July 2011, of the bank stress tests carried out by the European Banking Authority (EBA) and the European Central Bank (ECB), the banks in Cyprus passed the stress test with flying colours. Now, just over 18 months later, these banks are on the brink of bankruptcy and are to be rescued by the public by means of a partial expropriation.

1. How does the Commission explain the fact that the EU bank stress test gave the institutions in Cyprus a good report and now they are on the brink of bankruptcy?
2. Are further bank stress tests planned?
3. If so, what adjustments to the stress tests are envisaged?
4. If not, why not?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(13 May 2013)**

The bank stress tests carried out by the European Banking Authority (EBA) and the European Central Bank (ECB) and published in July 2011 indicated that the largest two Cypriot banks needed further strengthening of their capital buffers. Following updated estimates of EBA in December 2011, the two banks required additional capital amounting to a total of EUR 3.5 billion (Bank of Cyprus EUR 1.56 billion and Marfin, now Cyprus Popular Bank, EUR 1.97 billion) to reach a core Tier 1 capital ratio of 9%.

EBA is supposed to run another stress test this year, following a pause in 2012. More information on methodology of the tests is not known yet.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003362/13

an die Kommission

Andreas Mölzer (NI)

(25. März 2013)

Betrifft: Banken-Steuer — Verstoß gegen demokratische Prinzipien

Die für Zypern geplante Banken-Steuer, die im Zuge eines langen Wochenendes abgezogen werden sollte (und zwar vorrangig gegenüber allen anderen Zahlungen, die ein Bürger leisten möchte ist, also bevor die nächste Miete, die Stromkosten, das Schulgeld für die Kinder abgebucht werden), hat bei den Bürgern erwartungsgemäß eine massive Protestwelle ausgelöst. Diese Steuer sollte ohne Vorankündigung, ohne jeden Spielraum, sich zu wehren, und ohne Ermessensspielraum für die Bankangestellten, und ohne soziale Ausnahmen quasi im Handstreich erhoben wurden.

Die EU, welche Zypern zu dieser Aktion gedrängt hat — wenngleich die genauere Ausgestaltung durch die zypriotische Regierung gewählt wurde —, hat damit im Zuge der Eurokrise einmal mehr gegen demokratische Prinzipien verstoßen. Im Juni 2011 wurde auf EU-Ebene die gesetzliche Deckungssumme für Sparer mit 100 000 EUR abgesichert. Nicht einmal zwei Jahre später haben die EU-Finanzminister der 17 Euroländer einstimmig (!) eine Teilenteignung der Sparer beschlossen, um damit in Zypern die Banken und den Staat vor der Pleite zu bewahren, und so offen mit der Einlagen-Sicherung gebrochen. Eine Sondersteuer auf Sparguthaben ist im Bankengesetz nicht vorgesehen und kommt einer Teilenteignung gleich.

1. Wie steht die Kommission zu dem Bruch mit dem demokratischen Prinzip der Bekanntgabe, wonach jede Steuer vorher bekanntzugeben ist (auf dem Gesetzeswege, in amtlichen Verlautbarungen und mit Zustimmung der Parlamente), welches im Falle Zyperns auf EU-Druck ausgesetzt wurde und das auch im Rahmen der verschiedenen griechischen Bail-outs umgangen wurde?
2. Wie steht die Kommission dazu, dass damit indirekt die EU-Zusage der Einlagen-Sicherung verraten wurde?
3. Wie steht die Kommission dazu, dass im Zuge der Eurokrise die Regeln des Gemeinsamen Marktes gekippt werden?
4. Wird auf EU-Ebene über ein europäisches Insolvenzrecht für Banken beraten?
5. Sind auf EU-Ebene Regeln für einen geordneten Staatsbankrott geplant?

Antwort von Herrn Barnier im Namen der Kommission

(19. Juni 2013)

1. Die Kommission darf keine Lösungen unterstützen, die gegen das EU-Recht verstoßen würden. In der ursprünglichen Entscheidung der Eurogruppe über ein zyprisches Programm vom 15. März 2013 wurde die Zusage Zyperns begrüßt, eine einmalige Stabilitäts-Abgabe einzuführen.
2. Die zyprischen Behörden haben keine Abgabe auf Sparguthaben von weniger als 100 000 EUR erhoben. Folglich ist auch kein Konflikt mit der Richtlinie 2009/14/EG über Einlagensicherungssysteme entstanden.
3. Die Kommission geht davon aus, dass sich der Herr Abgeordnete auf die von Zypern eingeführten Beschränkungen des Kapitalverkehrs bezieht. Nach dem EU-Recht sind Beschränkungen des Kapitalverkehrs aus Gründen der öffentlichen Ordnung oder der öffentlichen Sicherheit und aus zwingenden Gründen des allgemeinen öffentlichen Interesses unter strengen Voraussetzungen vorübergehend zulässig.
4. Die Kommission hat im Juni 2012 einen Vorschlag für eine Richtlinie über die Abwicklung und Sanierung von Banken vorgelegt. Mit der Richtlinie würde ein EU-weiter Rahmen eingeführt, der es Behörden gestattet, im Falle einer Bankenkrise wirksam und zeitnah einzugreifen. So wäre es anhand des „Bail-in“-Instruments möglich, eine Bank durch Löschung oder Verwässerung von Anteilen zu rekapitalisieren und die Forderungen der Gläubiger zu reduzieren oder in Anteile umzuwandeln. Einlagen von weniger als 100 000 EUR sind von der Anwendung dieses Instruments ausgeschlossen und würden folglich erhalten bleiben.

5. Die Tragfähigkeit der Staatsverschuldung ist eine wichtige Voraussetzung für eine Finanzhilfe des ESM. Bei Erhalt eines Ersuchens um eine Finanzhilfe überträgt der Vorsitzende des Gouverneursrats der Europäischen Kommission im Benehmen mit der EZB die Aufgabe zu bewerten, ob die Staatsverschuldung tragfähig ist. Es wird erwartet, dass diese Bewertung, soweit angebracht, zusammen mit dem IWF durchgeführt wird. Für Zypern wurde eine solche Bewertung vorgelegt ⁽¹⁾.

(1) <http://www.esm.europa.eu/>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003362/13
to the Commission**

Andreas Mölzer (NI)

(25 March 2013)

Subject: Bank tax — violation of democratic principles

The bank tax planned for Cyprus, to be deducted over the course of a long weekend (and in fact taking precedence over all other payments that people may wish to pay, in other words before the next rent, electricity costs or school money for children is debited) has unsurprisingly triggered a huge wave of protests among the people. This tax was to be collected without prior notice, without any possibility of resisting it, without any scope for discretion on the part of the banking staff and without exceptions for any social groups in a kind of lightning strike.

The EU, which has forced Cyprus into taking this action — although the precise nature of the action was chosen by the Cypriot Government — has once again during the euro crisis violated democratic principles. In June 2011, the statutory level of cover for savers was guaranteed at EUR 100 000. Not even two years later, the EU finance ministers of the 17 members of the euro area decided unanimously on a partial expropriation of savers in order to protect the banks and the State in Cyprus from bankruptcy, thus openly breaking the deposit guarantee. There is no provision for a special tax on savings in the Banking Law and it amounts to a partial expropriation.

1. What is the Commission's view with regard to the breach of the democratic principle of notification, according to which any tax is to be notified in advance (by means of legislation, in official announcements and with the consent of the parliaments), something that did not happen in the case of Cyprus, under pressure from the EU, and which was also bypassed in connection with the various bail-outs of Greece?
2. What is the Commission's position with regard to the fact that this has indirectly broken the EU's commitment with regard to the deposit guarantee?
3. What is its view with regard to the fact that, over the course of the euro crisis, the rules of the common market are being overturned?
4. Are any discussions being held at EU level concerning a European bankruptcy law for banks?
5. Are any EU level rules for an orderly state bankruptcy planned?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission

(19 June 2013)

1. The Commission cannot support solutions that would be contrary to EC law. The initial Eurogroup decision on a Cypriot programme of 15 March 2013, welcomed the Cypriot authorities' commitment to introduce a one-off stability levy.
2. The Cypriot authorities have not imposed any levy on deposits under EUR 100 000. Thus there is no compatibility issue with Directive 2009/14/EC on deposit-guarantee schemes.
3. The Commission assumes that the Honourable Member refers to the restrictions on capital movements adopted by Cyprus. In accordance with EC law restrictions on capital movement can be introduced temporarily and under strict conditions on grounds of public policy or public security and for overriding reasons of general public interest.
4. The Commission presented a proposal of directive on bank resolution and recovery in June 2012. The directive would introduce in the whole of the EU a framework with all tools allowing authorities to intervene decisively and timely in a banking crisis. In particular, the bail-in tool would allow a bank to be recapitalised with shareholders wiped out or diluted, and creditors would have their claims reduced or converted to shares. Deposits below EUR 100 000 are excluded from this tool and would therefore be entirely preserved.
5. A sustainable position with regard to public debt is an important precondition for the granting of financial assistance from the ESM. On receipt of a request for financial assistance, the Chairperson of the Board of Governors shall entrust the European Commission, in liaison with the ECB, with the task to assess whether public debt is sustainable. Wherever appropriate, such an assessment is expected to be conducted together with the IMF. For Cyprus, such an assessment has been provided ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.esm.europa.eu/>

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003363/13
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(25. März 2013)

Betrifft: Einlagensicherung — Schutzsystem für Sparer

Die österreichische Einlagensicherung hat sich nur bei der Pleite von sehr kleinen Banken bewährt. Experten sind der Ansicht, dass die jetzigen Schutzmechanismen nicht ausreichen, wenn große Finanzkonzerne in Schwierigkeiten geraten. Alle Bemühungen die fünf Einlagensicherungskreise zu reformieren, von denen alle wissen, dass sie in der vorliegenden Form gar nicht wirken können, sind am Widerstand einzelner Banken gescheitert, die sich weigern, für Kunden von anderen Sektoren aufkommen zu müssen.

Der Einlagensicherung gehören alle heimischen Institute sowie einige ausländische Zweigniederlassungen an. Somit haftet Österreich für Kunden ausländischer Banken, beispielsweise für die russische Staatsbank VTB, die in Österreich über eine Banklizenz verfügt und damit dem hiesigen Einlagensicherungssystem unterliegt und in andere EU-Länder expandieren darf.

1. Wurden im Zuge der Banken-Stresstests auch die Einlagensicherungssysteme überprüft?
2. Falls ja, zu welchem Ergebnis kam man?
3. Falls nein, warum nicht?
4. Gibt es auf EU-Ebene Bestrebungen gegebenenfalls anfällige Einlagensicherungs-Systeme einer Reform zu unterziehen?

Antwort von Herrn Barnier im Namen der Kommission
(29. Mai 2013)

Durch Artikel 21 der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1093/2010 erhält die Europäische Bankenaufsichtsbehörde die Befugnis, die Durchführung EU-weiter Stresstests zu veranlassen und zu koordinieren, um die Widerstandsfähigkeit von Finanzinstituten gegenüber ungünstigen Marktentwicklungen zu bewerten und gegebenenfalls Empfehlungen an die zuständigen nationalen Aufsichtsbehörden auszusprechen, Problempunkte zu beheben, die bei dem Stresstest festgestellt wurden. Als Finanzinstitute gelten nach dieser Verordnung Kreditinstitute, Wertpapierfirmen und Finanzkonglomerate. Einlagensicherungssysteme waren demzufolge in dem EU-weiten Stresstest von 2011 nicht einbezogen.

Wie in der Richtlinie 94/19/EG über Einlagensicherungssysteme vorgesehen, sind solche Systeme derzeit in allen Mitgliedstaaten in Kraft.

In den letzten Jahren hat die Kommission entschiedene Maßnahmen getroffen, um die Widerstandsfähigkeit des Einlagensicherungssystems in Europa zu stärken.

In einem ersten Schritt hat die Kommission im Oktober 2008 vorgeschlagen, die Fristen für die Rückzahlung der Einlagen von drei Monaten auf 20 Arbeitstage zu verkürzen und die Deckungssummen für Einleger auf 100 000 EUR zu harmonisieren⁽¹⁾. Der Vorschlag wurde vom Gesetzgeber im März 2009 angenommen und ist jetzt in vollem Umfang in Kraft⁽²⁾.

Im Juli 2010 hat die Kommission dann eine umfassende Novellierung der Einlagensicherungsrichtlinie vorgeschlagen⁽³⁾. Die Reform zielt insbesondere darauf ab, strenge harmonisierte Regeln für die Finanzierung der Einlagensicherungssysteme festzulegen, etwa durch eine Ex-ante-Finanzierung oder die Verbesserung des Zugangs der Einleger dank einer Rückzahlungsfrist von nur sieben Tagen. Außerdem sollen nach diesem Vorschlag alle Einlagensicherungssysteme laufend überwacht und mindestens alle drei Jahre einem Stresstest unterzogen werden.

Dieser Vorschlag wird zurzeit vom Parlament und vom Rat geprüft.

⁽¹⁾ KOM(2008)661 endg.

⁽²⁾ ABl. L 68 vom 13.3.2009, S. 3.

⁽³⁾ KOM(2010)368 endg.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003363/13
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(25 March 2013)

Subject: Deposit guarantee scheme — protection for savers

The Austrian deposit guarantee scheme has only proved successful in connection with the bankruptcy of very small banks. Experts believe that the current protection mechanisms will be inadequate if large financial groups get into difficulties. All efforts to reform the five deposit guarantee systems, which everyone knows cannot possibly work in their present form, have failed due to the opposition of individual banks, which refuse to have to be responsible for customers from other sectors.

All Austrian institutions and some foreign branches participate in the deposit guarantee scheme. Consequently, Austria is liable for customers of foreign banks, for example of the Russian State-owned bank VTB, which has a banking licence in Austria and is therefore subject to the deposit guarantee system there and can expand into other EU Member States.

1. Were the deposit guarantee systems also reviewed when the bank stress tests were carried out?
2. If so, what conclusion was reached?
3. If not, why not?
4. Are any efforts being made at EU level to reform vulnerable deposit guarantee systems, where necessary?

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

Article 21 of Regulation (EU) No 1093/2010 empowers the European Banking Authority to initiate and coordinate EU-wide stress tests to assess the resilience of financial institutions to adverse market developments and, where appropriate, to issue recommendations to national supervisory authorities to correct issues identified in the stress test. Financial institutions, as defined in this regulation, cover credit institutions, investment firms and financial conglomerates. Accordingly, the EU-wide stress test exercise of 2011 did not cover Deposit Guarantee Schemes.

Deposit Guarantee Schemes are currently established in all Member States, as provided by Directive 94/19/EC (the 'DGS Directive').

In recent years, the Commission has taken strong measures to reinforce the resilience of the deposit guarantee system in Europe.

First, the Commission proposed in October 2008 to shorten the repayment deadlines from three months to 20 working days and to harmonise the level of coverage of depositors to EUR 100 000 ⁽¹⁾. This proposal was adopted by the legislator in March 2009 and is now fully applicable ⁽²⁾.

Secondly, the Commission proposed a comprehensive recast of the DGS Directive in July 2010 ⁽³⁾. The reform notably aims for stringent harmonised rules on the funding of Deposit Guarantee Schemes including *ex ante* contributions and improving depositors access thanks to a repayment deadline of only seven days. It would also require all DGSs to be supervised on an ongoing basis and to be subject to stress tests at least every three years.

This proposal is currently pending before the Parliament and the Council.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2008) 661 final.

⁽²⁾ OJ L 68, 13.3.2009, p. 3-7.

⁽³⁾ COM(2010) 368 final.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003364/13
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(25. März 2013)

Betrifft: Feinstaubbelastung durch Drucker und Kopierer

Feinstaubemissionen können gesundheitliche Auswirkungen wie die Verstärkung von Allergiesymptomen, die Zunahme von asthmatischen Anfällen, Atemwegsbeschwerden und Lungenkrebs, aber auch Herz-Kreislauf-Erkrankungen haben. Quellen der Feinstaubbelastung in geschlossenen Räumen sind der Rauch von Tabakwaren, Laserdrucker und Kopierer. Über die Frage, ob die Stäube, die Laserdrucker ausstoßen, tatsächlich Menschen krank machen, streitet die Fachwelt.

Laut einer Studie nehmen der Wartungsstand der Geräte, die Häufigkeit ihrer Nutzung, das Alter, die Tonerfarbe, das Druckerpapier und sogar die Luftströmung im Raum Einfluss auf ein mögliches Risiko durch Feinstaubbelastung. Forscher empfehlen, Drucker und Kopierer nach Möglichkeit nicht direkt am Arbeitsplatz, sondern in einem separaten, gut belüfteten Raum aufzustellen, was sich natürlich in der Praxis nicht immer umsetzen lässt. Angeblich verursachen Laserdrucker beim Drucken eine Feinstaubbelastung, die ungefähr mit der einer mittelstark befahrenen Straße zu vergleichen ist.

1. Gibt es auf EU-Ebene Studien hinsichtlich der Feinstaubbelastung durch Drucker?
2. Sind EU-weite Vorgaben hinsichtlich Feinstaubfilter bei Druckern bzw. höchstzulässige Belastungswerte geplant?

Antwort von Herrn Andor im Namen der Kommission
(28. Mai 2013)

1. Die Kommission hat keine EU-weite Studie über die berufsbedingte Exposition gegenüber Feinstaub durch Drucker und Kopierer eingeleitet, es gibt jedoch mehrere Studien zu diesem Thema in der veröffentlichten internationalen Fachliteratur ⁽¹⁾.
2. Die Kommission plant nicht, spezifische EU-weite Anforderungen für Feinstaubfilter bei Druckern oder Höchstwerte der zulässigen Belastung festzulegen.

⁽¹⁾ Die Behandlung einer Reihe von Studien ist in U. Ewers and D. Nowak „Health hazards caused by emissions of laser printers and copiers?“ unter folgendem Link nachzulesen:
http://www.springer-vdi-verlag.de/library/content/gest/2006/11/Ewers%20Nowak%20engl_30024.pdf

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003364/13
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: Particulate matter pollution from printers and photocopiers

Particulate matter emissions can affect health, for example by exacerbating allergy symptoms and causing an increase in asthma attacks, respiratory disorders and lung cancer, but also cardiovascular diseases. Sources of particulate matter pollution in enclosed spaces include tobacco smoke, laser printers and photocopiers. The opinions of experts differ as to whether the particles emitted by laser printers actually make people sick.

According to one study, the maintenance status of the equipment, the frequency with which it is used, its age, the toner colour, the printing paper and even the airflow in the room are factors influencing the possible risk as a result of particulate matter pollution. Researchers recommend that, where possible, printers and photocopiers not be placed right next to where people work, but in a separate, well-ventilated room, which, in practice, is not always possible of course. It is claimed that, during printing, laser printers generate particulate matter pollution comparable to that found on a moderately busy road.

1. Are there any studies at EU level into particulate matter pollution caused by printers?
2. Are there any plans for EU-wide requirements with regard to particulate matter filters on printers or maximum permissible pollution levels?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(28 May 2013)**

1. The Commission has not initiated any study at EU level of occupational exposure to particulate matter pollution from printers and photocopies, although there are several studies on the subject in the published international scientific literature ⁽¹⁾.
2. The Commission has no plans to lay down specific EU-wide requirements for particulate matter filters on printers or maximum permissible pollution levels.

⁽¹⁾ For a review of a number of studies, see U. Ewers and D. Nowak 'Health hazards caused by emissions of laser printers and copiers?' at: http://www.springer-vdi-verlag.de/library/content/gest/2006/11/Ewers%20Nowak%20engl_30024.pdf

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003365/13
aan de Commissie
Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)
(25 maart 2013)**

Betreft: Geplande olieboringen in de wateren tussen Marokko en de Canarische eilanden

Op de Canarische eilanden en meer bepaald op het eiland Lanzarote zwelt het protest aan van de plaatselijke bevolking tegen de geplande olieboringen nabij Lanzarote en Fuerteventura door het bedrijf REPSOL. Ook andere bedrijven, zoals het Schotse Cairns Energy, Total, Chevron en Genel Energy zijn uit op olieboringen in de wateren tussen Marokko en Lanzarote. Er worden heel wat bezwaren opgeworpen tegen deze initiatieven:

1. Ze gebeuren in een gebied dat zeer aardbevingsgevoelig is en zijn dus zeer risicovol;
2. Bij een eventueel ongeluk worden de ecologische waardevolle zones aan de kusten van voornoemde eilanden sterk bedreigd. De Unesco bestempelt het gebied als een „Biosphere reserve” en de Canarische eilanden werden ook gecatalogeerd als Particularly Sensitive Sea Area (PSSA);
3. Een olielek betekent ook een sterke bedreiging voor alle toeristische activiteiten, de belangrijkste economische sector van het gebied die zorgt voor heel wat werkgelegenheid;
4. Beide eilanden zijn 100 % afhankelijk van ZUIVER zeewater dat ontzilt wordt. Een klein ongeval met olie zet de twee eilanden zonder drinkwater;
5. Olieboringen zullen de spanningen tussen Spanje en Marokko doen toenemen vanwege mogelijke grensgeschillen. Marokko wil immers de EEZ (Exclusive Economic Zone) extreem uitbreiden;
6. De olieboringen zijn gepland in gebieden die mede onderdeel vormen van het al jarenlang slepende conflict tussen de Westelijke Sahara en de Marokkaanse overheid.

Tijdens de mei-zitting van het EP zal de nieuwe Verordening van het Europees Parlement en de Raad worden aangenomen betreffende de veiligheid van offshore-olie- en -gasprospectie-, -exploratie- en -productieactiviteiten. Over deze wet bestaat een politiek akkoord tussen de onderhandelaars van het EP en de Raad van Ministers.

Mag ik van de Commissie vernemen:

1. Welke stappen zij bereid is te ondernemen teneinde aan de zes voormelde bezwaren tegemoet te komen?
2. Of ze bereid is stappen te ondernemen ten aanzien van de Spaanse en Marokkaanse autoriteiten om de spanningen in verband met grensconflicten en het conflict in de Westelijke Sahara, die door deze boringen dreigen toe te nemen, te verminderen?
3. Over welke middelen zij, overeenkomstig de nieuwe verordening, beschikt om de veiligheid van de olieprospectie-, -exploratie- en -productieactiviteiten voor de volle 100 procent te garanderen?
4. Of zij desgewenst bereid is alle mogelijke wettelijke middelen in te zetten om deze activiteiten te verbieden?

**Antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie
(3 juni 2013)**

In 2011 heeft de Commissie nieuwe EU-wetgeving voorgesteld met betrekking tot de veiligheid van offshore olie- en gasactiviteiten teneinde ongelukken te voorkomen en de reactie op noodsituaties en milieuaansprakelijkheid te verbeteren. In het voorstel, dat de gewone wetgevingsprocedure doorloopt en dat binnenkort zal worden aangenomen, wordt een regelgevingskader voor de hele EU beschreven om ervoor te zorgen dat offshore-operaties worden toegestaan, uitgevoerd en geregeld op basis van specifieke risicobeoordelingen per site. De doelgerichte aanpak van de wetgeving moet ertoe leiden dat zowel bij de goedkeuring als bij de uitvoering van elk project rekening wordt gehouden met een volledige reeks risico's en gevarensenario's, met inbegrip van die welke door het geachte Parlementslid worden aangehaald. Er mag slechts worden gestart met boren wanneer de onafhankelijke bevoegde instantie van de betrokken lidstaat de plannen heeft beoordeeld en aanvaard, om zo eventuele restrisico's voor het milieu, voor de bevolking of voor de economie tot een aanvaardbaar niveau terug te brengen. De bevoegde instantie heeft eveneens het recht om de booractiviteiten te verbieden. Zodra het voorstel is aangenomen, zal de Commissie haar bevoegdheden uit hoofde van het Verdrag uitoefenen om een correcte en tijdige toepassing van de wetgeving in de Unie te verzekeren.

Geschillen over de grensafbakening van wateren vallen niet onder de bevoegdheid van de EU. De Commissie kan de betrokken partijen enkel aanmoedigen om op vreedzame wijze tot een overeenkomst te komen door de beginselen van het VN-verdrag, alsook de relevante resoluties van de VN-Veiligheidsraad en de bepalingen van het Zeerechtverdrag van de VN te volgen.

Wat een mogelijk verbod op de desbetreffende activiteiten betreft, verwijst de Commissie het geachte Parlementslid naar het antwoord op schriftelijke vraag E-003699/2012.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003365/13
to the Commission
Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: Planned oil drilling in the waters between Morocco and the Canary Islands

In the Canary Islands, and more specifically on the island of Lanzarote, the protest by the local population against planned oil drilling near Lanzarote and Fuerteventura by the company REPSOL is burgeoning. Other companies, too, such as the Scottish company Cairns Energy, Total, Chevron and Genel Energy, are intent on prospecting for oil in the waters between Morocco and Lanzarote. Many objections have been raised against these initiatives:

1. Oil drilling would take place in an area that is highly prone to earthquakes and is, therefore, very risky;
2. In the event of an accident, the environmentally significant areas on the coasts of the aforementioned islands will be seriously threatened. Unesco has designated the area as a biosphere reserve and the Canary Islands have also been categorised as a Particularly Sensitive Sea Area (PSSA);
3. An oil spill would also mean a major threat to all tourist activities, the most important economic sector in the region and source of many jobs;
4. Both islands are 100% dependent on PURE desalinated seawater. A small oil accident would deprive the two islands of drinking water;
5. Oil drilling would increase tensions between Spain and Morocco because of possible border disputes. After all, Morocco wants to expand its EEZ (Exclusive Economic Zone) significantly;
6. The oil drilling is planned in areas that have been part of many years' ongoing conflict between Western Sahara and the Moroccan Government.

During the May session of the European Parliament, the new Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the safety of offshore oil and gas prospecting, exploration and production activities will be adopted. There is a political agreement between Parliament's negotiators and the Council of Ministers in respect of this piece of legislation.

Could the Commission answer the following questions:

1. What steps is it prepared to take in order to meet the six aforementioned objections?
2. Is it prepared to take steps towards the Spanish and Moroccan authorities in order to reduce tensions in connection with border disputes and the conflict in Western Sahara, which threaten to increase as a result of such drilling?
3. What resources does the Commission have at its disposal under the new Regulation to guarantee 100% the safety of oil prospecting, exploration and production activities?
4. Otherwise, is the Commission prepared, if so desired, to mobilise all possible legal means in order to prohibit these activities?

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

The Commission proposed in 2011 new EU legislation addressing the safety of offshore oil and gas operations in order to prevent accidents, and to strengthen emergency response and environmental liability. The proposal, currently in the ordinary legislative procedure and due to be adopted soon, will lay down an EU-wide regulatory framework for ensuring that offshore operations are authorised, conducted and regulated on the basis of site-specific risk assessments. The goal-setting approach taken in the legislation should ensure that a full set of risks and hazard scenarios, including those invoked by the Honourable Member, are considered in both the approval and execution stages of each project. Drilling can only start once the independent competent authority of the Member State concerned has assessed and accepted the plans to reduce any residual risk to the environment, people or economy to an acceptable level. The competent authority also has the right to prohibit drilling activities. Once the proposal will be adopted, the Commission will exercise its powers under the Treaty to ensure correct and timely application of the legislation across the Union.

Border maritime delimitation disputes fall outside the competence of the EU. The Commission can only encourage the interested parties to reach an agreement by peaceful means following the UN Charter principles, the relevant UN Security Council's Resolutions and the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea provisions.

As regards the possibility of a prohibition of the activities at stake, we would like to refer the Honourable Member to the reply to Written Question E-003699/2012.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003366/13
aan de Commissie
Peter van Dalen (ECR)
(25 maart 2013)

Betref: Inkrimping EU personeel

In de meerjarenbegroting 2014-2020 stelt de Europese Commissie voor het personeelbestand van de EU met 5 % te laten krimpen. Onlangs verschenen in de kringen van de vakbonden voor EU-personeel, onder meer in de nieuwsbrief van TAO-AFI van 15 maart 2013, berichten dat deze krimp kan worden opgevangen door de Uitvoerende Agentschappen te laten groeien. Overtollig personeel van de Europese instellingen zou bij deze Agentschappen van de EU een nieuwe werkplek kunnen krijgen.

1. Heeft de Commissie kennis genomen van de berichten dat overtollig EU-personeel kan worden opgevangen bij de EU Uitvoerende Agentschappen? Zo ja, hoe beoordeelt zij deze berichten?
2. Is de Commissie van mening dat dergelijk beleid in strijd is met de voorstellen van de Commissie voor de Meerjarenbegroting 2014-2020 en de geloofwaardigheid van de Commissie aantast? Zo nee, waarom niet?
3. Kan de Commissie bevestigen dat de voorgestelde krimp van 5 % op het aantal EU ambtenaren, daadwerkelijk leidt tot 5 % minder personeel ten opzichte van de huidige situatie? Zo nee, waarom niet?

Antwoord van de heer Šefčovič namens de Commissie
(28 mei 2013)

De Commissie blijft onverminderd vasthouden aan de voorstellen voor het meerjarig financieel kader voor 2014-2020 om het personeelsbestand de komende vijf jaar met 5 % af te bouwen en komt haar verbintenis reeds na in de ontwerpbegroting voor 2013 (1 % personeelsinkrimping tussen 2012 en 2013).

Zoals reeds in de voorstellen is aangekondigd, overweegt de Commissie eveneens meer gebruik te maken van de mogelijkheid om de bestaande uitvoerende agentschappen aan te spreken. De Rekenkamer heeft bevestigd dat dit een goed instrument is voor een betere dienstverlening en een grotere zichtbaarheid van de EU.

De Commissie zal ervoor trachten te zorgen dat een nieuwe delegatie van taken aan de bestaande uitvoerende agentschappen geen gevolgen voor de begroting heeft.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003366/13
to the Commission**

Peter van Dalen (ECR)

(25 March 2013)

Subject: EU staff cuts

In the multiannual budget for 2014-2020, the European Commission has proposed to cut the EU workforce by 5%. Recently, reports have appeared in EU staff union circles, including the TAO-AFI newsletter of 15 March 2013, that such cuts can be offset by expanding the Executive Agencies. Any excess European institution staff would then be offered a new position within these EU agencies.

1. Is the Commission aware of the reports that excess EU staff can be absorbed by the EU's Executive Agencies? If so, how does it view these reports?
2. Is the Commission of the opinion that such a policy is contrary to its proposals for the Multiannual Budget for 2014-2020 and that it affects the Commission's credibility? If not, why not?
3. Can the Commission confirm that the proposed 5% cut in the number of EU officials will actually lead to a 5% reduction in staff compared to the current situation? If not, why not?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission

(28 May 2013)

The Commission remains firmly committed to the 2014-2020 Multiannual Financial Framework proposals to reduce 5% staff over five years and already started delivering on this commitment in the 2013 Draft Budget (-1% staff reduction between 2012 and 2013).

As announced in these proposals, the Commission is also considering the option of more extensive recourse to existing executive agencies; an instrument that the Court of Auditors has confirmed provides better service delivery and EU visibility.

The Commission will seek to ensure that any new delegation of tasks to the existing executive agencies would remain budgetary neutral.

(Nederlandse versie)

**Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003367/13
aan de Commissie
Lucas Hartong (NI) en Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(25 maart 2013)**

Betref: Discriminatie tijdens „netwerkdag” Nederlandse omroepen

Op 15 mei a.s. organiseren de samenwerkende publieke omroepen (NPO) in Nederland een „netwerkdag”. Naar nu blijkt is die dag uitsluitend toegankelijk voor „kandidaten met een multiculturele achtergrond” ⁽¹⁾. Mediastudent en geïnteresseerde Anoul Hendriks bleek absoluut niet welkom en werd pro-actief door de NPO studiedag afgebeeld ⁽²⁾. In het Handvest van de Europese Grondrechten staat te lezen dat „elke discriminatie, met name op grond van ... ras, kleur, etnische of sociale afkomst (...) het behoren tot een nationale minderheid, geboorte ... is verboden. (...) Elke discriminatie op grond van nationaliteit is verboden.” (art. 21.1 en 21.2). Verder stelt art. 14.1 dat „... eenieder recht op onderwijs heeft alsmede toegang tot beroepsopleiding en bijscholing” ⁽³⁾. Deze vorm van discriminatie is ook verboden door de Richtlijn houdende toepassing van het beginsel van gelijke behandeling van personen ongeacht ras of etnische afstamming.

In dat kader de volgende vragen:

1. Kan de Commissie aangeven of het organiseren van een dergelijke „netwerkdag”, waar specifiek wordt gediscrimineerd op juist die punten die het Handvest van de Europese Grondrechten noemt, acceptabel is?
2. Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat onderwijs te allen tijde voor iedereen in gelijke mate toegankelijk dient te zijn? Zo nee, waarom niet en wat zijn dan de volgens haar te hanteren criteria bij het verlenen van toegang tot onderwijs?
3. Is het volgens de Commissie acceptabel dat een publieke omroep die met belastinggeld wordt betaald (uit de algemene middelen dus) een dergelijk discriminatoir toegangsbeleid hanteert?

**Antwoord van mevrouw Vassiliou namens de Commissie
(3 juni 2013)**

1. De Commissie herinnert eraan dat de bepalingen van het Handvest tot de lidstaten zijn gericht, maar uitsluitend wanneer zij het recht van de Unie ten uitvoer leggen ⁽⁴⁾. Voor zover de gegeven situatie niet uit een dergelijke tenuitvoerlegging voortvloeit, zijn de genoemde bepalingen niet van toepassing.

In het EU-recht verbiedt Richtlijn 2000/43/EG betreffende rassengelijkheid ⁽⁵⁾ discriminatie op grond van ras of etnische afstamming op een aantal gebieden, waaronder arbeid en beroepsopleiding, sociale bescherming, onderwijs en toegang tot en aanbod van goederen en diensten. Nederland heeft de richtlijn omgezet in zijn nationaal recht. Zodra hiervoor is gezorgd, is het aan de nationale rechterlijke instanties en autoriteiten om het nationaal recht in specifieke situaties toe te passen. Op grond van de richtlijn moeten alle lidstaten een orgaan oprichten voor de bevordering van gelijke behandeling. Dit orgaan heeft onder meer de taak om bijstand te verlenen aan slachtoffers van discriminatie. In Nederland is dit het College voor de Rechten van de Mens (website: <http://www.mensenrechten.nl/>).

2. De Commissie herinnert eraan dat volgens het EU-recht het beginsel van gelijke behandeling lidstaten niet belet specifieke maatregelen te nemen om nadelen in de beroepsloopbaan die verband houden met ras of etnische afstamming, godsdienst of overtuiging, handicap, leeftijd, seksuele geaardheid of geslacht, te voorkomen of te compenseren.
3. De Commissie kan niet aangeven of het acceptabel is of niet dat begrotingsmiddelen aldus worden bestemd, aangezien dergelijke keuzes onder de exclusieve bevoegdheid van de nationale autoriteiten vallen.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.elsevier.nl/Cultuur--Televisie/nieuws/2013/3/Publieke-Omroepen-organiseren-multiculturele-stagedag-1201021W/>

⁽²⁾ <https://twitter.com/anoul/status/314404207585267712>

⁽³⁾ http://www.europarl.europa.eu/charter/pdf/text_nl.pdf

⁽⁴⁾ Artikel 51 van het Handvest van de grondrechten van de Europese Unie.

⁽⁵⁾ Richtlijn 2000/43/EG van de Raad van 29 juni 2000 houdende toepassing van het beginsel van gelijke behandeling van personen ongeacht ras of etnische afstamming, PB L 180 van 19.7.2000, blz. 22.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003367/13
to the Commission**

Lucas Hartong (NI) and Auke Zijlstra (NI)

(25 March 2013)

Subject: Discrimination during the Dutch broadcasters' 'networking day'

On 15 May this year, the umbrella body of the Dutch public broadcasting organisations (NPO) will be holding a 'networking day'. As it turns out, it has reserved this day for 'candidates from a multicultural background' ⁽¹⁾ only. However, Anouël Hendriks, a media student who wanted to participate in the event, was definitely not welcome and was encouraged over the phone not to come by the NPO organisers ⁽²⁾. However, the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union states that 'Any discrimination based on any ground such as ... race, colour, ethnic or social origin ... membership of a national minority ... birth ... shall be prohibited. ... Any discrimination on grounds of nationality shall be prohibited.' (Article 21(1) and 21(2)). Furthermore, Article 14(1) states that '... everyone has the right to education and to have access to vocational and continuing training' ⁽³⁾. This form of discrimination is also prohibited by the directive implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin.

1. Can the Commission indicate whether it is acceptable to organise such a 'networking day', where discrimination on precisely the grounds referred to in the Charter of Fundamental Rights will take place?

2. Does the Commission share the opinion of the Dutch Freedom Party (PVV) that education must be accessible at all times and equally to everyone? If not, why not and what criteria should be used, in its opinion, when providing access to education?

3. Does the Commission find it acceptable that a public broadcaster funded by taxpayers' money (in other words, from the public purse) should be applying such a discriminatory access policy?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission

(3 June 2013)

1. The Commission recalls that the provisions of the Charter are addressed to the Member States only when they are implementing EC law ⁽⁴⁾. Insofar as the situation at hand is not the result of such an implementation, the said provisions are not applicable.

In EC law, Directive 2000/43/EC on Racial Equality ⁽⁵⁾ prohibits discrimination on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin in a number of areas, including employment and vocational training, social protection, education and access to and supply of goods and services. The Netherlands has transposed the directive into its national law. Once this has been ensured, it is for the national courts and authorities to apply national law in individual situations. Under the directive, all Member States have been required to set up a body for the promotion of equal treatment, which among its tasks provides assistance to victims of discrimination. In the Netherlands, this body is Netherlands Institute for Human Rights (College voor de Rechten van de Mens, website: <http://www.mensenrechten.nl/>).

2. The Commission recalls that under EC law, the principle of equal treatment does not prevent Member States from taking specific measures to prevent or compensate for disadvantages in professional carriers linked to racial or ethnic origin, to religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation or to gender.

3. The Commission is unable to comment on whether allocating budgetary funds for a certain action is acceptable or not, as such choices are within the exclusive competence of national authorities.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.elsevier.nl/Cultuur--Televisie/nieuws/2013/3/Publieke-Omroepen-organiseren-multiculturele-stagedag-1201021W/>

⁽²⁾ <https://twitter.com/anoul/status/314404207585267712>

⁽³⁾ http://www.europarl.europa.eu/charter/pdf/text_en.pdf

⁽⁴⁾ Article 51 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.

⁽⁵⁾ Council Directive 2000/43/EC of 29 June 2000 implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin, OJ L 180, 19.7.2000, p. 22.

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-003368/13
do Komisji**

Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)

(25 marca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Rozwój rynku e-papierosów w Unii Europejskiej

Na polski i europejski rynek trafia coraz więcej tzw. e-papierosów, czyli urządzeń mających przeważnie kształt papierosa oraz ustnik wypełniony specjalnym płynem zawierającym glicerynę, glikol propylenowy, nikotynę oraz dodatki aromatyczne.

Wiedza w społeczeństwie na temat e-papierosów nadal jest niewielka. Nie ma także przepisów prawnych regulujących ich sprzedaż i zastosowanie.

Dyrektorzy polskich szkół wyrażają opinię, że mają do czynienia z plagą „palenia e-papierosów” wśród dzieci. Elektroniczne papierosy są dziś towarem łatwo dostępnym. Dyrektorzy zauważają, że wraz z rozprzestrzenianiem się punktów sprzedaży zwiększa się problem palenia e-papierosów w szkołach.

W większości punktów sprzedaży znajduje się informacja, że elektroniczne papierosy są niedostępne dla nieletnich, ale nie ma przepisów, które zabraniałyby ich sprzedaży. Dyrektorzy wprowadzają własne zaostrożenia w szkołach, ale nie są w stanie skutecznie ich egzekwować.

Wojewódzka Stacja Sanitarno-Epidemiologiczna w Poznaniu zwraca uwagę na brak odpowiednich programów profilaktycznych, które mogłaby wdrażać w swoje działania.

Zwracam się z zapytaniem:

1. Czy Komisja podziela obawę przed szkodliwym wpływem e-papierosów na zdrowie dzieci?
2. Czy są przewidywane działania mające na celu zmniejszenie tego ryzyka?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Tonio Borga w imieniu Komisji

(6 maja 2013 r.)

Komisja jest świadoma toczących się dyskusji na temat szkodliwych skutków zdrowotnych związanych z papierosami elektronicznymi oraz atrakcyjności papierosów elektronicznych w szczególności dla młodzieży.

Zgodnie z wnioskiem Komisji dotyczącym zmiany dyrektywy w sprawie wyrobów tytoniowych⁽¹⁾ papierosy elektroniczne zostaną objęte ramami prawnymi obowiązującymi w stosunku do produktów leczniczych, jeśli poziom zawartej w nich nikotyny przekroczy określone progi. Tak więc w przypadku przekroczenia danego progu wprowadzenie papierosów elektronicznych do obrotu wymagać będzie uzyskania uprzedniego pozwolenia na mocy przepisów ustawodawstwa farmaceutycznego. Proóg zawartości nikotyny określono w odniesieniu do zawartości nikotyny w produktach stosowanych w nikotynowych terapiach zastępczych, który uzyskały już pozwolenie na dopuszczenie do obrotu w państwach członkowskich.

W przypadku papierosów elektronicznych o zawartości nikotyny poniżej określonych progów we wniosku Komisji przewidziano konieczność opatrzenia ich ostrzeżeniem zdrowotnym. Musiałby one również spełniać wymogi dyrektywy w sprawie ogólnego bezpieczeństwa produktów, tak jak ma to miejsce obecnie.

We wniosku Komisji założono, że większość papierosów elektronicznych najprawdopodobniej objętych zostanie przepisami ustawodawstwa farmaceutycznego. Przy wprowadzaniu ich do obrotu, musiano by zatem przestrzegać przepisów mających zastosowanie do wprowadzania do obrotu produktów leczniczych w poszczególnych państwach członkowskich, w tym skutecznych ograniczeń wiekowych, aby chronić młodzież.

⁽¹⁾ COM (2012) 788 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003368/13
to the Commission
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)
(25 March 2013)

Subject: Expansion of the market for e-cigarettes in the European Union

An ever-increasing number of 'e-cigarettes', or devices which look similar to a cigarette and which have a mouthpiece filled with a special liquid containing glycerine, propylene glycol, nicotine and aromatic additives, are reaching the Polish and European markets.

The general public is still largely uninformed about e-cigarettes, and there are no statutory regulations governing their sale and use.

Polish headteachers have reported that they are dealing with a plague of 'e-cigarette smoking' among their pupils. Electronic cigarettes are readily available to buy at present. According to the headteachers, the problem of e-cigarette smoking in schools is becoming more widespread as the number of sales outlets increases.

The majority of sales outlets have signs saying that electronic cigarettes may not be sold to children, but there are no regulations prohibiting their sale. Headteachers are imposing more stringent punishments in schools, but they are unable to enforce them effectively.

The Voivodeship Sanitary and Epidemiological Station in Poznan has highlighted the need for corresponding preventive programmes which it could implement within its field of action.

I would therefore like to ask the following questions:

1. Is the Commission also concerned about the harmful influence of e-cigarettes on children's health?
2. Are there any plans for measures aimed at reducing this risk?

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

The Commission is aware of discussions about adverse health effects associated with electronic cigarettes and their attractiveness in particular for young people.

According to the Commission proposal for a revised Tobacco Product Directive, ⁽¹⁾ electronic cigarettes would fall under the legal framework for medicinal products if they contain levels of nicotine above certain thresholds. Thus, their bringing on the market would require prior authorisation under pharmaceutical legislation above the threshold in question. The nicotine threshold has been identified by considering the nicotine content of nicotine replacement therapies that have already received a marketing authorisation by Member States.

For electronic cigarettes below the thresholds, the Commission proposal foresees that they carry health warnings. They would also have to comply with the General Product Safety Directive as it is the case at the moment.

The Commission proposal foresees that the majority of electronic cigarettes would most likely fall under the pharmaceutical legislation. Their placing on the market would thus have to comply with the rules applying to the placing on the market of medicinal products in the respective Member States, including an effective age limit to protect young people.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2012) 788 final.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-003369/13
adresată Comisiei
Minodora Cliveti (S&D)
(25 martie 2013)

Subiect: Stagiile remunerate incluse în calculul pensiilor

Rata șomajului în rândul tinerilor a cunoscut o creștere alarmantă, în prezent în Uniunea Europeană fiind peste cinci milioane de tineri sub 25 de ani care nu pot găsi un loc de muncă.

În contextul actualei crize economice, stagiile ar putea juca un rol cheie în creșterea accesului tinerilor pe piața muncii. Acestea realizează tranziția de la cunoștințele teoretice dobândite pe parcursul educației la competențele necesare la locul de muncă, contribuind, astfel, la îmbunătățirea șanselor tinerilor de a găsi un loc de muncă.

Au fost constatate foarte multe situații când tinerii, fiind în imposibilitatea găsirii unui loc de munca, au fost nevoiți să lucreze ca stagiați, ajungând chiar și la un an și jumătate de stagii remunerate efectuate.

Este de remarcat faptul că tinerii intră târziu pe piața muncii și astfel contribuția finală pentru pensia completă este afectată.

Poate Comisia să încurajeze Statele Membre să integreze în calculul pensiei finale durata stagiilor de formare remunerate?

Răspuns dat de dl Andor în numele Comisiei
(21 mai 2013)

Chestiunile legate de remunerare și protecție socială sunt o responsabilitate a statelor membre și a partenerilor sociali.

În a doua etapă a consultării partenerilor sociali din UE cu privire la un cadru de calitate pentru stagii ⁽¹⁾, Comisia a consultat *inter alia* cu privire la întrebarea dacă ar trebui să se clarifice între stagiar și organizația gazdă problema protecției sociale ⁽²⁾. Din păcate, partenerii sociali au decis să nu înceapă negocierile în conformitate cu articolul 155 din TFUE în vederea unui acord între partenerii sociali privind un cadru de calitate pentru stagii. Comisia intenționează să prezinte o propunere în acest sens până la sfârșitul anului 2013.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2012)728 din 5.12.2012.

⁽²⁾ A se vedea secțiunea 5.1 „Un cadru de calitate pentru stagii”.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003369/13
to the Commission
Minodora Cliveti (S&D)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: Inclusion of paid internships in the calculation of pensions

Youth unemployment has been rising at an alarming rate, with more than 5 million young people in the European Union under the age of 25 currently unable to find a job.

In light of the current economic crisis, internships could play a key role in making the labour market more accessible to young people. They help make the transition from the theoretical knowledge acquired throughout education to the skills required in the workplace, thereby helping improve the chances of young people in finding a job.

There has been a huge number of situations in which young people, unable to find a job, have had to work as interns, obtaining paid internships even for as long as 18 months.

It should be noted that young people are entering the labour market late, thus affecting the final contribution to the overall pension.

Does the Commission encourage Member States to include the duration of paid internships in the final pension calculation?

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

Questions of remuneration and social protection are a responsibility of the Member States and the social partners.

In its second-stage consultation of the EU social partners on a quality framework on traineeships ⁽¹⁾, the Commission consulted *inter alia* on the question whether social protection coverage should be clarified between the trainee and the host organisation ⁽²⁾. Unfortunately, social partners decided not to start negotiations under Art. 155 TFEU towards a social partner agreement on a quality framework for traineeships. The Commission intends to present a proposal on this subject by the end of 2013.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2012) 728 of 5.12.2012.

⁽²⁾ See Section 5.1 'Quality Framework for Traineeships'.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-003370/13
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(25. März 2013)

Betrifft: Nachfrage zu E-000750/2013 vom 21.3.2013

Die Kommission sagt in ihrer Antwort vom 21.3.2013, ihr sei der Zustand des Friedhofes in Margo „nicht bekannt“.

1. Wie kann dies zutreffen, wenn die Kommission immer von intensiven Bemühungen im nördlichen Teil der Insel spricht? (Die Fotos werden der Kommission auf postalischem Weg übermittelt.)

Dass der jüdische Friedhof „nicht auf der Liste“ steht, gibt Anlass zu größtem Bedenken, da auch die jüdische Kultur unbestreitbar ein Teil der europäischen Kultur ist.

Es werden immerhin EU-Mittel bereitgestellt, um bedeutende Kulturstätten zu renovieren und zu restaurieren.

2. Nach welchen Kriterien wird die Bedeutung der Kulturstätten bemessen und wonach werden sie ausgewählt?

2a. Warum wurde dieser Friedhof nicht in diese Liste aufgenommen, wo es sich hierbei doch ebenso um ein Stück europäische Geschichte handelt?

Die Kommission spricht von einer „umfassenden Lösung“, die „rasch“ gefunden werden muss.

3. Ist sich die Kommission in ihrer Erweiterungsstrategie bewusst, dass der nördliche Teil Zyperns ebenso Teil der Europäischen Union — und militärisch besetzt — ist und es daher für unsere Bürgerinnen und Bürger schwer verständlich ist, wenn hier von „Erweiterung“ gesprochen wird?

4. Plant die Kommission im Zuge der „Gespräche“, die Verpflichtungen der Türkei hinsichtlich der UN-Resolutionen endlich einzufordern?

4a. Wie gedenkt die Kommission in diesem Punkt nun vorzugehen?

(Mit der höflichen Bitte um detaillierte Ausführung.)

Antwort von Herrn Füle im Namen der Kommission
(2. Mai 2013)

Die Kommission dankt der Frau Abgeordneten für die Informationen und die Fotos vom jüdischen Friedhof in Margo, die sie am 28. März nach der Beantwortung der Anfrage E-000750/2013 vom 21. März 2013⁽¹⁾ übermittelt hat.

Die EU-Mittel für kulturelles Erbe werden dem unter Schirmherrschaft der Vereinten Nationen (VN) tätigen bikommunalen Technischen Ausschuss für das kulturelle Erbe zur Verfügung gestellt. Die Kommission verfolgt die Entscheidungen dieses Ausschusses über die zu restaurierenden und zu schützenden Denkmäler. Der Ausschuss stützt sich dabei auf eine im Jahr 2010 durchgeführte Studie, die die Ausarbeitung einer Liste mit mehr als 2 300 Kulturstätten, die Erstellung von rund 700 Bestandserfassungen und die Durchführung von 121 technischen Untersuchungen des derzeitigen Zustands der Denkmäler sowie eine Schätzung der Restaurierungskosten umfasste. In der Studie wurde der Bedeutung und Dringlichkeit der notwendigen Restaurierungen Rechnung getragen. Auf der Grundlage der Studie erstellte der bikommunale Ausschuss eine Liste mit 11 Kulturstätten auf der ganzen Insel, die dringend der Restaurierung bedürfen.

Der Verweis auf das Strategiepapier für die Erweiterung bezog sich auf die Verpflichtungen der Türkei, sich konstruktiv mit der Zypernfrage zu befassen und einen positiven Beitrag zu den Gesprächen unter Federführung der VN zu leisten, die darauf abzielen, zu einer umfassenden und dauerhaften Lösung der Zypern-Frage im Einklang mit den einschlägigen Resolutionen des VN-Sicherheitsrates und mit den Prinzipien, auf die die Europäische Union sich stützt, zu gelangen. Dies wird von der Kommission gegenüber der Türkei regelmäßig zur Sprache gebracht.

Die Kommission hat die Türkei wiederholt darauf hingewiesen, dass dringend eine Lösung der Zypernfrage gefunden werden muss, und wird dies erforderlichenfalls auch in Zukunft tun.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/de/parliamentary-questions.html>

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-003370/13
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: Follow-up to Question E-000750/2013 of 21 March 2013

The Commission stated in its answer of 21 March 2013 that it was 'not aware' of the current condition of the Margo Jewish Cemetery.

1. How can this be so when the Commission repeatedly refers to intensive efforts being made in northern Cyprus? (I have forwarded photographs to the Commission by post.)

The fact that the Jewish Cemetery 'is not part of [the] list [of priority monuments]' is a matter of much concern, because Jewish culture is unquestionably part of the European cultural heritage.

EU funding is, after all, being provided to renovate and restore important cultural sites.

2. What criteria are used to assess the importance of the cultural sites and how are they selected?

2a. Why was this cemetery — as a part of Europe's history — not included in the list?

The Commission refers to the aim of 'reaching a swift conclusion'.

3. Is it aware, as it pursues its enlargement strategy, that the northern part of Cyprus, too, is a part of the European Union — which is under military occupation — and that people find talk of 'enlargement' puzzling in that context?

4. Does the Commission intend, in the course of the negotiations to which it refers, finally to insist that Turkey fulfils its commitments under the relevant UN resolutions?

4a. How does the Commission now intend to proceed on this matter?

Please answer in detail.

**Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(2 May 2013)**

The Commission thanks the Honourable Member for the information and the photos provided on the Margo Jewish Cemetery on 28 March following its answer to E-000750/2013 of 21 March 2013 ⁽¹⁾.

The EU funds for cultural heritage are allocated for the activities of the bi-Communal Technical Committee on Cultural Heritage operating under UN auspices. The Commission follows the decisions of the Technical Committee on Cultural Heritage on the monuments to be restored and protected. The bi-communal Committee's assessment is based on a study conducted in 2010, which compiled a list of more than 2300 cultural heritage sites, the preparation of around 700 inventory charts and the carrying out of 121 technical assessments, analysing the current conditions of the monuments, and restoration costing needs. The study took into account the importance and the urgency of the needed restoration. Following this study, the bi-communal Committee identified a list of 11 cultural heritage sites throughout the island in need of emergency measures.

The reference to the Enlargement Strategy Paper referred to the obligations of Turkey to treat constructively the Cyprus issue and contribute positively to the talks, aimed at finding a fair, comprehensive and viable settlement of the Cyprus issue within the UN framework, in accordance with the relevant UN Security Council's resolutions and in line with the principles on which is EU is founded. The Commission continues to raise this with Turkey on a regular basis.

The Commission has constantly stated to Turkey that a solution to the Cyprus problem is urgent and will continue to raise the issue as appropriate.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html>

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003371/13
a la Comisión**

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Trato desigual en relación con participaciones preferentes

El Fondo de Garantía de Depósitos comprará las participaciones preferentes de las entidades que las emitieron y reembolsará parte de su dinero a los inversores. Los dueños de participaciones preferentes perderán un 38 % de su inversión. De igual modo, perderán parte de su inversión quienes suscribieron subordinadas perpetuas, que tendrán que renunciar a un 36 % de su inversión.

Pero estos descuentos no se aplicarán del mismo modo para todas las entidades, mientras que el descuento medio para los clientes de Nova Caixa Galicia es del 43 %, para los clientes de Catalunya Caixa llega hasta el 61 %. Esta diferencia puede suponer un perjuicio para los clientes de la entidad menos favorecida.

¿Cuál es la justificación en el marco del MoU para este trato diferenciado para los clientes de una u otra entidad?

¿Sabe la Comisión si existe un criterio uniforme para la aplicación de descuentos a las participaciones preferentes?
¿No cree que esta diferencia puede ir en contra del principio de igualdad de trato a los ciudadanos europeos establecido en el TUE?

¿Puede la Comisión decir si está de acuerdo con el trato desigual y posiblemente discriminatorio a los clientes de una u otra entidad en los descuentos de las participaciones preferentes?

Respuesta del Sr. Almunia en nombre de la Comisión

(16 de mayo de 2013)

Es importante señalar que todos los titulares de instrumentos financieros en forma de participaciones preferentes o de deuda subordinada perpetua de todos los bancos que se beneficien de ayuda estatal en España en el marco del Memorandum de Acuerdo han recibido un trato equitativo y no discriminatorio. Los recortes en dichos instrumentos se calculan siguiendo la misma metodología, que en los casos de Caixa Catalunya y Novacaixagalicia se especifica en detalle en las fichas descriptivas adjuntas a las Decisiones de la Comisión Europea [véase, «(A) Methodology for conversion into capital» (Metodología para la conversión en capital), puntos 6.4 a 6.8, y «(B) Specific provision for dated subordinated debt» (Disposiciones específicas para la deuda subordinada fechada), puntos 6.9 a 6.10, de ambas Decisiones]. El recorte calculado depende del instrumento de que se trate, del tipo de interés/cupón que ofrezca y de su plazo de vencimiento. Los instrumentos financieros de los que son titulares los clientes de Caixa Catalunya y Novacaixagalicia varían a estos respectos, lo que explica la diferencia en los descuentos medios a que se hace referencia en la pregunta de Su Señoría.

Los enlaces a las Decisiones sobre la reestructuración de los dos bancos pueden consultarse en:

Decisión de Caixa Catalunya:

http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/cases/244292/244292_1400504_213_2.pdf

Decisión de Novacaixagalicia:

http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/cases/244293/244293_1400377_199_2.pdf

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003371/13
to the Commission**

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 March 2013)

Subject: Unequal treatment regarding preferred shares

The Deposit Guarantee Fund will buy preferred shares from the institutions that issued them and refund some of investors' money. The preferred shareholders will lose 38% of their investment. Similarly, owners of perpetual subordinated bonds will lose 36% of their investment.

However, these discounts will not apply equally across the board: the average discount for Novacaixagalicia customers will be 43%, while for Caixa Catalunya customers it will be 61%. This difference may be prejudicial to the latter's customers.

How does the memorandum of understanding justify the differential treatment of these institutions' customers?

Is the Commission aware of a uniform criterion for the application of discounts to preferred shares? Does it not believe that this difference may contravene the principle of equal treatment for EU citizens laid down in the Treaty on European Union?

Does it agree with the unequal and potentially discriminatory treatment of these institutions' customers regarding discounts to preferred shares?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission

(16 May 2013)

It is important to note that all customers holding financial instruments in the form of preferred shares or perpetual subordinated debt, in all banks benefitting from state aid in Spain within the framework of the memorandum of understanding, have been treated in an equal and non-discriminatory way. The 'haircuts' on those instruments are calculated by the same methodology, which in the cases of Caixa Catalunya and Novacaixagalicia is specified in detail in the term sheets attached to the related European Commission Decisions (see '(A) Methodology for conversion into capital' — points 6.4 to 6.8 — and '(B) Specific provision for dated subordinated debt' — points 6.9 to 6.10 — of both Decisions). The calculated haircut depends on the instrument which is involved, the interest/coupon it bears as well as its time to maturity. Financial instruments held by customers of Caixa Catalunya and Novacaixagalicia vary in those aspects, which explains the difference in the average discounts referred to in the Honourable Member's question.

The links to the decisions on the restructuring of the two banks can be found at:

Caixa Catalunya decision:

http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/cases/244292/244292_1400504_213_2.pdf

Novacaixagalicia decision:

http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/cases/244293/244293_1400377_199_2.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003373/13

**alla Commissione
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)**

(25 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: La questione dei marò

È passato ormai più di un anno dall'incidente, accaduto in acque internazionali al largo delle coste indiane, a seguito del quale due pescatori indiani sono stati uccisi, la petroliera Lexie, battente bandiera italiana, è ferma nelle acque indiane «a disposizione» della magistratura del paese e due marò, facenti parte della scorta militare presente sull'imbarcazione come da programma anti-pirateria, sono detenuti in un carcere indiano in attesa di conoscere la loro sorte. La vicenda ha subito presentato incongruenze che a tutt'oggi devono ancora essere superate.

Poiché la nave, al momento dell'incidente, si trovava in acque internazionali, la giurisdizione avrebbe dovuto essere italiana, ovvero quella di appartenenza dell'imbarcazione; i marò, benché militari del battaglione San Marco in servizio sulla nave, non vedono riconosciuti i diritti derivanti dal loro stato e vengono arrestati, incarcerati e deferiti alla magistratura indiana come se fossero semplici civili. In aggiunta a ciò e in relazione all'evolversi dei fatti, il governo indiano ha imposto limitazioni di movimento all'ambasciatore italiano in India mettendo in dubbio la legittimità dell'immunità diplomatica.

Secondo quanto dichiarato negli ultimi giorni dal portavoce dell'Alto Rappresentante dell'UE per la politica estera e di sicurezza comune Catherine Ashton, ogni limitazione ai movimenti dell'ambasciatore italiano in India sarebbe contraria agli obblighi internazionali previsti dalla convenzione di Vienna sulle relazioni diplomatiche.

Va inoltre considerato che il portavoce di Catherine Ashton ha sottolineato come l'Alto Rappresentante abbia preso atto «con preoccupazione» delle decisioni della Corte suprema indiana, in base alle quali l'ambasciatore Daniele Mancini è tenuto a chiedere l'autorizzazione alla stessa Corte per lasciare il paese fino a nuovo ordine, e che la convenzione di Vienna del 1961 sulle relazioni diplomatiche è una pietra miliare dell'ordinamento giuridico internazionale che dovrebbe essere rispettata in tutte le occasioni.

Tutto ciò premesso, l'interrogante chiede alla Commissione se reputa che vi sia una violazione delle norme internazionali da parte dell'India nei confronti dell'Italia e che sia necessario un arbitrato internazionale per dirimere la questione.

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione

(13 maggio 2013)

L'Alta Rappresentante segue la questione da vicino fin dall'inizio, in stretto contatto con le autorità italiane e indiane, invitando ripetutamente le due parti a trovare quanto prima una soluzione soddisfacente per entrambe sulla base della Convenzione delle Nazioni Unite sul diritto del mare e del diritto internazionale.

Subito dopo la sentenza pronunciata dalla Corte suprema nel mese di marzo 2013, il portavoce dell'Alta Rappresentante ha espresso preoccupazione circa il fatto che le restrizioni alla libertà di movimento dell'ambasciatore italiano in India potrebbero violare gli obblighi internazionali ai sensi della convenzione di Vienna del 1961 sulle relazioni diplomatiche.

L'Alta Rappresentante continuerà a seguire la vicenda con grande attenzione e auspica quanto prima una soluzione amichevole basata sul diritto internazionale.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003373/13
to the Commission
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: The case of the Italian marines

A year has passed since the incident which occurred in international waters off the Indian coast, resulting in two Indian fishermen being killed, the oil tanker *Enrica Lexie*, sailing under the Italian flag, being detained in Indian waters 'at the disposal' of India's judiciary, and two marines, members of the military escort on board the vessel as part of an anti-piracy programme, being held in an Indian jail waiting to hear their fate. From the outset, there were inconsistencies in this affair, which still need to be explained.

Since the ship was in international waters at the time of the incident, it should have been subject to Italian jurisdiction, namely, the jurisdiction to which the vessel belonged. The rights of the marines were not respected, despite the fact that they were soldiers from the San Marco Regiment on duty on board the ship: they were arrested, imprisoned and referred to the Indian courts as though they were simple civilians. Furthermore, in view of how the matter has developed, the Indian Government has imposed restrictions on the movements of Italy's Ambassador to India, calling into question the legitimacy of diplomatic immunity.

According to a statement made in recent days by the spokesperson of the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Policy and Security Policy, Baroness Ashton, any limitations on the movement of the Italian Ambassador to India would contravene the international obligations established under the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations.

Furthermore, Baroness Ashton's spokesperson stressed that the High Representative notes 'with concern' the decisions of the Supreme Court of India, based on which the Ambassador, Daniele Mancini, is required to seek the Court's permission to leave the country until further orders, and that the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961 is a cornerstone of the international legal order which should be respected at all times.

In light of the above, does the Commission believe that India has violated international law, with regard to Italy, and that international arbitration is necessary to resolve the question?

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

The HR/VP has been following this issue very carefully, since its beginning, in close contact with both the Italian and Indian authorities. The HR/VP has consistently encouraged Italy and India to find a mutually satisfactory outcome to this bilateral case as soon as possible, based on the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea and international law.

Immediately after the Supreme Court Orders of March 2013, the HR/VP, through her spokesperson, expressed concern that any limitations to the freedom of movement of the Ambassador of Italy to India would be contrary to the international obligations established under the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations.

The HR/VP, who will continue to pay great attention to this issue, hopes that an amicable solution based on international law can be found as rapidly as possible.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003375/13

ao Conselho

Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)

(25 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Discurso de Shimon Peres — Irão e Síria

O Presidente de Israel, Shimon Peres, defendeu abertamente, na intervenção que fez na última sessão plenária do Parlamento Europeu, a violação do direito internacional e da soberania da Síria, a ingerência nos seus assuntos internos, incluindo a intervenção da Liga Árabe e a formação de um governo provisório. Israel aumenta a escalada de provocações e ameaças, atirando ainda mais lenha para a fogueira do conflito interno na Síria e desrespeitando o direito do povo sírio a decidir o seu presente e o seu futuro.

Relativamente ao Irão, defendeu igualmente a ingerência nos assuntos internos deste país, pedindo aos deputados do Parlamento Europeu que intervenham nas próximas eleições do país.

Estas declarações enquadram-se na escalada de violência no Médio Oriente, nomeadamente dos EUA e de países da União Europeia, como a França que, em aliança com a Arábia Saudita, o Qatar e outras monarquias ditatoriais do mundo árabe e usando o sionismo de Israel como ponta de lança, visam assegurar por via da guerra e da submissão de países soberanos o domínio imperialista sobre os abundantes recursos naturais e energéticos da região.

Assim, pergunto ao Conselho:

Condena esta proposta de violação da soberania da Síria e do Irão, as sucessivas provocações e a perigosa escalada das agressões já levadas a cabo por Israel contra a Síria?

Não considera necessário desenvolver esforços no plano internacional para travar o passo às reiteradas violações do direito internacional e da Carta da ONU por Israel na Palestina e na Síria e ao possível desencadear de um conflito militar na região de grandes proporções e de dramáticas consequências no plano regional e internacional?

Resposta

(17 de junho de 2013)

O Conselho não abordou os pontos específicos suscitados pela Senhora Deputada, tendo no entanto manifestado em diversas ocasiões, a última das quais nas suas conclusões de 18 de fevereiro de 2013, a sua profunda preocupação com a deterioração da situação na Síria.

Nessas conclusões, o Conselho manifestou a profunda preocupação da UE em relação aos efeitos de contágio da crise síria nos países vizinhos e reiterou o seu apego à soberania, independência e integridade territorial da Síria.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003375/13
to the Council**

Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)

(25 March 2013)

Subject: Speech by Shimon Peres — Iran and Syria

In a speech made at the most recent European Parliament plenary session, the Israeli President Shimon Peres openly called for the violation of international law and of Syria's sovereignty, as well as interference in its internal affairs, by urging the Arab League to intervene and to form a provisional government. Israel's increasing provocations and threats add more fuel to the fire of the internal conflict in Syria and disrespect the Syrian people's right to decide their own present and future.

He also called for interference in Iran's internal affairs and urged MEPs to intervene in the country's upcoming elections.

These statements are in line with the escalating violence in the Middle East, in particular that involving the United States and EU countries such as France which, in alliance with Saudi Arabia, Qatar and other dictatorial Arab monarchies, using Israel's Zionism as a spearhead, are aiming to ensure imperialist domination over the region's abundant natural and energy resources through war and the submission of sovereign countries.

Does the Council condemn Israel's proposed violation of both Syria's and Iran's sovereignty, as well as its successive provocations and dangerous escalation of aggression against Syria?

Does it not believe that the international community must work to prevent Israel from repeatedly violating international law and the UN Charter in both Palestine and Syria and the possible onset of a large-scale military conflict in the region which would have dramatic consequences both regionally and internationally?

Reply

(17 June 2013)

The Council has not addressed the specific points raised by the Honourable Member. Nonetheless, it has on several occasions expressed its grave concerns about the deteriorating situation in Syria, most recently in its conclusions of 18 February 2013.

In those conclusions, the Council expressed the EU's deep concerns at the spill-over effects of the Syrian crisis in neighbouring countries and reiterated its attachment to the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Syria.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003376/13

à Comissão

Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)

(25 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Discurso de Shimon Peres, Presidente de Israel

O Presidente de Israel, Shimon Peres, defendeu no Parlamento Europeu, no discurso que fez na última sessão plenária em Estrasburgo, uma maior cooperação entre o seu país e a União Europeia através do estabelecimento de consórcios entre governos e empresas multinacionais no domínio da investigação e do desenvolvimento de tecnologias. É conhecido o desenvolvimento e a importância que Israel atribui ao desenvolvimento da indústria das chamadas tecnologias de duplo uso, ou seja, de tecnologias de uso militar e civil. São também conhecidos os efeitos práticos do seu uso, nomeadamente na manutenção e extensão da ocupação da Palestina, na agressão e repressão dos palestinianos, nos ataques e na violação da soberania de vários países da região.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

Estão a ser desenvolvidos alguns contactos e projetos para o desenvolvimento de projetos conjuntos, financiados por fundos e/ou programas da UE, tendo em vista o desenvolvimento destas tecnologias? Quais são esses programas, que montantes estão envolvidos e com que objetivos?

Resposta dada por Geoghegan-Quinn em nome da Comissão

(17 de maio de 2013)

A cooperação entre a UE e Israel no domínio da investigação e da inovação é regida pelo «Acordo de Cooperação Científica e Tecnológica entre a Comunidade Europeia e o Estado de Israel»⁽¹⁾. Com base no artigo 2.º, n.º 1, e no anexo I desse acordo, os organismos de investigação de Israel participam e recebem financiamento do Sétimo Programa-Quadro de investigação, desenvolvimento tecnológico e demonstração (7.º PQ, 2007-2013) nas mesmas condições que os organismos dos Estados-Membros da UE. O programa Horizonte 2020, que é o próximo programa-quadro de investigação e inovação da UE (2014-2020), estará aberto à associação de Israel, sob reserva das condições estabelecidas no artigo 7.º do regulamento que o institui.

No que respeita às tecnologias de dupla utilização, embora algumas empresas israelitas que participam nas atividades de investigação do programa-quadro se dediquem aos domínios da defesa e da segurança, a investigação financiada pelo PQ limita-se à segurança civil e à proteção dos cidadãos. De um modo mais geral, a investigação de dupla utilização (definida como investigação que tem potencialmente aplicação militar ou terrorista) faz parte da «lista de controlo ético» que se aplica a todas as propostas apresentadas no âmbito do programa-quadro e, se for caso disso, é submetida a uma avaliação ética por peritos independentes.

A Comissão está ciente das preocupações manifestadas pelo Parlamento Europeu e pelas organizações da sociedade civil quanto à participação de certas entidades israelitas em projetos do PQ.

⁽¹⁾ JO L 220 de 25.8.2007.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003376/13
to the Commission
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: Speech by Israeli President Shimon Peres

In a speech made at the most recent European Parliament plenary session in Strasbourg, Israeli President Shimon Peres called for greater cooperation between his country and the EU through the establishment of partnerships between governments and multinational companies in the field of research and technology development. It is well known that Israel is involved in and attaches great importance to the development of so-called dual-use technologies, which are technologies for both military and civilian use. The practical impact of these technologies is also well known: the continuous and increasing occupation of Palestine, aggression against and repression of the Palestinian people, and attacks on and violation of the sovereignty of several countries in the region.

Are any contacts being made and plans being drafted to implement joint projects, financed by EU funds/programmes, aimed at developing these technologies? What are these programmes, what sums are involved and what are the aims thereof?

**Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(17 May 2013)**

Cooperation between the EU and Israel in the field of research and innovation is governed by the 'Agreement on Scientific and Technical Cooperation between the European Community and the State of Israel' ⁽¹⁾. On the basis of Article 2(1) and Annex I of this Agreement, research entities from Israel participate in and receive funding from the Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013) under the same conditions as those applicable to entities from EU Member States. Horizon 2020, the next EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020), will be open to the association of Israel, subject to the conditions set out in Article 7 of the Horizon 2020 regulation.

With regard to dual-use technologies, while some Israeli companies participating in FP security research activities are active in the fields of defence and security, the FP-funded research is limited to Civil Security and the protection of citizens. More broadly, dual use (defined as research having potential military or terrorist applications) is included in the Ethics Checklist applying to all proposals submitted to the framework Programme and, when relevant, is subject to an Ethical Review by independent experts.

The Commission is aware of the concerns raised by the European Parliament and civil society organisations in relation to the participation of certain Israeli entities in FP projects.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 220, 25.8.2007.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003377/13
à Comissão
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL) e Elisa Ferreira (S&D)
(25 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Situação na empresa Açomonta

Nos últimos dias o sindicato luxemburguês OGB-L acusou a empresa portuguesa Açomonta (com filial em Differdange, Luxemburgo) de praticar «escravatura moderna», ao recorrer, nos últimos dois anos, a vários subempreiteiros que têm enviado trabalhadores portugueses ou com residência em Portugal para trabalhar no Luxemburgo, por conta da Açomonta. Segundo o Sindicato, estes trabalhadores em vez de receberem o salário legal no Luxemburgo (cerca de 2 400 euros brutos) estão a receber 300 a 700 euros por mês e a trabalhar com horários que não respeitam o tempo de repouso legal obrigatório. O sindicato refere também que estes trabalhadores não estão a ser pagos pelas horas extraordinárias e que são alojados em «condições desumanas», em armazéns em França, na fronteira com o Luxemburgo. Por outro lado, a mesma fonte relata que os trabalhadores que se encontram nesta situação não têm qualquer possibilidade de fazer valer os seus direitos, uma vez que a empresa os ameaça com a expulsão do Luxemburgo.

Face a esta situação, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que informações tem acerca desta situação? Como a avalia?
2. A referida empresa recebeu quaisquer apoios comunitários? Com que fins foram concedidos e que compromissos assumiu aquando da concessão dos apoios? Considera que, a existirem compromissos, estes estão a ser postos em causa pela administração da empresa?
3. Considera que, neste caso, a diretiva de destacamento de trabalhadores está a ser violada?
4. Tem conhecimento de possíveis diligências que estejam a ser feitas para pôr cobro a esta inadmissível situação de exploração de trabalhadores?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003423/13
à Comissão
Edite Estrela (S&D)
(26 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Exploração de trabalhadores portugueses no Luxemburgo

Tendo em conta um comunicado do sindicato luxemburguês OGB-L que denuncia alegadas práticas de «dumping social» levadas a cabo pela empresa portuguesa «Açomonta» e acusa os responsáveis desta empresa de praticar «escravatura moderna»;

Tendo em conta que a central sindical descreveu várias práticas da empresa portuguesa, cuja filial no Luxemburgo tem sede em Differdange, que violam as regras do destacamento europeu, incluindo pagamento de salários inferiores ao que prevê a lei e horas de trabalho que não respeitam «o repouso obrigatório»;

Tendo em conta que o sindicato garante que os trabalhadores, em vez de receberem o salário de acordo com a legislação do Luxemburgo, que ronda os 2 400 euros brutos, «não recebem mais que 300 a 700 euros por mês», porque lhes são descontados «a viagem, o transporte e a alimentação»,

Pergunta à Comissão:

1. A Comissão tem conhecimento desta situação?
2. Que medidas pensa tomar a Comissão para melhor garantir a aplicação da Diretiva 96/71/CE relativa ao destacamento de trabalhadores no âmbito de uma prestação de serviços?
3. De que forma as disposições constantes da proposta de Diretiva respeitante à execução da Diretiva 96/71/CE (COM(2012)0131 final) poderão contribuir para melhor garantir os direitos dos trabalhadores em situações semelhantes, em particular as constantes do artigo 12.º relativo à responsabilidade solidária?

Resposta conjunta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão*(17 de maio de 2013)*

A Comissão não tem conhecimento das situações descritas pelas Senhoras Deputadas. Os trabalhadores, dependendo da situação em que se encontrem, podem ser abrangidos pela Diretiva 96/71/CE ⁽¹⁾ e beneficiarem de um conjunto básico («núcleo») de condições mínimas de trabalho e emprego, incluindo o pagamento do salário mínimo do país onde trabalham. O acompanhamento e o cumprimento das condições de trabalho e da remuneração efetiva integram os principais domínios de competência dos Estados-Membros.

Os projetos executados com o apoio do financiamento da UE devem estar em conformidade com a legislação nacional e com a legislação da UE. No entanto, a Comissão não está em posição de avaliar os factos ou indicar se uma empresa privada atuou em conformidade com a legislação aplicável. Cabe às autoridades nacionais assegurar que a legislação nacional é aplicada correta e eficazmente pelo empregador.

De acordo com as autoridades portuguesas, a empresa Açomonta recebeu um financiamento do Fundo Social Europeu no montante de 67 822,86 euros no período de programação 2000-2006. As operações selecionadas destinavam-se a reforçar o potencial dos trabalhadores e, de acordo com as autoridades portuguesas, cumpriram as regras da UE e as regras nacionais ao longo de todo o período de execução.

⁽¹⁾ Diretiva 96/71/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 16 de dezembro de 1996, relativa ao destacamento de trabalhadores no âmbito de uma prestação de serviços, JO L 18 de 21.1.1997.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003377/13
to the Commission
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL) and Elisa Ferreira (S&D)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: Situation at Açomonta

In the last few days the Luxembourgish trade union OGB-L has accused the Portuguese company Açomonta (which has a branch in Differdange, Luxembourg) of practising 'modern slavery'. Over the past two years, the company has used several contractors which have sent Portuguese workers or workers resident in Portugal to work in Luxembourg, on its behalf. The trade union claims that these workers receive EUR 300-700 per month instead of the legal Luxembourgish salary (around EUR 2 400 gross) and work hours that do not comply with the mandatory statutory rest period. The trade union also claims that these workers are not being paid for overtime and that they are housed in 'inhumane conditions' in warehouses in France, on the border with Luxembourg. Furthermore, the same source reports that workers who find themselves in this situation are unable to assert their rights, since the company threatens them with deportation from Luxembourg.

1. What information does the Commission have on this situation? What is its assessment of it?
2. Has Açomonta received any kind of EU aid? For what purpose was aid granted and what undertakings were given when it was received? If undertakings have been given, does the Commission believe these are being broken by the company management?
3. Does it believe that the Posting of Workers Directive is being violated in this case?
4. Is it aware of possible steps that are being taken to put a stop to this unacceptable worker exploitation?

**Question for written answer E-003423/13
to the Commission
Edite Estrela (S&D)
(26 March 2013)**

Subject: Exploitation of Portuguese workers in Luxembourg

A report by the Luxembourg trade union OGB-L has drawn attention to the alleged practice of 'social dumping' by the Portuguese company 'Açomonta', and has accused its management of 'modern-day slavery'.

The trade union has denounced several practices by the Portuguese firm — which has branch offices at Differdange in Luxembourg — which contravene European regulations on the posting of workers, and which include salaries below the legal minimum and demand working hours that do not respect 'mandatory statutory rest periods'.

According to the trade union, instead of being paid the legal minimum wage in Luxembourg, which is approximately EUR 2 400 gross per month, these workers 'receive no more than EUR 300-700 per month' as their 'travel, transport and food' is deducted.

1. Is the Commission aware of this situation?
2. What steps will the Commission take to better ensure the implementation of Directive 96/71/EC concerning the posting of workers in the framework of the provision of services?
3. How can the provisions in the proposal for a directive on the enforcement of Directive 96/71/EC (COM(2012)0131 final) better guarantee the rights of workers in similar situations, in particular those set out in Article 12 relating to joint liability?

Joint answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission*(17 May 2013)*

The Commission is not aware of the concrete situation as described by the Honourable Member. Depending on the workers situation, they may be subject to Directive 96/71/EC⁽¹⁾ and entitled to a core set ('nucleus') of clearly defined minimum terms and conditions of employment, including the minimum rate of pay in the country where they work. The monitoring and enforcement of working conditions and actual remuneration is within the main remits of the Member States' competence.

Projects carried out with the support of EU funding must comply with EU and national law. However, the Commission is not in a position to assess the facts or state whether a private company has complied with the law applicable. It is for the national authorities to ensure that the national legislation is correctly and effectively applied by the employer.

According to the Portuguese authorities, Açomonta Company received European Social Fund financial support amounting to EUR 67 822.86 in the 2000-06 programming period. The selected operations aimed to enhance the employees' potential and, according to the Portuguese authorities, complied with EU and national rules throughout the implementation period.

⁽¹⁾ 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.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003378/13

ao Conselho

Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)

(25 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Deputados impedidos de entrar em Marrocos

Quatro deputados do Parlamento Europeu, membros do seu Intergrupo do Sahara Ocidental, foram impedidos de entrar em Marrocos, onde faziam escala para chegar ao Sahara Ocidental onde pretendiam observar a situação dos direitos humanos.

Assim, pergunto ao Conselho:

Que comentário faz a esta repetida ação das autoridades marroquinas?

Como pretende abordar esta ação atentatória do direito internacional e de acordos existentes entre a UE e Marrocos?

Irá exigir um pedido de desculpas formal das autoridades marroquinas?

Não considera que se trata de mais uma tentativa das autoridades marroquinas de esconder do mundo as continuadas violações dos direitos humanos que impõe à população dos territórios ocupados do Sahara Ocidental?

Resposta

(17 de junho de 2013)

O Conselho está a par dos acontecimentos a que se refere a Senhora Deputada, os quais deram origem a contactos entre a UE e as autoridades marroquinas.

Mais genericamente, em abril de 2012, por ocasião do 10.º Conselho de Associação UE-Marrocos, a UE reafirmou o seu empenho na resolução do conflito do Sara Ocidental. A UE apoiou plenamente os esforços do Secretário-Geral das Nações Unidas (SGNU) e do seu Enviado Pessoal para ajudar as partes a chegarem a uma solução política justa, duradoura e mutuamente aceitável para todas as partes em causa, que permita a autodeterminação do povo do Sara Ocidental, no quadro de mecanismos consentâneos com os objetivos e os princípios enunciados na Carta das Nações Unidas, em conformidade com as resoluções do Conselho de Segurança das Nações Unidas, nomeadamente a Resolução 1979 (2011). A UE incentivou ainda todas as partes a continuarem a trabalhar com o Enviado Pessoal do SGNU a fim de se registarem progressos na busca dessa solução, fazendo prova de realismo e de espírito de compromisso. A UE exprimiu, além disso, o seu apego ao respeito pelos direitos humanos e recordou as obrigações que incumbem a cada uma das partes. Neste contexto, a UE congratulou-se com o maior papel assumido pelo CNDH em matéria de fiscalização e de defesa dos direitos humanos, nomeadamente no Sara Ocidental, e com a constitucionalização desse papel.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003378/13
to the Council**

Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)

(25 March 2013)

Subject: MEPs denied entry to Morocco

Four MEPs, members of the Western Sahara Intergroup, have been denied entry to Morocco while making a stopover en route to Western Sahara, where they intended to observe the human rights situation.

What is the Council's assessment of this repeated action by the Moroccan authorities?

How will it address this action which contravenes international law and existing agreements between the EU and Morocco?

Will it demand a formal apology from the Moroccan authorities?

Does it not believe that this is yet another attempt by the Moroccan authorities to hide from the world the continued human rights violations being committed against the population of the occupied territories of Western Sahara?

Reply

(17 June 2013)

The Council is aware of the events referred to by the Honourable Member, at the time of which appropriate contacts took place between the EU and the Moroccan authorities.

More generally, in April 2012, on the occasion of the 10th EU-Morocco Association Council, the EU restated its commitment to a resolution of the conflict in Western Sahara. It fully supported the efforts being made by the United Nations Secretary-General (UNSG) and his Personal Envoy to help the parties to find a just and lasting political solution that is mutually acceptable to all parties concerned and allows self-determination for the people of Western Sahara in the context of arrangements consistent with the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations as provided for in the UNSC resolutions, including Resolution 1979 (2011). It also encouraged all the parties to continue working with the UNSG's Personal Envoy to secure progress in the search for such a solution, demonstrating realism and a spirit of compromise. The EU also wished to express its commitment to safeguarding human rights and recalled the obligations incumbent on each of the parties. In that connection, it welcomed the increased role for the CNDH (National Council for Human Rights) and its enshrinement in the constitution with regard to the monitoring and protection of human rights, including in Western Sahara.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-003379/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(25 martie 2013)

Subiect: Reglementările legale cu privire la medicamentul Avastin

Pacienții români bolnavi de cancer au reclamat faptul că tratamentul cu medicamentul Avastin, considerat ca fiind eficient în întârzierea evoluției anumitor tumori, nu are în Uniunea Europeană indicație terapeutică în tumori cerebrale, ci numai în alte forme de cancer. Prin urmare, costul acestui medicament nu poate fi decontat în cadrul sistemelor de asigurări de sănătate.

Comisia este rugată să precizeze care este stadiul studiilor clinice cu privire la utilizarea medicamentului menționat în cazuri de tumori cerebrale și când va deveni disponibil pentru pacienții europeni.

Răspuns dat de dl Borg în numele Comisiei
(14 mai 2013)

Avastin este un medicament care este în curs de autorizare la nivelul UE pentru tratarea cancerului colorectal, pulmonar, ovarian, renal și de sân ⁽¹⁾.

Avastin este testat pe pacienți care suferă de cancer cerebral sau de metastaze ale creierului în nouă trialuri clinice înregistrate în Registrul UE al trialurilor clinice ⁽²⁾ și în aproximativ 90 de trialuri înregistrate în registrele institutelor naționale de sănătate din Statele Unite ⁽³⁾. Marea majoritate a acestor trialuri au fost inițiate recent, iar rezultatele sunt așteptate în următorul an sau în următorii trei ani.

Comisia nu este în măsură să evalueze momentul în care Avastin va fi autorizat la nivelul UE pentru tratarea cancerului cerebral.

⁽¹⁾ http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/medicines/human/medicines/000582/human_med_000663.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058001d124

⁽²⁾ <https://www.clinicaltrialsregister.eu/>

⁽³⁾ <http://clinicaltrials.gov/>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003379/13
to the Commission
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(25 March 2013)**

Subject: Legal regulations for the drug Avastin

Cancer patients in Romania have claimed that there is no therapeutic indication in the European Union for using the drug Avastin, considered to be effective in slowing the growth of certain tumours, to treat not only brain tumours but also other types of cancer. Consequently, the cost of this drug cannot be discounted under health insurance schemes.

Can the Commission specify the status of the clinical trials on the use of this drug in cases involving brain tumours, and when it will become available to European patients?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(14 May 2013)**

Avastin is a medicinal product which is currently authorised at EU level for the treatment of colorectal, lung, ovarian, kidney and breast cancer ⁽¹⁾.

Avastin is being tested in patients suffering from brain cancer or brain metastases in nine clinical trials registered in the EU Clinical Trials Register ⁽²⁾ and in about 90 trials registered in the United States' National Institutes of Health ClinicalTrials.gov registry ⁽³⁾. The large majority of these trials have recently been initiated and results are expected within the next one to three years.

The Commission is not in a position to assess when Avastin will be authorised at EU level for the treatment of brain cancer.

⁽¹⁾ http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/medicines/human/medicines/000582/human_med_000663.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058001d124

⁽²⁾ <https://www.clinicaltrialsregister.eu/>

⁽³⁾ <http://clinicaltrials.gov/>

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-003380/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(25 martie 2013)

Subiect: Nivelul de contaminare cu bacterii a legumelor ambalate neprelucrate

Un profesor emerit de bacteriologie al Universității Aberdeen (Scoția), expert în microbiologie și siguranță alimentară, a ridicat recent problema nivelului de contaminare cu bacterii a legumelor ambalate neprelucrate disponibile în comerțul alimentar (salate).

Comisia este rugată să precizeze dacă dispune de un studiu cu privire la nivelul de contaminare cu bacterii a acestui tip de produse, dacă intenționează să monitorizeze această problemă și dacă are în vedere să înainteze propuneri legislative cu privire la reglementările în domeniu.

Răspuns dat de dl Borg în numele Comisiei
(13 mai 2013)

Directiva 2003/99/CE ⁽¹⁾ prevede obligația statelor membre de a monitoriza zoonozele și agenții zoonotici la animale și produsele alimentare, rezistența antimicrobiană, de a investiga focarele de toxiinfecție alimentară și de a-și transmite reciproc toate informațiile legate de zoonoze și de agenții zoonotici la animale și în produsele alimentare. Datele furnizate de statele membre sunt colectate la nivelul Uniunii.

Cel mai actual raport de sinteză al UE privind tendințele și sursele de zoonoze, de agenți zoonotici și de focare de toxiinfecție alimentară ⁽²⁾ a fost publicat la 9 aprilie 2013 de către Autoritatea Europeană pentru Siguranța Alimentară (EFSA) și de Centrul European de Prevenire și Control al Bolilor.

În plus, în urma epidemiei din 2011 de *Escherichia coli* care produce toxina Shiga, înregistrată în Uniunea Europeană, Comisia a solicitat EFSA să examineze gradul de risc pe care îl prezintă agenții patogeni din alimentele de origine neanimală. Un prim aviz științific ⁽³⁾ publicat la data de 8 ianuarie 2013 a avut ca obiect analiza datelor epidemiologice și realizarea unui clasament al riscului prezentat de combinațiile de alimente/agenți patogeni. În plus, Comisia i-a solicitat EFSA să emită un al doilea aviz privind riscul pentru sănătatea publică generat de agenți patogeni care pot contamina alimentele de origine neanimală. Activitatea EFSA este în curs de desfășurare, iar avizul acesteia este așteptat în 2014.

⁽¹⁾ JO L 325, 12.12.2003, p. 31.

⁽²⁾ <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/3129.htm>

⁽³⁾ <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/3025.htm>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003380/13
to the Commission**

Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)

(25 March 2013)

Subject: Level of bacterial contamination in packaged unprocessed vegetables

An emeritus professor of bacteriology from the University of Aberdeen (Scotland), who is an expert in microbiology and food safety, recently raised the issue of the level of bacterial contamination in packaged unprocessed vegetables (salad) available in the food retail sector.

Can the Commission specify whether it has a study on the level of bacterial contamination in products of this kind, whether it intends to monitor this issue and whether it is considering submitting legislative proposals for regulations in this area?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission

(13 May 2013)

Directive 2003/99/EC ⁽¹⁾ requires Member States to monitor zoonoses and zoonotic agents in animals and food, antimicrobial resistance, to investigate food-borne outbreaks and to exchange all the information related to zoonoses and zoonotic agents in animals and food. The data provided by the Member States are collected at Union level.

The most up-to-date EU Summary Report on Trends and Sources of Zoonoses, Zoonotic Agents and Food-borne Outbreaks ⁽²⁾ was published on 9 April 2013 by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) and the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control.

Moreover, following the 2011 outbreaks of Shiga toxin-producing *Escherichia coli* in the European Union, the Commission requested EFSA to look at the risk posed by pathogens in food of non-animal origin. A first scientific opinion ⁽³⁾ published on 8 January 2013 was related to outbreak data analysis and risk ranking of food/pathogen combinations. Furthermore, the Commission asked EFSA to issue a second opinion on the public health risk posed by pathogens that may contaminate food of non-animal origin. EFSA's work is underway and its opinion is expected in 2014.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 325, 12.12.2003, p.31.

⁽²⁾ <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/3129.htm>

⁽³⁾ <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/3025.htm>

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-003381/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(25 martie 2013)

Subiect: „Permise de rezidență biometrice” pentru imigranții români și bulgari, în Marea Britanie

Guvernul Regatului Unit a anunțat că studiază introducerea de „permise de rezidență biometrice” pentru imigranții români și bulgari care vor intra pe teritoriul acestui stat începând din 2014.

Comisia este rugată să comenteze această inițiativă și să precizeze dacă aceasta nu are caracter discriminatoriu față de cetățenii europeni care provin din România și Bulgaria.

Răspuns dat de dna Reding în numele Comisiei
(15 mai 2013)

Conform informațiilor furnizate Comisiei de către autoritățile Regatului Unit, această țară nu preconizează să elibereze permise de ședere biometrice pentru resortisanții români și bulgari.

În temeiul dreptului UE, în legislația lor națională, statele membre pot impune tuturor cetățenilor UE care nu sunt resortisanți ai țării respective obligația să se înregistreze la autoritățile naționale, astfel cum se prevede la articolul 8 alineatul (1) din Directiva privind libera circulație ⁽¹⁾.

După înregistrare, cetățenilor UE li se eliberează imediat un certificat de înregistrare. Directiva privind libera circulație nu autorizează statele membre să elibereze certificate de înregistrare diferite pentru cetățenii UE din state membre diferite.

⁽¹⁾ Directiva 2004/38/CE a Parlamentului European și a Consiliului din 29 aprilie 2004 privind dreptul la liberă circulație și ședere pe teritoriul statelor membre pentru cetățenii Uniunii și membrii familiilor acestora, JO L 158, 30 aprilie 2004, p. 77.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003381/13
to the Commission**

Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)

(25 March 2013)

Subject: 'Biometric residence permits' for Romanian and Bulgarian immigrants in the UK

The United Kingdom Government has announced that it is looking at the introduction of 'biometric residence permits' for Romanian and Bulgarian immigrants entering this state's territory from 2014.

Can the Commission comment on this initiative and specify whether it does not discriminate against EU citizens from Romania and Bulgaria?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission

(15 May 2013)

According to the information provided to the Commission by the United Kingdom authorities, the United Kingdom has no plans to issue biometric residence permits to Romanian and Bulgarian nationals.

Under EC law, Member States may in their national laws oblige all non-national EU citizens to register their residence with national authorities, as laid down in Article 8(1) of the Free Movement Directive ⁽¹⁾.

Once registered, EU citizens shall be immediately issued with a registration certificate. The Free Movement Directive does not authorise Member States to issue different registration certificates to EU citizens from different Member States.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 2004/38/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the right of citizens of the Union and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States, OJ L 158, 30.4.2004, p. 77.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-003382/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(25 martie 2013)

Subiect: Gradul de contractare, respectiv stadiul plăților efectiv realizate pentru România

Comisia este rugată să prezinte datele oficiale, la zi, cu privire la gradul de contractare a fondurilor europene, respectiv stadiul plăților efectiv realizate, din fondurile europene, pentru România.

De asemenea, Comisia este rugată să comenteze diferența extrem de mare între cifrele referitoare la cei doi indicatori.

Răspuns dat de dl. Hahn în numele Comisiei
(17 mai 2013)

În conformitate cu datele publicate de Ministerul Fondurilor Europene ⁽¹⁾, la data de 31 martie 2013, autoritățile de management care gestionează cele șapte programe din cadrul politicii de coeziune au încheiat acorduri cu beneficiarii pentru 88 % din totalul fondurilor alocate pentru 2007-2013.

Comisia a rambursat 2,5 milioane EUR (13 % din totalul fondurilor alocate), la care se adaugă 2,1 milioane EUR de plăți în avans. Astfel, suma totală plătită de Comisie reprezintă 24 % din totalul fondurilor alocate (4,6 miliarde EUR dintr-un total de 19,2 miliarde EUR).

Diferența dintre procentul rambursat (13 %) și valoarea acordurilor de finanțare cu beneficiarii (88 %) este cauzată de implementarea lentă a proiectelor, ca urmare a finalizării cu întârziere a procedurilor de selecție a proiectelor și a experienței limitate a beneficiarilor, de sistemul împovărat de gestionare și de control al programelor, de problemele sistemice care au generat constatări importante în cursul auditurilor, ceea ce a dus la întreruperea și presuspendarea plăților și a corecțiilor financiare, de lipsa resurselor bugetare la nivelul autorităților de management și de lipsa resurselor de cofinanțare la nivelul beneficiarilor.

Conform datelor din partea autorității de management a Fondului european agricol pentru dezvoltare rurală (FEADR), la data de 7 februarie 2013, 71 % din fondurile alocate pentru perioada 2007-2013 pentru măsuri de investiții au fost contractate la nivelul beneficiarilor. La 31 martie 2013, Comisia plătită 43 % din totalul fondurilor alocate FEADR pentru perioada 2007-2013 (3,5 miliarde EUR dintr-un total de 8,1 miliarde EUR) sau 50 % (4 miliarde EUR) dacă se include, de asemenea, procentul de 7 % reprezentat de plățile în avans din cadrul FEADR (561,5 milioane EUR).

(1) <http://www.fonduri-ue.ro/>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003382/13
to the Commission**

Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)

(25 March 2013)

Subject: Contracting rate and status of payments actually made to Romania

Can the Commission provide official, up-to-date data on the rate of contracting from European funds and on the status of payments actually made from European funds to Romania?

In addition, can the Commission comment on the huge disparity between the figures for both indicators?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission

(17 May 2013)

According to data published by the Ministry of European Funds ⁽¹⁾, as of 31 March 2013, the managing authorities of the 7 cohesion policy programmes had concluded agreements with beneficiaries for 88% of the total 2007-2013 allocation.

The Commission reimbursed EUR 2.5 million (13% of the total allocation) and together with EUR 2.1 million of advance payments, the total amount paid by the Commission represents 24% of the total allocation (EUR 4.6 billion out of EUR 19.2 billion).

The gap between the amount reimbursed (13%) and the value of the financing agreements with the beneficiaries (88%) is due to the slow implementation of projects, caused by delayed finalisation of project selection procedures and the limited experience of beneficiaries; the heavy management and control system of the programmes; systemic issues causing significant audit findings which led to interruption and pre-suspension of payments and financial corrections; shortage of budgetary resources at the level of managing authorities and a lack of co-financing resources at the beneficiaries' level.

According to data from the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) managing authority, 71% of the 2007-2013 funds allocated for investment-type measures were committed at beneficiary level as of 7 February 2013. As of 31 March 2013, the Commission has paid 43% of the total 2007-13 EAFRD allocation (EUR 3.5 billion out of EUR 8.1 billion), or 50% (EUR 4.0 billion) if the 7% EAFRD advance payment (EUR 561.5 million) is also included.

(1) <http://www.fonduri-ue.ro/>

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003383/13
a la Comisión**

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(25 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Sector bancario de Chipre

Con la aprobación del *Six Pack*, la Comisión Europea tiene poder para proponer recomendaciones de carácter macroeconómico a los Estados miembros de la zona euro. Estas recomendaciones se basan en el análisis de un conjunto de indicadores que se entienden clave para poder analizar la situación de cada Estado miembro más allá del volumen de su deuda pública.

Chipre ha tenido que pedir un rescate con fondos europeos después de que sus bancos se encontraran en una situación de insolvencia. Más allá de las razones concretas que han llevado a este hecho, uno de los factores fundamentales ha sido el gran tamaño de su sector bancario en relación con el PIB de la isla mediterránea ⁽¹⁾. Esto ha tendido como consecuencia que los costes de su recapitalización fueran demasiado elevados para ser financiados simplemente con fondos públicos y se ha tenido que recurrir al *bail-in* de parte de los depósitos. Las *country specific recommendations* para Chipre de noviembre de 2012 no tenían en cuenta el tamaño de su sector financiero como un factor de riesgo para su economía.

Este *bail-in* ha creado desconfianza entre los ahorradores de toda la zona euro, que temen que en otras circunstancias se les pueda aplicar la misma medida. Una posible medida para generar confianza entre los ciudadanos y los inversores sería la creación de un fondo de resolución y garantía de depósitos parecido al que existe en Estados Unidos.

A la luz de lo anterior,

1. ¿Piensa la Comisión introducir en el *scoreboard* del mecanismo de desequilibrios macroeconómicos un indicador para controlar el tamaño absoluto del sector financiero de un Estado miembro respecto a su PIB?
2. En el marco de su *blueprint* para el futuro de la Unión Monetaria, ¿piensa la Comisión hacer una propuesta legislativa para la creación de un Fondo de Resolución y de Garantía de Depósitos Europeo para restablecer la confianza de los ciudadanos e inversores?

Respuesta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión

(7 de junio de 2013)

Por el momento no se tiene la intención de incluir tal indicador en el cuadro de indicadores del procedimiento de desequilibrio macroeconómico (PDM). Sin embargo, el cuadro de indicadores ya incluye la tasa de incremento de los pasivos totales del sector financiero. Este indicador es una medida muy global del aumento de los riesgos potenciales del sector financiero. La experiencia ha mostrado que una rápida expansión de este sector, más que el gran tamaño del mismo, ha tenido a menudo gran influencia en las crisis financieras. Para más detalles sobre este indicador, se remite a Su Señoría al documento de trabajo de los servicios de la Comisión «*Completing the Scoreboard for the MIP: Financial Sector Indicator*» ⁽²⁾. El cuadro de indicadores también incluye otros indicadores financieros tales como los relativos a la deuda del sector privado y al flujo de crédito al sector privado.

El cuadro de indicadores solo es un filtro inicial del procedimiento, y las decisiones sobre la existencia de desequilibrios, o desequilibrios excesivos, no se derivan automáticamente de los indicadores del cuadro. El análisis realizado por la Comisión en el contexto del PDM tiene en cuenta todos los indicadores y toda la información de que se dispone, con inclusión, en su caso, del tamaño del sector bancario. Para más detalles sobre la aplicación del PDM, sírvase remitirse a la Comunicación de 10 de abril de 2003 ⁽³⁾ y a los exámenes exhaustivos de 2013 relativos a 13 países ⁽⁴⁾.

La Comisión se propone adoptar este verano una propuesta relativa a un mecanismo único de resolución. Por ahora no se considera la posibilidad de introducir un sistema paneuropeo de garantía de depósitos.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/03/21/us-eurozone-cyprus-banking-size-idUSBRE92K0YK20130321>

⁽²⁾ SWD (2012) 389 final de 14.11.2012, disponible en:

http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/economic_governance/documents/alert_mechanism_report_2013_financial_sector_en.pdf

⁽³⁾ «Resultados de los exámenes exhaustivos con arreglo al Reglamento (UE) n° 1176/2011, relativo a la prevención y corrección de los desequilibrios macroeconómicos», COM(2013) 199 final.

⁽⁴⁾ European Economy-Occasional Papers, nos 132 a 144.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003383/13
to the Commission**

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)

(25 March 2013)

Subject: Cypriot banking sector

The Commission has the power to propose macroeconomic recommendations to Member States in the euro area, following the adoption of the 'Six-Pack'. These recommendations are based on the analysis of a set of indicators considered essential for assessing the situation in each Member State over and above the size of its public debt.

Cyprus has had to request an EU bailout after its banks became insolvent. As well as the specific reasons that led to this situation, a major factor was the Mediterranean island's oversized banking sector in relation to its GDP ⁽¹⁾. As a result, public funds alone cannot cover recapitalisation costs and the country has had to resort to bailing-in deposits. The country-specific recommendations for Cyprus, dated November 2012, did not consider the size of its financial sector to be a risk factor for its economy.

This bail-in has caused distrust among savers throughout the euro area, who fear that the same measure may be applied to them in other circumstances. One possible way to build confidence among citizens and investors would be to create a deposit insurance and resolution fund similar to that in the United States.

1. Will the Commission include in the Macroeconomic Imbalance Procedure Scoreboard an indicator to monitor the absolute size of a Member State's financial sector in relation to its GDP?
2. As part of its blueprint for the future of the Monetary Union, will it make a legislative proposal for the creation of a European Deposit Insurance and Resolution Fund to restore the confidence of citizens and investors?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission

(7 June 2013)

There is no plan at the moment to include such an indicator in the Macroeconomic Imbalance Procedure (MIP) scoreboard. However, the scoreboard already includes the growth rate of total financial sector liabilities. The indicator is a very broad measure of the expansion of the exposure to potential risks in the financial sector. Experience has shown that a fast expansion of the financial sector, more than the large size of the sector itself, has often been relevant in financial crises. For more details on this indicator, the Honourable Member is referred to the Commission Staff Working Paper: 'Completing the Scoreboard for the MIP: Financial Sector Indicator.' ⁽²⁾ The scoreboard also includes other financial indicators like the private sector debt and the private sector credit flows.

The scoreboard is only an initial filter of the procedure and the decisions on the existence of imbalances, or excessive imbalances, do not depend mechanically on the scoreboard indicators. The analysis undertaken by the Commission in the context of the MIP takes into account all available indicators and information, including where appropriate the size of the banking sector. For more details on the implementation of the MIP, please refer to the communication of 10 April 2013 ⁽³⁾ and the 2013 in-depth reviews for thirteen countries ⁽⁴⁾.

The Commission is to adopt a proposal on the Single Resolution Mechanism this summer. The issue of a pan-European Deposit Guarantee System is not being considered at this stage.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/03/21/us-eurozone-cyprus-banking-size-idUSBRE92K0YK20130321>

⁽²⁾ SWD (2012) 389 final of 14.11.2012, available at:

http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/economic_governance/documents/alert_mechanism_report_2013_financial_sector_en.pdf

⁽³⁾ 'Results of in-depth reviews under Regulation (EU) No 1176/2011 on the prevention and correction of macroeconomic imbalances,' COM(2013) 199 final.

⁽⁴⁾ European Economy-Occasional Papers, 132 to 144.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003384/13
a la Comisión**

Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)

(25 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Desfibriladores en las instituciones europeas

Según le consta al diputado al Parlamento Europeo que formula la presente pregunta, la Comisión Europea está prestando apoyo a los Estados miembros en el ámbito de los paros cardíacos a través de proyectos financiados por el Programa de Salud de la UE como, por ejemplo, EuroHeart I y II, Eurhobop y SITS EAST.

Según las estadísticas de Eurostat ⁽¹⁾, la muerte súbita cardíaca es una de las principales causas de muerte en Europa. La desfibrilación precoz —en los primeros minutos del colapso— aumenta considerablemente la tasa de supervivencia del afectado.

En este contexto, ¿hará un esfuerzo la Comisión para asegurar que todas las instituciones europeas disponen de desfibriladores externos automáticos?

Respuesta del Sr. Šefčovič en nombre de la Comisión

(22 de mayo de 2013)

La Comisión no tiene competencias en cuanto a la instalación de desfibriladores en otras Instituciones.

Sin embargo, ha empezado a instalar desfibriladores en sus edificios o grupos de edificios y trabaja para que la totalidad de los mismos esté equipada a finales del año 2013.

(1) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Causes_of_death_statistics/es#Enfermedades_respiratorias

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003384/13
to the Commission**

Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)

(25 March 2013)

Subject: Defibrillators in the EU institutions

I understand that the Commission is providing funding under the EU health programme for projects such as EuroHeart I and II, EURHOBOP and SITS-EAST to help Member States respond when a person suffers a cardiac arrest.

According to Eurostat figures ⁽¹⁾, cardiac arrests are one of the leading causes of death in Europe. Early defibrillation — within minutes of collapse — considerably increases the patient's chance of survival.

Will the Commission therefore make sure that all EU institutions are equipped with automated external defibrillators?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M Šefčovič au nom de la Commission

(22 mai 2013)

La Commission n'est pas compétente en matière d'installation de défibrillateurs dans d'autres Institutions.

La Commission a pour sa part commencé à installer des défibrillateurs dans ses bâtiments ou groupes de bâtiments et prévoit que l'ensemble de ceux-ci sera équipé pour la fin de l'année 2013.

⁽¹⁾ See 'Respiratory diseases' section of http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Causes_of_death_statistics.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003385/13
an die Kommission
Jutta Steinruck (S&D)
(25. März 2013)

Betrifft: Tierkörperbeseitigung

Der Zweckverband Tierkörperbeseitigung in Rheinland-Pfalz, dem Saarland, Rheingau-Taunus-Kreis und Landkreis Limburg-Weilburg wurde in Rheinland-Pfalz durch ein Landesgesetz errichtet und nimmt in den genannten Gebieten die Tierkörperbeseitigung als durch Bundes- und Landesgesetz übertragenen Aufgabe wahr. Zur Beseitigung von jährlich rund 85 000 Tonnen Tierkörpern und tierischen Abfällen betreibt er in Rivenich und Sandersmühle (beides in Rheinland-Pfalz) Beseitigungsanlagen.

Durch EU-Richtlinien kommt dem Zweckverband außerdem die Aufgabe zu, Reservekapazitäten für den Fall einer Seuche vorzuhalten. Dafür bezahlen die Kommunen im Einzugsgebiet eine jährliche Umlage von insgesamt 1,7 Mio. EUR. Alle weiteren Kosten werden durch die Gebühren der Schlachtbetriebe, durch Kostenerstattungen für verendete Tiere und Erlöse aus dem Verkauf der hergestellten Mehle und Fette vollständig abgedeckt.

Die Umlagefinanzierung für die Reservekapazitäten waren Bestandteil eines von der Kommission eröffneten Wettbewerbsverfahrens und der Zweckverband wurde aufgefordert, die seit 1998 geleisteten Zahlungen in Höhe von ca. 42 Mio. EUR zurückzuzahlen.

Da der Zweckverband dieses nicht leisten kann, droht die Eröffnung eines Vertragsverletzungsverfahrens, in dessen Folge das Land dem Zweckverband den Auftrag entzieht und ihn damit vom Markt nimmt. Die Aufgabe selbst wird dann ausgeschrieben.

Nach bisherigem Kenntnisstand könnten nur die Firma Rethmann Group und einige Töchterfirmen ein Angebot einreichen, da es sonst keine weiteren Marktakteure gibt. Wenn die Rethman Group den Auftrag bekommt, wird sie in Deutschland faktisch ein Monopol besitzen.

1. Mit welcher Begründung stellt die Kommission einen Verstoß gegen das Beihilferecht fest, wenn Kommunen und Länder ihrer Verpflichtung nachkommen und Reservekapazitäten zur Tierkörperbeseitigung aufrechterhalten?
2. Ist sich die Kommission der weiteren Monopolisierung eines Marktes bewusst, wenn der genannte Zweckverband nicht weiter für die öffentlichen Körperschaften Aufgaben wahrnehmen kann?

Antwort von Herrn Almunia im Namen der Kommission
(6. Juni 2013)

Zu dem von der Frau Abgeordneten dargelegten Sachverhalt:

Die Verpflichtung zur Vorhaltung von Reservekapazitäten gründet nicht auf EU-Rechtsvorschriften, sondern auf einem Beschluss der lokalen Behörden. Die Kommission ist nach den Vorschriften für staatliche Beihilfen nicht befugt, ein Vertragsverletzungsverfahren gegen den Verband einzuleiten. Vielmehr ist Deutschland gemäß Kommissionsbeschluss⁽¹⁾ verpflichtet, die Beihilfen vom Verband zurückzufordern. Da Deutschland dieser Verpflichtung bis jetzt nicht nachgekommen ist, kann die Kommission gemäß Artikel 108 Absatz 2 AEUV Deutschland vor dem Gerichtshof verklagen. Die Kommission kann nicht bestätigen, ob die Rückforderung dazu geführt hat, dass der Verband vom Markt genommen wurde. Die Kommission merkt an, dass der Verband aufgrund seines Rechtsstatus als Körperschaft des öffentlichen Rechts möglicherweise vor Insolvenz geschützt ist. Dies kann an sich eine mit dem Gemeinsamen Markt unvereinbare staatliche Beihilfe darstellen. Schließlich werden die zuständigen nationalen Behörden durch den Kommissionsbeschluss nicht verpflichtet, die Aufgabe auszuscheiden. In Übereinstimmung mit der Rechtsprechung zu den Rechtssachen Telaustria und Parking Brixen obliegt es ihnen, über die künftige Organisation zu entscheiden.

Frage 1: Die Kommission verweist die Frau Abgeordnete auf die Erwägungsgründe ihres Beschlusses.

Frage 2: Die Kommission verfügt nicht über detaillierte Informationen über die aktuelle Marktlage in Deutschland.

⁽¹⁾ Beschluss 2012/485/EU der Kommission vom 25. April 2012 über die staatliche Beihilfe SA.25051 (C 19/10) (ex NN 23/10), die Deutschland zugunsten des Zweckverbands Tierkörperbeseitigung in Rheinland-Pfalz, im Saarland, im Rheingau-Taunus-Kreis und im Landkreis Limburg-Weilburg gewährt hat (ABl. L 236 vom 1.9.2012, S. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003385/13
to the Commission
Jutta Steinruck (S&D)
(25 March 2013)

Subject: Disposal of animal carcasses

The Zweckverband Tierkörperbeseitigung (special-purpose association for animal carcass disposal) in Rhineland-Palatinate, Saarland, the Rheingau-Taunus district and the district of Limburg-Weilburg was established in Rhineland-Palatinate by means of a federal state law and takes care of the disposal of animal carcasses in the aforementioned areas as a task conferred on it by federal and federal state law. For the disposal of around 85 000 tonnes of animal carcasses and animal waste each year it operates disposal installations in Rivenich and Sandersmühle (both in Rhineland-Palatinate).

Under EU directives, the association is also responsible for maintaining reserve capacity in case there is an epidemic. The municipalities in the catchment area pay an annual contribution of EUR 1.7 million in total for this. All further costs are covered in full by fees from slaughterhouses, reimbursements for mortalities and revenue from the sale of the meals and fats produced.

The funding of the reserve capacity through contributions was the subject of competition proceedings initiated by the Commission and the association was required to pay back payments made since 1998, amounting to approximately EUR 42 million.

Since the association cannot afford this, it is threatened with the initiation of an infringement procedure, the consequence of which being that the federal state will divest it of its task, thereby removing it from the market. The task itself will then be put out to tender.

On the basis of information currently available, only the Rethmann Group and a few subsidiaries would be able to submit a bid, as there are no other market operators. If the Rethmann Group is awarded the task it will de facto have a monopoly in Germany.

1. How does the Commission justify its conclusion that there has been a violation of state aid rules when the municipalities and federal states are fulfilling their obligation and maintaining reserve capacity for the disposal of animal carcasses?
2. Is the Commission aware that there will be further monopolisation of a market if the aforementioned association can no longer carry out its duties for the public bodies?

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

On the facts as set out by the Honourable Member:

The obligation to maintain a reserve capacity is not based on EU legislation, but based on a decision taken by the local authorities. The Commission has no power, under state aid rules, to launch an infringement procedure against the association. Rather, Germany is obliged, under the decision⁽¹⁾, to recover the aid from the association. Thus far, Germany has not done so. Therefore, the Commission may refer Germany to the Court pursuant to Article 108(2) TFEU. The Commission cannot confirm whether recovery lead to the removal of the association from the market. The Commission notes that the association, by virtue of its legal status as a Koerperschaft des Oeffentlichen Rechts, may be shielded against insolvency. This may constitute by and in itself incompatible state aid. Finally, the decision does not oblige the competent national authorities to tender out the operations. It is up to them, in compliance with the Telaustria and Parking Brixen case law, to decide on the future organisation.

Question 1: The Commission refers the Honourable Member to the motivation of its Decision.

Question 2: The Commission does not have at its disposal detailed information on the current market situation in Germany.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 236/1 of 1.9.2012, Commission decision of 25 April 2012 on state aid SA.25051 (C 19/10) (ex NN 23/10) granted by Germany to the Zweckverband Tierkörperbeseitigung in Rhineland-Palatinate, Saarland, Rheingau-Taunus-Kreis and Landkreis Limburg-Weilburg (2012/485/EU).

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-003387/13
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin)**

Jürgen Klute (GUE/NGL)

(26. März 2013)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Klarstellungen zum Engagement der EU für den Mercosur und die Demokratie in Paraguay

Am 24. August 2012 nahm die Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin wie folgt Stellung zum Ausschluss Paraguays aus dem Mercosur:

„Die EU ist fest entschlossen, ein Assoziierungsabkommen mit dem Mercosur abzuschließen, und arbeitet weiter darauf hin. Es liegt am Mercosur zu entscheiden, wie er sich aufstellt“.

Nach dem Vertrag von Lissabon kann sich kein einzelner Mitgliedstaat mit einem von der EU abgeschlossenen internationalen Abkommen befassen, sondern dafür sind ausschließlich die Kommission und der Rat zuständig.

Kann die Kommission dazu folgende Fragen beantworten:

1. Welche Maßnahmen wird die Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin angesichts der jüngsten öffentlichen Erklärungen des deutschen Botschafters in Paraguay ergreifen, der verlauten ließ, dass — erstens — die EU nicht mit dem Mercosur verhandele, wenn Paraguay ausgeschlossen bleibe, und — zweitens — Paraguay weiterhin vollwertiges Mitglied des Mercosur sei?
2. Welche Maßnahmen wird die Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin ergreifen, nachdem der deutsche Außenminister eine offizielle Einladung an einen Vertreter der Regierung Federico Francos ausgesprochen hat, obwohl das ordnungsgemäße Verfahren bei der Amtsenthebung des früheren Präsidenten Fernando Lugo vom Genfer Menschenrechtsausschuss, dem Mercosur, der OAS, der UNASUR und der CELAC infrage gestellt worden ist und obwohl diese Einladung im Widerspruch zum allgemeinen Konsens in der Region steht?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission

(24. April 2013)

1. Der Herr Abgeordnete nimmt auf einen Artikel der lokalen Presse Bezug, in dem auf eine Äußerung des deutschen Botschafters in Asunción zur Beteiligung Paraguays an den Verhandlungen zwischen der EU und dem Mercosur eingegangen wurde. In der betreffenden Pressekonferenz wurden jedoch die Beziehungen zwischen Deutschland und Federico Franco erörtert, nicht aber die Verhandlungen der EU mit Mercosur oder andere Themen, die mit der EU im Zusammenhang stehen. Der Botschafter Deutschlands sprach in seiner Eigenschaft als Vertreter seines Landes.

Die EU verhandelt mit dem Mercosur als einer regionalen Organisation, und es obliegt dem Mercosur, über seine interne Organisation zu entscheiden.

2. Guido Westerwelle handelte in seiner Eigenschaft als Außenminister Deutschlands.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-003387/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

Jürgen Klute (GUE/NGL)

(26 March 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Clarifications regarding the EU's commitment to concluding an association agreement with Mercosur, and democracy in Paraguay

In her answer to an inquiry about the suspension of Paraguay from Mercosur, the Vice-President/High Representative said on 24 August 2012 that 'the EU is committed to concluding an Association Agreement with Mercosur and will continue to work towards it. It is up to Mercosur to decide how they organise themselves.'

According to the Lisbon Treaty, international agreements concluded by the EU can only be handled by the Commission and the Council, not by individual Member States.

1. What measures will the Vice-President/High Representative take in response to the recent public declarations by the German Ambassador to Paraguay to the effect that, firstly, the EU will not negotiate with Mercosur unless Paraguay is included and, secondly, 'Paraguay remains a full member of Mercosur'?
2. What measures will the Vice-President/High Representative take in light of the German Minister of Foreign Affairs having sent an official invitation addressed to a representative of Federico Franco's government, despite the fact that the respect of due process in the destitution of former President Fernando Lugo has been questioned by the Geneva Human Rights Committee, Mercosur, the Organisation of American States, the Union of South American Nations and the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States and that this invitation breaks with the general consensus in the region?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(24 April 2013)

1. The reference is made to a local press article that presented an interpretation made of a comment on the presence of Paraguay in the EU-Mercosur negotiations made by the German ambassador in Asuncion. The press conference dealt with the subject of the Franco-German relationship and not with the Mercosur negotiations or any other EU related subject. The ambassador for Germany spoke in his capacity as representative of his country.

The EU negotiates with Mercosur as a regional organisation and it is up to Mercosur to decide on its internal organisation.

2. Guido Westerwelle acted in his capacity of German Minister of Foreign Affairs.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-003388/13
to the Commission
Nessa Childers (S&D)
(26 March 2013)

Subject: Liquidation of Anglo Irish Bank and credit unions

Many Irish credit unions are presently carrying a loss of around EUR 15 million in funds belonging to their members, as a direct result of the Irish Government's decision to liquidate the Irish Bank Resolution Corporation (IBRC) and the timing of that decision. Clearly, this is a matter of great concern to the Irish League of Credit Unions (ILCU), their member credit unions and, in turn, credit union members, who are the ordinary people of Ireland.

In 2005, several ILCU-affiliated credit unions invested in the Anglo Irish Bank's deposit-based tracker bonds.

Like many others, credit unions have long been encouraged and advised to invest excess funds in secure deposits with highly rated financial institutions. Anglo Irish Bank was an A-rated institution at the time these deposit-based tracker bonds were purchased and the purchase was fully permitted under the Irish legislation (Trustee Authorised Investments Order, 1998) with which credit unions were compelled to comply at that time.

The credit unions claim that when Anglo Irish Bank deposits were transferred to Allied Irish Bank in 2011, Anglo/IBRC refused to transfer the deposit-based tracker bonds, despite repeated requests from credit unions to do so.

Each of the 16 credit unions has now received EUR 100 000 from the state's Deposit Guarantee Scheme (this being the maximum available under the terms of that scheme). While the average investment in these deposits by credit unions was EUR 1 million, some credit unions invested EUR 2 million and are now carrying a loss of EUR 1.9 million. Again, this is money which belongs to the ordinary credit union members of Ireland.

The Irish Department of Finance recently confirmed that since these deposits are not covered by the state's eligible liabilities guarantee scheme, any further claim by credit unions for the outstanding balances will only be addressed if funds remain available at the end of the liquidation process for the purposes of distribution to unsecured creditors. The special liquidator has indicated that he considers it unlikely that any funds will remain for this purpose.

The Irish Government has by its actions, it is claimed, caused a loss of EUR 15 million to the credit union movement in Ireland.

Does the Commission have an opinion as to whether this action is in breach of Ireland's bailout conditions? What options are available to the member credit unions in order to recover these deposits?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(13 May 2013)

The resolution of IBRC was an important step in the restructuring of the Irish financial sector which significantly reinforced the sustainability of the well-performing Irish programme. The Commission believes that Member States in the EU are obliged to ensure full and effective protection of depositors, even in times of severe crisis. That is why all depositors in the EU have since 2010 been guaranteed up to EUR 100 000. As part of the resolution of IBRC the Irish authorities fully met their commitments under the Deposit Guarantee Scheme and the 'ELG' ⁽¹⁾ introduced in December 2009. As the Anglo Irish Bank Credit Union Bond 2005 was issued in 2005 it is not covered by the ELG as it pre dates the scheme. While it is very regrettable that any losses may incur to Irish Credit Unions as a result of the resolution of IBRC, the process fully respected the relevant guarantee applicable to the Anglo Irish Bank Credit Union Bond 2005 in a liquidation procedure. The resolution of IBRC is not in breach of Ireland's bailout condition.

The Commission is very conscious of the important role played by Credit Unions in the Irish financial sector particularly for the financially excluded or the less well-off members of the community. In light of this the restructuring of Credit Unions is a key priority of the financial sector reforms under the EU/IMF programme. The Credit Union Restructuring Board, ReBo, has been established and a Resolution Fund has been created with EUR 250 million committed to the sector and a further EUR 250 million has been allocated to the ReBo to assist with restructuring vulnerable credit unions during the next three years. The relevant credit unions should engage directly with the special liquidator appointed to IBRC and where necessary the ReBo

⁽¹⁾ Eligible Liabilities Guarantee Scheme.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-003389/13
to the Commission**

Martina Anderson (GUE/NGL)

(26 March 2013)

Subject: FLAG (fisheries local action groups) funding

Can the Commission:

1. Clarify how much funding has been allocated to Ireland under Axis 4 of the European Fisheries Fund?
2. Clarify how much funding has been allocated to Ireland under Axes 1, 2 and 3 of the European Fisheries Fund?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission

(3 May 2013)

As stipulated in Article 20 of the regulation on the European Fisheries Fund ⁽¹⁾ (EFF), the operational programme is drawn up by the Member State after consultations with the local and regional economic and social partners in the fisheries and aquaculture sector and following an *ex-ante* evaluation and an analysis of policy areas eligible for support in term of strengths and weaknesses. The choice of priority axes was therefore a strategic decision made by the Member State.

As a result, the Irish authorities chose initially to allocate the EFF as follows: EUR 34 766 000 for measures to adapt the fleet (Axis 1), null for aquaculture, inland fishing and processing and marketing (Axis 2), EUR 6 000 000 for measures of common interest (Axis 3) and EUR 1 500 603 for sustainable development of fisheries areas (Axis 4). They have informed the Commission that they now amend it as follows: EUR 29 936 500 for Axis 1, EUR 6 245 603 for Axis 2, EUR 5 046 500 for Axis 3 and EUR 788 000 for Axis 4. The remaining amount of EUR 250 000 is allocated to technical assistance.

The text of the EFF Seafood Development Operational Programme 2007-2013 is available on the Irish government web page (<http://www.agriculture.gov.ie/>). For further details, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine — Marine Agencies & Programmes Division.

⁽¹⁾ Council Regulation (EC) No 1198/2006 of 27 July 2006, OJ L 223, 15.8.2006, p. 1.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita P-003390/13

à Comissão

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)

(26 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Estudo sobre as consequências do fim das quotas leiteiras

Recentemente, foi trazido ao conhecimento público que a Comissão Europeia teria em seu poder um estudo sobre as consequências do fim das quotas leiteiras, com indicações ao nível de cada Estado-Membro. Alegadamente, uma das conclusões deste estudo aponta para que o fim das quotas tenha consequências desastrosas para a produção leiteira em vários países, como é o caso de Portugal.

Ora, o conhecimento público deste estudo e das suas conclusões é de evidente importância no atual contexto de reforma da Política Agrícola Comum e quando a Comissão Europeia insiste em dismantelar este importantíssimo instrumento de regulação da produção. A não divulgação pública deste estudo é assim, a todos os títulos, incompreensível e reprovável.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Confirma a realização deste estudo e as conclusões supramencionadas?
2. Em caso afirmativo, porque não foi o mesmo divulgado até à data? Quando pensa divulgá-lo?
3. Perante crescentes evidências relativas às consequências assimétricas do fim das quotas leiteiras, e tendo em conta que os «contratos» não resolverão o problema da limitação da produção, considera a Comissão a possibilidade de propor a reversão da decisão de acabar com as quotas e proceder ao seu ajuste às necessidades de cada país?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloș em nome da Comissão

(23 de abril de 2013)

1. São muitos os estudos publicados sobre os potenciais efeitos da abolição do regime de quotas leiteiras na UE. O Senhor Deputado refere-se certamente a dois estudos independentes realizados a pedido da Comissão em 2008 («Análise económica dos efeitos do fim do regime de quotas leiteiras da UE») e em 2009 («Impacto económico da abolição do regime de quotas leiteiras — análise regional da produção leiteira na União Europeia»). As conclusões e pareceres apresentadas nos relatórios são os dos consultores e não refletem necessariamente a opinião da Comissão Europeia. Ambos os estudos fazem projeções baseadas em pressupostos e cenários diferentes e nenhum deles prevê um impacto desastroso em qualquer Estado-Membro específico.

A Comissão está neste momento a realizar um novo estudo com vista a obter uma análise prospetiva sobre a evolução mais provável do setor do leite no futuro contexto sem quotas com base nos pontos de vista de um conjunto de peritos independentes. Os resultados deste estudo serão discutidos numa conferência que terá lugar em setembro de 2013 e em que serão convidados a participar as partes interessadas, os Estados-Membros e os representantes das instituições europeias.

2. Os estudos promovidos e financiados pela Comissão, tais como os mencionados no ponto anterior, estão publicados e à disposição do público no sítio Web da DG Agricultura ⁽¹⁾.

3. À luz da reforma da Política Agrícola Comum (PAC), a proposta da Comissão não altera a decisão tomada em 2003 pelo legislador de abolir as quotas leiteiras em 2015. Além disso, o Conselho e o Parlamento Europeu, nas suas posições até agora expressas no âmbito das negociações da PAC, apoiaram a proposta da Comissão de não prolongar o regime de quotas leiteiras após 2015.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/external-studies/index_en.htm

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-003390/13
to the Commission**

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)

(26 March 2013)

Subject: Abolition of milk quotas: study on the consequences

It has recently been reported that the Commission has a study in its possession describing how the abolition of milk quotas is making itself felt in the individual Member States. The study has allegedly concluded that the ending of the quota system is having a disastrous impact on milk production in several countries, including Portugal.

It is clearly important for this study and its findings to be brought to public notice, now that the common agricultural policy is in the process of reform and the Commission is bent on dismantling this vital production regulation tool. The failure to publish the study, therefore, is totally incomprehensible and wrong.

1. Can the Commission confirm that a study has been compiled and that its findings are as stated above?
2. If that is the case, why has the study not yet been made public? When does the Commission intend to publish it?
3. Given that the inequalities brought about are becoming increasingly more apparent and 'contracts' will not remove the constraints on production, could the Commission reverse the decision abolishing the quota system, so as to enable quotas to be adjusted according to each country's needs?

Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission

(23 April 2013)

1. Many studies have been issued on the potential effects of the abolition of the milk quota system in the EU. The Honourable Member might be referring to two independent studies commanded by the Commission in 2008 ('Economic analysis of the effects of the expiry of the EU milk quota system') and 2009 ('Economic Impact of the Abolition of the Milk Quota Regime — Regional Analysis of the Milk Production in the EU'). The conclusions and opinions presented in the reports are those of the consultants and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the European Commission. Both studies make projections based on different assumptions and scenarios, and neither estimates a disastrous impact in any specific Member State.

The Commission is currently running a new study to obtain a prospective analysis on the most likely evolution of the milk sector based on the viewpoints of a number of independent experts in the future context without quotas. The results of this study will be discussed in a conference that will take place in September 2013, where the stakeholders, Member States and representatives from the European institutions will be invited to participate.

2. The studies promoted and financed by the Commission, such as those mentioned in the preceding point, are published and available to the general public in the DG Agriculture website ⁽¹⁾.

3. In the light of the CAP reform, the Commission proposal on the table does not change the decision taken by the legislator in 2003 to abolish milk quotas in 2015. Moreover, the Council and the European Parliament, in their positions expressed so far under the CAP reform negotiations, supported the Commission proposal not to prolong the milk quota system after 2015.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/external-studies/index_en.htm

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003391/13
to the Commission
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(26 March 2013)**

Subject: Property rights of the Catholic community in Sevastopol

I have recently been alarmed to learn of the plight of the Roman Catholic community in Sevastopol, Ukraine. Its old church, a landmark of architectural and historical significance, survived the Second World War intact, but was converted by the Soviet authorities into a cinema. The local church has been campaigning for over 15 years to reclaim the building, but its calls have gone unheeded — even since the building became vacant two years ago. Orthodox and Muslim congregations have been granted their own premises, but the Catholic community alone is denied its rightful place of worship.

Senior clergy have complained not only that their appeals have been ignored, but that state officials have taken to ridiculing and insulting them in public. A member of the local council considering the case even claimed that all the city's Catholics were fascists who were attempting to usurp the Orthodox Church.

Given President Yanukovich's statements about human rights and religious freedom — in particular his call in April 2011 to return religious buildings to their rightful organisations — and also Ukraine's desire for closer EU integration, the treatment of Sevastopol's Catholics could be seen as a totemic issue for both religious and property rights in the country.

1. What steps is the Commission taking to raise the issue of religious freedom and property rights in Ukraine as part of that country's deepening dialogue and integration with the EU?
2. Does the Commission have a broader policy on the return of religious buildings to their erstwhile institutions in former Soviet and Soviet-bloc countries?

**Question for written answer E-003392/13
to the Commission
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(26 March 2013)**

Subject: Property rights of the Catholic community in Sevastopol

I have recently been alarmed to learn of the plight of the Roman Catholic community in Sevastopol, Ukraine. Its old church, a landmark of architectural and historical significance, survived the Second World War intact, but was converted by the Soviet authorities into a cinema. The local church has been campaigning for over 15 years to reclaim the building, but its calls have gone unheeded — even since the building became vacant two years ago. Orthodox and Muslim congregations have been granted their own premises, but the Catholic community alone is denied its rightful place of worship.

Senior clergy have complained not only that their appeals have been ignored, but that state officials have taken to ridiculing and insulting them in public. A member of the local council considering the case even claimed that all the city's Catholics were fascists who were attempting to usurp the Orthodox Church.

Given President Yanukovich's statements about human rights and religious freedom — in particular his call in April 2011 to return religious buildings to their rightful organisations — and also Ukraine's desire for closer EU integration, the treatment of Sevastopol's Catholics could be seen as a totemic issue for both religious and property rights in the country.

1. Is the Commission aware of the property dispute in Sevastopol, and does it take a view on it?
2. What steps is the Commission taking to raise the issue of religious freedom and property rights in Ukraine as part of that country's deepening dialogue and integration with the EU?
3. Does the Commission have a broader policy on the return of religious buildings to their erstwhile institutions in former Soviet and Soviet-bloc countries?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission*(23 May 2013)*

Restitution legislation is a national competence and therefore all decisions taken in this respect are in the hands of the national governments. Within the ongoing dialogue between the EU institutions and religious organisations, EU policies and issues that are of concern to the churches with a view to legislative and policy-making processes are discussed.

The EU monitors the matter of freedom of religion in Ukraine as reflected in the yearly ENP country progress report on Ukraine ⁽¹⁾, including with respect to the restitution of religious buildings and other property issues. In its political dialogues with Ukraine, the EU repeatedly encouraged the national authorities to engage into the resolution of outstanding issues raised by religious organisations.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/docs/2013_enp_pack/2013_progress_report_ukraine_en.pdf

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003393/13
to the Commission
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(26 March 2013)**

Subject: Persecution of Christians in Pakistan

The law in Pakistan states that anyone convicted of committing blasphemy can receive a sentence ranging from a fine to the death penalty. The Human Rights Commission of Pakistan (HRCP) has reported that whilst Muslims constitute the majority of those booked under these laws, hundreds of Christians are among the accused, with at least 12 having received the death sentence for blaspheming against Islam since 1988. Many of the lower court trials in which such penalties are handed out are also deeply flawed. This is evident from the fact that many cases are rejected on appeal in the higher courts due to lack of evidence, faults in due process or obvious wrongful motives on the part of the complainants.

Increasingly, however, this discrimination is going beyond mere accusations and court proceedings and taking the form of targeted violence. The Washington-based Middle East Media Research Institute recommended in September 2012 that Pakistan be placed on a 'genocide watch'. To take a recent example, on 8 March 2013 an allegation of blasphemy against a Christian in Pakistan prompted hundreds of Christian families to flee Badami Bagh, a working-class sector of Lahore, before their houses were burned down. Many Christians are now fleeing Pakistan to escape such potential violence.

On 25 March 2013, a demonstration was held in front of the European Parliament, organised by Pakistan Minority Aid, the Pakistan Christian Party and the Centre for Legal Aid Assistance and Settlement (CLAAS), to raise further awareness of structural discrimination in Pakistan's legislation and constitution, religious persecution and violence against religious minorities, and the kidnapping and forced conversion of young women and girls.

1. How much of the EU's aid budget is earmarked for Christian minorities in Pakistan?
2. Would the Commission consider increasing this amount in the next aid review?

**Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(13 May 2013)**

The Commission does not earmark funds for specific religious groups. It supports the protection and promotion of the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion or belief independently of its content; also recognising the right to change religion or not to follow any religion.

Freedom of religion or belief is one of the four priorities identified in the EU Human Rights Country Strategy for Pakistan (2011, updated February 2013). To implement the strategy, the EU Delegation is supporting actions on preventing and responding to religious intolerance and discrimination. Two programmes for a total of EUR 5.81 million are about to start during 2013.

Support for human rights defenders is an established element of the EU's human rights external relations policy. A special fund from the European initiative for democracy and human rights allows for rapid assistance in the form of small grants in support to human rights defenders at risk. Thanks to one of these small grants given to a local organisation, persons accused of blasphemy in Pakistan are receiving legal representation.

Freedom of religion or belief and the specific situation of members and communities belonging to religious minorities are regularly addressed in the political dialogue with the Government of Pakistan. The EU has made its views on the blasphemy laws clear. The Commission refers the Honourable Member to the answers to previous written questions E-010472/2012 and E-004204/2012 ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html>

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003395/13
alla Commissione
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(26 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Aumento della violenza contro le donne in Svezia

Il 6 marzo 2013 a Stoccolma è stato denunciato uno stupro di gruppo ai danni di una ragazza di 15 anni aggredita da almeno sei uomini. Si è trattato già del terzo stupro di gruppo denunciato quest'anno alla polizia e verificatosi nella zona di Stoccolma. In Svezia tra il 2003 e il 2010 le aggressioni sessuali e gli stupri sono aumentati del 254 % e le donne prese di mira sono una su quattro. A Stoccolma nel 2012 si sono verificati mediamente cinque stupri al giorno. A livello mondiale la Svezia registra il secondo dato più alto per episodi di stupro, con 63,5 stupri ogni 100 000 abitanti nel 2010. Stando alle statistiche ufficiali della polizia svedese, l'80 % dei casi viene commesso da immigrati o richiedenti asilo.

Secondo un'indagine delle Nazioni Unite volta ad analizzare le statistiche sui reati a livello mondiale, i paesi con la più alta incidenza pro capite di stupri, definiti dalle Nazioni Unite «rapporto sessuale senza un valido consenso», sono Botswana, Svezia, Nicaragua, Grenada e Regno Unito. Nell'Europa occidentale le statistiche sugli stupri aumentano ogni anno, in particolare in Svezia, Regno Unito, Belgio, Francia e Paesi Bassi.

1. È la Commissione a conoscenza dell'aumento dei casi di stupro nell'UE?
2. Ha istituito eventuali meccanismi per monitorare tali reati?
3. Quali misure intende adottare per garantire la sicurezza dei suoi cittadini e proteggerli dai crimini?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(27 maggio 2013)

Spetta all'autorità nazionale indagare su questo tipo di reato e perseguirlo. Numerosi dati confermano che in tutta l'Unione europea alla maggior parte dei casi di stupro non consegue una condanna.

Allo stadio attuale, non sono disponibili a livello dell'UE dati ufficiali e comparabili sulla violenza di genere. L'Istituto europeo per l'uguaglianza di genere (EIGE) sviluppa strumenti per raccogliere risorse e dati comparabili e affidabili sulla violenza contro le donne ⁽¹⁾, attualmente oggetto di un'indagine condotta dall'Agenzia per i diritti fondamentali (FRA) ⁽²⁾, i cui risultati saranno disponibili nel 2014 e forniranno dati a livello dell'UE su tutte le forme di violenza contro le donne.

Lo stupro è una grave violazione delle libertà fondamentali della vittima. La Commissione è impegnata a dare una forte risposta politica per combattere tutte le forme di violenza contro le donne, soprattutto attraverso il conferimento di potere alle donne, le campagne di sensibilizzazione, l'azione legislativa, lo scambio di buone prassi, il miglioramento delle conoscenze e la raccolta di dati.

Al fine di proteggere e assistere le vittime, nell'ottobre 2012 ⁽³⁾ è stata adottata la nuova direttiva 2012/29/UE che istituisce norme minime in materia di diritti, assistenza e protezione delle vittime di reato e garantirà l'adozione di tutta una serie di misure speciali intese a proteggere e sostenere le vittime vulnerabili e quindi anche le donne che subiscono reati sessuali. La direttiva sottolinea inoltre la necessità di formare gli operatori della giustizia, vale a dire gli agenti di polizia, i pubblici ministeri e i giudici, sui bisogni delle vittime. Tale formazione è indispensabile per cambiare l'atteggiamento nei loro confronti e far sì che vengano trattate con rispetto e comprensione.

⁽¹⁾ Gli studi dell'EIGE sono disponibili alla pagina: <http://www.eige.europa.eu/content/activities/Gender-based-violence>

⁽²⁾ Le informazioni sull'indagine in corso dell'Agenzia per i diritti fondamentali sono disponibili al seguente indirizzo: <http://fra.europa.eu/en/project/2012/fra-survey-womens-well-being-and-safety-europe>

⁽³⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:315:0057:0073:IT:PDF>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003395/13
to the Commission
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(26 March 2013)**

Subject: Increase in violence against women in Sweden

On 6 March 2013, a gang rape was reported in Stockholm in which a 15 year old girl was attacked by at least six men. This was already the third gang rape reported to police in the Stockholm area this year. Sex attacks and rapes increased by 254% in Sweden between 2003 and 2010, with one in four women having been targeted. In 2012 there were on average five rapes a day in Stockholm. With 63.5 rapes per 100 000 inhabitants in 2010, Sweden has the second highest figures for rape in the world. According to official statistics from the Swedish police, 80% of cases were committed by immigrants or asylum-seekers.

Based on the UN survey of crime statistics around the world, the countries with the highest per capita incidence of rape, defined by the UN as 'sexual intercourse without valid consent', are Botswana, Sweden, Nicaragua, Grenada and the United Kingdom. Rape statistics have been increasing each year in western Europe, especially in Sweden, the UK, Belgium, France and the Netherlands.

1. Is the Commission aware of the increase in rape within the EU?
2. Has the Commission established any mechanism to monitor these crimes?
3. What steps does the Commission intend to take to guarantee the safety of its citizens and protect them from such crimes?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(27 May 2013)**

It is for the national authority to investigate and prosecute this type of crime. There is substantial evidence that across the European Union the majority of rape cases does not result in a conviction.

At this stage, there are no official and comparable data at EU level on gender based violence. The European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) develops tools to collect comparable and reliable data and resources on VAW ⁽¹⁾. The Fundamental Rights' Agency's (FRA) survey on VAW ⁽²⁾ will provide EU-data on all forms of VAW and will be available in 2014.

Rape is a serious violation of the victim's fundamental freedoms. The Commission is committed to a strong policy response to combat all forms of VAW. This primarily through empowerment of women, awareness raising, legislative action, exchanges of good practice, improving knowledge and data collection.

To protect and support victims, the new Directive 2012/29/EU establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime, was adopted in October 2012 ⁽³⁾. The directive will ensure that a whole range of special measures will be put in place to protect and support vulnerable victims, among them women victims of sexual crime. The directive also emphasises the need to train practitioners (police, prosecutors and judges) on the needs of victims, which is crucial for changing attitudes towards victims and treating them with respect and recognition.

⁽¹⁾ The EIGE studies are available at: <http://www.eige.europa.eu/content/activities/Gender-based-violence>

⁽²⁾ Information on the ongoing FRA survey can be found at: <http://fra.europa.eu/en/project/2012/fra-survey-womens-well-being-and-safety-europe>

⁽³⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:315:0057:0073:EN:PDF>

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003396/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)**

Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)

(26 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Accuse relative alla crescente censura sulla stampa in Argentina

Il 25 marzo 2013 il quotidiano britannico *The Times* ha riferito che Cristina Fernández de Kirchner, presidente dell'Argentina, è stata accusata di aver tentato di impedire la pubblicazione su alcuni giornali di articoli critici nei confronti del suo governo esercitando pressioni sugli inserzionisti affinché questi sospendessero l'acquisto di spazi pubblicitari su tali giornali. Pubblicazioni quali *La Nación* e *Perfil* e il gruppo editoriale *Clarín* hanno fatto sapere che i loro proventi pubblicitari sono drasticamente diminuiti a seguito delle pressioni esercitate dal governo su importanti sponsor. Secondo il redattore capo della rivista *Clarín*, l'obiettivo è di asfissiare finanziariamente la stampa, determinando una forma di censura silenziosa che avrà per conseguenza la scomparsa della stampa indipendente in Argentina. Pare che la presidente Kirchner abbia un rapporto difficile con i media e che abbia definito «nazisti» e «mafiosi» giornalisti e dirigenti dei mezzi di comunicazione.

I giornali ritengono di essere presi di mira perché riportano la verità sulla società argentina e, in particolare, sul problema dell'inflazione galoppante. Il governo Kirchner è accusato di manipolare i dati relativi all'inflazione, cosa che potrebbe portare all'espulsione del paese dal Fondo monetario internazionale. Complessivamente, si prevede che le aziende private di comunicazione subiranno una perdita pari a 70 milioni di dollari nell'arco dell'anno.

Secondo quanto pubblicato Guillermo Moreno, segretario argentino per il commercio interno, avrebbe detto a una serie di sponsor importanti, come Walmart e Carrefour, che avrebbero avuto difficoltà a ottenere l'autorizzazione governativa al rimpatrio degli utili se avessero continuato a pubblicare pubblicità su *Clarín*, *La Nación* e *Perfil*.

Può la Commissione rispondere alle seguenti domande:

1. Qual è la posizione del Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante in merito alle voci secondo le quali la presidente argentina starebbe adottando provvedimenti volti a privare dei proventi pubblicitari le pubblicazioni e gruppi editoriali che pubblicano articoli critici, di fatto compromettendo la libertà dei media?
2. Come valutano i funzionari della delegazione dell'Unione europea a Buenos Aires le affermazioni di *Clarín* e altri periodici sul fatto che il governo starebbe cercando di censurare i media critici nei suoi confronti?
3. Ha il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante sollevato di recente con il governo argentino la questione della libertà di stampa nel paese? Quali misure è disposta ad adottare al fine di affrontare la recente preoccupante situazione provocata dalla presidente Kirchner?

Risposta dell'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione

(3 luglio 2013)

In Argentina la libertà d'informazione è garantita dalla costituzione. In una sentenza del marzo 2011 la Corte suprema argentina ha statuito che tutti i media dovrebbero ricevere le pubblicità ufficiali.

L'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente e i servizi che a lei fanno capo ribadiscono regolarmente l'importanza e il valore della libera stampa.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003396/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(26 March 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Allegations of increasing press censorship in Argentina

On 25 March 2013 the UK's *Times* reported that Argentina's President Cristina Fernández de Kirchner had been accused of trying to prevent critical reports about her government from being published in newspapers by putting pressure on advertisers to cease to place business with the offending newspapers. Publications such as *La Nación* and *Perfil*, as well as the media group Clarin, report that their advertising revenue has fallen dramatically because of government pressure on important sponsors. The editor-in-chief of Clarin says: 'The objective is to asphyxiate the press financially. It's a form of silent censorship'. And 'the consequences will be that the independent press in Argentina ceases to exist'. President Kirchner is alleged to have a strained relationship with the media, and has called reporters and media executives 'Nazis' and 'Mafiosi'.

The newspapers believe that they are being targeted for reporting the truth about Argentine society, which includes the problem of rampant inflation. The Kirchner government is accused of manipulating inflation figures which could mean expulsion from the International Monetary Fund. Overall, it is predicted that the private media firms will incur losses of USD 70 million over the year.

The publications claim that Argentina's Secretary of Interior Trade, Guillermo Moreno, told a number of major sponsors such as Walmart and Carrefour that they would face difficulty obtaining government authorisation to repatriate their profits if they continued to advertise with Clarin, *La Nación* and *Perfil*.

1. What is the position of the Vice-President/High Representative regarding reports that Argentina's President is taking steps to deprive publications and media groups of advertising revenue because of their critical reporting, effectively undermining media freedom?
2. What is the assessment of EU officials at the Delegation in Buenos Aires regarding the claims of Clarin et al. that the government is working to censor critical media?
3. Has the Vice-President/High Representative raised the issue of press freedom inside Argentina with its government recently, and what steps is she prepared to take to address this recent alarming development brought about by President Kirchner?

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

In Argentina Freedom of information is guaranteed by the Constitution. In a ruling in March 2011 Argentina's Supreme Court stated that all media should receive official advertising.

The HR/VP and her services routinely stress the importance and the value of a free press.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003397/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)**

(26 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Applicazione della Sharia nei territori siriani controllati dai ribelli

Il 20 marzo 2013 il *Washington Post* ha riferito che nella città siriana di Aleppo la giustizia è ora amministrata secondo la legge islamica (Sharia) nell'ambito di uno sforzo sistematico teso a islamizzare la città e che ciò ha ripercussioni su una serie di attività sociali e quotidiane. Il Consiglio della Sharia ha assunto il controllo di un ospedale cittadino, nel quale emana sentenze su reati di adulterio, furto e uso di droga. Il Consiglio si pronuncia inoltre su casi di rapimento, omicidio, matrimonio e divorzio e la popolazione laica che si è opposta alla sua autorità è stata presa di mira.

Per le strade di Aleppo, gruppi militanti salafiti come il Fronte al-Nusra impongono misure volte a disciplinare il comportamento sociale e hanno preso il controllo dei panifici e delle scorte di farina e carburante. Per quanto riguarda la vita in Siria dopo la possibile caduta del regime baatista, al-Nusra respinge l'ipotesi di indire le elezioni, che considera antislamiche. Altri giuristi islamici hanno dichiarato che finché Bashar al-Assad rimarrà al potere e gli Stati occidentali negheranno l'accesso alle armi ai gruppi di ribelli moderati, è probabile che i gruppi estremisti della Jihad, come al-Nusra, diventino più forti e impongano un maggiore controllo sociale.

Può la Commissione rispondere alle seguenti domande:

1. Quali iniziative è disposto ad adottare il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante per contrastare la crescente imposizione dei tribunali e della giustizia islamici in città siriane di tradizione laica?
2. Qual è la posizione del Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante rispetto alla fornitura di armi a gruppi di ribelli moderati, come il Libero esercito siriano, che potrebbero contrastare l'ascesa dei gruppi islamici radicali come al-Nusra?
3. Quali passi ha intrapreso il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante per trattare il problema con il segretario di Stato americano John Kerry?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione

(6 giugno 2013)

L'Unione europea ha costantemente manifestato il proprio sostegno a una transizione politica democratica in Siria pienamente conforme ai principi universali dei diritti umani. La transizione è un processo interno al paese in cui si esprimono e si confrontano diverse visioni di società e al quale partecipano diverse forze politiche, compreso l'Islam politico. L'Unione è pronta a cooperare con i gruppi impegnati a garantire la partecipazione pacifica alla vita democratica, mettendo però in chiaro i valori che sostiene e l'importanza che ascrive a una società pluralista e tollerante.

Un tale approccio è tanto più importante in considerazione degli scontri violenti in atto in Siria tra vari gruppi dell'opposizione e il regime di Assad. L'UE ha assunto una posizione di principio di sostegno alla coalizione nazionale delle forze siriane della rivoluzione e dell'opposizione (coalizione dell'opposizione siriana) che ha sollecitato a rispettare i principi dei diritti umani, l'inclusività e la democrazia.

Anche al fine di rafforzarne l'efficacia e la legittimità sul terreno in Siria, l'Unione intende sostenere attivamente la coalizione dell'opposizione siriana nello stabilire contatti con le comunità locali nelle aree insorte assistendo queste ultime con la fornitura di servizi di base.

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ha preso in considerazione tutte le osservazioni in merito a un'eventuale revoca dell'embargo sulle armi e ha invitato gli Stati membri a raggiungere un accordo sulla questione. Gli esperti militari e politici esprimono valutazioni divergenti sull'efficacia di armare i ribelli moderati per rovesciare l'equilibrio militare in loro favore stante la necessità di controlli adeguati sui destinatari finali delle consegne di armi. Allo stesso tempo, l'AR/VP ha invitato a proseguire il lavoro perché il regime di sanzioni dell'Unione europea diventi più flessibile consentendo di assistere meglio la popolazione civile.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003397/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(26 March 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Application of Sharia law in rebel-held Syrian territory

On 20 March 2013 *The Washington Post* reported that justice is now being dispensed under Sharia law in the Syrian town of Aleppo as part of a systematic effort to Islamicise the town, with an impact on a number of social and daily activities. The Sharia Council has taken over a hospital in the town, inside which the authorities hand out various sentences for crimes of adultery, theft and drug abuse. The Hayaa al-Sharia is also responsible for adjudicating cases involving kidnapping, murder, marriage and divorce. Secular residents who have voiced their opposition to the Hayaa have been targeted.

On the streets of Aleppo militant Salafist groups such as the al-Nusra Front are taking steps to regulate social behaviour, and have taken control of the town's bakeries and stocks of flour and fuel. As regards life in Syria after the eventual fall of the Baathist regime, al-Nusra rejects the idea of having elections, as they view them as un-Islamic. Other Islamic jurists have said that as long as Bashar al-Assad remains in charge and more moderate rebel groups are denied access to arms from Western states, the likelihood is that extremist jihadi groups such as al-Nusra will grow stronger and impose greater social control.

1. What steps is the Vice-President/High Representative prepared to adopt in order to stem the growth of imposed Sharia courts and justice inside traditionally secular Syrian towns?
2. What is the position of the Vice-President/High Representative regarding the arming of moderate rebel groups such as the Free Syrian Army, which could counterbalance the rise of Islamist radical groups such as al-Nusra?
3. What steps has the Vice-President/High Representative taken towards addressing this issue with US Secretary of State John Kerry?

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

The EU has constantly expressed its support for the model of democratic political transition in Syria that is in full conformity with the universal principles of human rights. Transition is a home-grown process in which different visions of society are expressed and confronted. Diverse political forces are part of this process, including that of political Islam. The EU is ready to work with groups committed to the peaceful participation in democratic life, but it is clear on the values it supports and the need for a pluralistic and tolerant society.

This approach is all the more important as Syria is in a state of a violent confrontation between diverse opposition groups and the Assad regime. The EU has taken a principled stance to support the National Coalition of Syrian Revolutionary and Opposition Forces (Syrian Opposition Coalition — SOC) and has called on it to be respectful of the principles of human rights, inclusivity and democracy.

The EU is planning to actively support the SOC in reaching out to local communities in rebel-contested areas and assist them in the provision of basic services also in an effort to bolster the effectiveness and legitimacy of the SOC on the ground in Syria.

The HRVP has taken all views into account regarding the possible lifting of the arms embargo and has called the MS to reach a consensus in this matter. Assessments by military and political experts differ as to the efficacy of arming the moderate rebels with regard to ensuring proper control over arms delivery final recipients and tipping the military balance in the moderates' favour. At the same time, HRVP has called on further work to make our sanctions regime more flexible to better assist the civilian population.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003398/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)**

(26 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Ripristino della sovranità in Mali

Secondo quanto riportato il 20 marzo 2013 dal quotidiano britannico *The Telegraph*, il Presidente francese François Hollande avrebbe recentemente affermato in occasione di una cena che tutto il territorio di Mali verrà liberato nei prossimi giorni, dichiarando che «il nostro intervento ci ha permesso in due mesi di ottenere risultati importanti: l'offensiva dei gruppi terroristici è stata fermata e le città sono state riconquistate».

Il primo ministro francese Jean-Marc Ayrault ha affermato che i soldati francesi lasceranno il Mali alla fine del mese di aprile e che verrà effettuato un esame per valutare in che modo è possibile impiegare i soldati francesi per allontanare i ribelli islamisti dal Mali, anche dopo l'inizio del rientro in Francia delle truppe. Hollande ha affermato che verrà istituita una forza di stabilizzazione, costituita da soldati africani e maliani.

Il gruppo Al-Qaeda nel Maghreb islamico (AQIM) continua a essere attivo nella regione e sono almeno 15 i cittadini francesi ancora tenuti in ostaggio, uno dei quali è stato decapitato il 10 marzo. La Francia ha dichiarato che adotterà tutte le misure necessarie per salvare gli altri ostaggi.

La missione di addestramento dell'UE, guidata dal generale di brigata François Lecointre, ha il compito di addestrare l'esercito maliano. Lecointre ha tuttavia dichiarato che l'esercito deve essere completamente ristrutturato, sostenendo che «oggi opera più come un insieme eterogeneo di elementi, messi insieme su richiesta e per motivi di emergenza per far fronte a una pesante situazione di combattimento [...] non è un vero e proprio esercito» e che occorre impegnarsi molto per migliorare la situazione.

1. Il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante condivide le osservazioni pessimistiche sullo stato delle forze militari maliane?
2. Come valutano i funzionari dell'UE in Mali la capacità dell'esercito maliano e africano di respingere e neutralizzare gli eventuali ripetuti attacchi del gruppo AQIM?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione

(29 maggio 2013)

La situazione dell'esercito maliano è preoccupante: sia il Mali che l'Unione europea concordano da tempo su questa constatazione. Alla luce di tali fatti l'Unione europea si è impegnata a sostenere la richiesta delle autorità legittime del Mali, nell'ambito delle pertinenti risoluzioni dell'Unione europea, attraverso l'intervento della missione EUTM.

Questa iniziativa si associa a un maggiore impegno dell'Unione europea a favore della stabilizzazione e della ricostruzione del Mali. La modernizzazione sotto controllo civile delle forze di difesa e di sicurezza maliane rappresenta pertanto, unitamente alle elezioni e alla riconciliazione, uno dei tre indicatori principali presi in considerazione dai partner del paese, tra cui l'Unione europea e gli Stati membri, per valutare i progressi della transizione.

Assicurare il ritorno dello Stato nel nord del paese, parallelamente a un processo politico di negoziazione e di riconciliazione, implica il dispiegamento massiccio di mezzi militari che, in questa fase, il Mali da solo non può permettersi. Questa situazione giustifica il coinvolgimento della forza internazionale sotto l'egida delle Nazioni Unite.

Al momento attuale l'Unione europea non può esprimere un giudizio anticipato sul successo operativo di questo sforzo collettivo profuso dal Mali e dai suoi partner. Piuttosto l'Unione, insieme ai suoi partner, assume un'obbligazione di mezzi, a vantaggio sia delle capacità militari che delle capacità di contrasto del terrorismo. Poiché queste ultime implicano la volontà di predisporre provvedimenti che interessano l'intero ambito della sicurezza e della giustizia penale, l'Unione europea ha intensificato gli sforzi specifici con un distaccamento di agenti di collegamento dell'EUCAP SAHEL.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003398/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(26 March 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Restoration of sovereignty in Mali

On 20 March 2013, the UK's *Telegraph* newspaper reported that French President François Hollande had said during a recent dinner that all of Mali's territory would be liberated in the coming days, stating that 'our intervention allowed us to obtain major results within two months: the offensive by terrorist groups was stopped [and] the towns were recaptured'.

French Prime Minister Jean-Marc Ayrault has said that French troops will leave Mali at the end of April. He has also said that an assessment will be carried out in order to gauge how French troops can work to remove Islamist rebels from Mali, even after troops begin their return to France. Mr Hollande has said that a stabilisation force will be put in place, composed of African and Malian troops.

Al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM) continues to be active in the region, and at least 15 French citizens are still being held hostage. One was beheaded on 10 March. France has said it will take all necessary steps to rescue the remaining hostages.

The EU training mission, under the command of Brigadier-General François Lecointre, has been put in charge of training the Malian army. However, Lecointre has stated that the army needs to be completely restructured, arguing that 'today, it acts more as a somewhat disparate set of elements, put together on request and on an emergency basis in order to cope with a tough combat situation [...] it's not an army as such', and going on to say that improving the situation will take a lot of work.

1. Does the Vice-President/High Representative share this pessimistic view of the state of Mali's military forces?
2. What is the assessment of EU officials in Mali regarding the preparedness of both Malian and African troops to repulse and defeat any continued attacks from AQIM?

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

The state of Mali's military forces is a concern which has been shared by Mali and by the EU for some time. This concern underpins the EU's support for the requests of the legitimate Malian authorities and the framework of the relevant EU resolutions via the deployment of the EUTM mission.

This effort is linked to wider EU involvement in the stabilisation and reconstruction of Mali. The modernisation, under civilian control, of the Malian defence and security forces is one of the three key indicators — along with elections and reconciliation — used by Mali's partners, including the EU and its Member States, to assess the progress of the transition process.

Securing the return of state control to the north of the country, as a necessary part of the political negotiation and reconciliation process, requires considerable military means which are currently beyond the scope of Mali alone. This is the reason for the involvement of the international force, working under UN auspices.

At this stage, the EU is unable to predict the operational success of this joint effort on the part of Mali and its partners; working together with its partners, however, it has undertaken to provide resources to support both military and anti-terrorist capacity. These involve studying measures within the security and criminal justice chain as a whole, and the EU has strengthened its specific efforts via the deployment of the EUCAP SAHEL mission.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003399/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)**

(26 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Presunto divieto di ingresso in Libia per uno scrittore ebreo francese

Il 22 marzo 2013 il quotidiano inglese *The Independent* ha riferito che al noto scrittore e filosofo francese Bernard-Henri Lévy sarebbe stato vietato l'ingresso in Libia in quanto ebreo.

Ciò sarebbe avvenuto nonostante Lévy fosse stato un acceso sostenitore dell'intervento militare per deporre la dittatura del colonnello Gheddafi e, secondo il quotidiano, «abbia aiutato a persuadere Sarkozy a inviare aerei militari francesi per proteggere i ribelli dalle forze di Gheddafi».

Lo scrittore avrebbe dovuto accompagnare l'ex presidente Nicholas Sarkozy a Tripoli ma, stando a quanto riferito da un portavoce anonimo della capitale libica, le origini ebraiche di Lévy avrebbero rischiato di esporre la città ad attacchi da parte delle milizie islamiche. Sarkozy intendeva annullare la visita, ma Lévy lo avrebbe persuaso a proseguire.

1. Alla luce di quanto suesposto, quali misure è il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante pronto ad adottare per incoraggiare le autorità libiche a intraprendere le azioni necessarie per promuovere la tolleranza religiosa e contrastare l'antisemitismo tra la popolazione libica?
2. Qual è la valutazione dei funzionari dell'UE in Libia rispetto all'attuale livello effettivo di minaccia di attacchi contro gli interessi europei e occidentali all'interno del paese?
3. Inoltre, qual è la posizione dei funzionari della delegazione dell'UE e dei capi missione degli Stati membri a Tripoli rispetto al divieto mosso contro Bernard-Henri Lévy di entrare nel territorio libico?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione

(23 maggio 2013)

Secondo quanto dichiarato dall'UE a Tripoli il 13 marzo 2013, la detenzione di esponenti di minoranze religiose (cristiani e musulmani ahmadi) con accuse di presunto proselitismo costituisce motivo di preoccupazione. L'UE ha rilevato gli sviluppi positivi registrati di recente con il rilascio di molte delle persone arrestate.

Le condizioni di sicurezza in Libia restano sostanzialmente instabili, sebbene le varie regioni del paese presentino livelli di insicurezza diversi.

L'UE, pur rispettando la piena sovranità delle autorità libanesi in merito al diritto di consentire l'accesso al loro territorio, condanna qualsiasi discriminazione fondata su razza, sesso, lingua, religione e convinzioni personali.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003399/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(26 March 2013)**

Subject: VP/HR — French Jewish writer allegedly barred from Libya

On 22 March 2013 the UK's *Independent* newspaper reported that well-known French writer and philosopher Bernard-Henri Lévy had been barred from entering Libya because he is Jewish.

This is despite the fact that Lévy was a vocal proponent of military intervention to oust the dictator Colonel al-Qaddafi from power and, according to the newspaper, 'is credited with helping to persuade Mr Sarkozy to send French warplanes to protect the rebels from Gaddafi's forces'.

The writer was expected to travel with former President Nicholas Sarkozy to Tripoli, but an unnamed spokesperson for the city of Tripoli was quoted as saying that the fact that Levy is Jewish could have exposed the municipality to attacks by Islamist militias. Sarkozy planned to cancel his visit, but Levy persuaded him to continue.

1. In light of the above case, what steps is the Vice-President/High Representative prepared to take to encourage the Libyan authorities to take the necessary action to encourage religious tolerance and tackle anti-Semitism within the wider Libyan population?
2. What is the assessment of EU officials in Libya regarding the current real level of threat of attacks against European and Western interests inside the country?
3. In addition, what is the position of EU delegation officials and Member State heads of mission in Tripoli regarding the barring of Bernard-Henri Lévy from entry to Libya?

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

The detention of members of religious minorities (Christians and Ahmadi Muslims) on alleged charges of proselytism constitutes a cause of concern as expressed by the EU through a statement issued in Tripoli on 13 March 2013. The EU has noted the recent positive development of the release of several of the individuals who had been arrested.

The security situation in the country remains broadly fluid although the degree of insecurity varies in the different regions of the country.

The EU respects the full sovereignty of the Libyan authorities regarding their right to grant access to individuals to their territory. Obviously, the EU stands against any discrimination, based on race, sex, language, or religion and belief.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003400/13
alla Commissione**

Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)

(26 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Un anno dopo la strage di Tolosa

Il 17 marzo 2013 il presidente francese François Hollande ha commemorato il primo anniversario della strage di Tolosa, durante la quale quattro persone ebree (un rabbino e tre bambini) e tre soldati francesi sono stati uccisi a sangue freddo. Hollande ha reso omaggio alle vittime del terrorista islamico Mohammed Merah e ha affermato il fermo impegno del suo governo per combattere il terrorismo e l'antisemitismo, sottolineando che «La democrazia è sempre più forte del fanatismo. Quello che ci ha colpito maggiormente a Tolosa, però, è una cosa terribile che deve essere detta a voce alta: l'antisemitismo.»

Dopo la strage di Tolosa, il numero di atti di antisemitismo in Francia è aumentato e, fatto ancora più allarmante, Mohammed Merah sarebbe diventato un eroe in certi quartieri periferici di alcune città francesi. Alla cerimonia, tenutasi nella piazza Charles de Gaulle di Tolosa, il presidente Hollande ha commemorato gli ebrei deportati nei lager durante l'Olocausto e ha affermato: «L'antisemitismo non si è fermato dopo la tragedia di Tolosa, in cui hanno perso la vita tre bambini per lo stesso motivo per cui morirono i bambini del Vél d'Hiv e di Drancy, perché erano ebrei.»

La diffusione di un aperto antisemitismo, fatto di insulti, attacchi e odio contro gli ebrei e l'eredità ebrea in Europa, ha registrato un aumento negli ultimi anni ed è triste constatare che nel 2012 il numero di episodi di questo tipo è cresciuto rispetto al 2011. Negli ultimi tempi diverse organizzazioni che monitorano l'antisemitismo hanno riferito una serie di episodi contro gli ebrei in diversi paesi nell'intero territorio europeo, tra cui Francia, Belgio, Gran Bretagna, Germania, Polonia, Ungheria e Ucraina. In Ucraina, svastiche e simboli neonazisti sono stati tracciati con vernice spray su alcune sinagoghe e altri luoghi legati alla cultura ebrea, quali la casa dove visse Golda Meir e un monumento all'autore Sholom Aleichem. In Polonia i muri di un nuovo cimitero ebraico a Myslenice sono stati imbrattati con orribili slogan quali «Morte agli ebrei». Il 16 marzo 2013, in occasione di una dimostrazione anticomunista a Cracovia, circolavano slogan agghiaccianti e provocatori, tra cui «Abbasso il giudaismo» e «Colpiscili una volta con la falce e due volte col martello».

1. Quali misure ha adottato la Commissione dalla strage di Tolosa per arrestare la recrudescenza dell'antisemitismo in Europa?
2. Quali azioni intende intraprendere per porre fine alla dilagante intolleranza religiosa in Europa?
3. Ha istituito la Commissione un sistema formale per monitorare l'antisemitismo in Europa e nei paesi vicini?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione

(14 maggio 2013)

La Commissione condanna tutte le forme e manifestazioni di antisemitismo in quanto non sono compatibili con i valori su cui si fonda l'Unione europea.

La Commissione lotta contro qualsiasi forma di intolleranza utilizzando tutti gli strumenti a sua disposizione nel rispetto dei poteri conferiti all'Unione dai trattati, fra cui l'attento monitoraggio dell'attuazione della legislazione dell'UE in materia di incitamento all'odio attraverso discorsi e reati generati dall'odio, in particolare la decisione quadro su razzismo e xenofobia che vieta discorsi e reati razzisti o xenofobi, e la direttiva che vieta i discorsi razzisti nei servizi di media audiovisivi, per esempio in trasmissioni televisive e servizi di video on demand. Spetta tuttavia alle autorità nazionali, compresi i tribunali, analizzare i singoli casi e valutare se costituiscono un incitamento alla violenza o all'odio.

La Commissione fornisce inoltre sostegno finanziario alle attività dei portatori di interesse rivolte, ad esempio, a promuovere una migliore comprensione fra religioni e culture diverse e a migliorare la tolleranza nell'UE ⁽¹⁾, a combattere il razzismo e la xenofobia sul terreno, commemorando le vittime dell'olocausto, e a promuovere la tolleranza e la comprensione interculturale e interconfessionale. L'Agenzia per i diritti fondamentali raccoglie dati su tematiche riguardanti il razzismo e la xenofobia ⁽²⁾. I risultati del suo sondaggio sulle esperienze degli ebrei e la percezione dell'antisemitismo dovrebbero essere pubblicati nell'autunno del 2013.

⁽¹⁾ Per ulteriori informazioni sulle attività della Commissione in questo settore:

http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/racism-xenophobia/index_en.htm

⁽²⁾ Per ulteriori informazioni sulle attività della Commissione in questo settore, consultare il sito della direzione generale Giustizia:

http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/racism-xenophobia/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003400/13
to the Commission
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(26 March 2013)

Subject: One year since Toulouse killings

On 17 March 2013 French President François Hollande commemorated the first anniversary of the killings in Toulouse in which four Jewish people — a rabbi and three children — and three French soldiers were murdered in cold blood. President Hollande paid tribute to the victims of the Islamist terrorist Mohammed Merah and expressed his government's strong commitment to fighting terrorism and anti-Semitism. He stressed that 'democracy is always stronger than fanaticism. But what really hit us in Toulouse was something terrible that we must say out loud — anti-Semitism.'

After the Toulouse killings, the number of anti-Semitic acts in France grew and, most alarmingly, Mohammed Merah reportedly became a hero in parts of the suburbs of some French cities. At the ceremony in Toulouse's Charles de Gaulle Square, President Hollande commemorated Jews deported to the camps during the Holocaust and said: 'Anti-Semitism has not stopped after the tragedy in Toulouse, where children died for the same reason as those of the Vel d'Hiv and Drancy, because they were Jews.'

The growth of open anti-Semitism, such as insults, attacks and hatred towards Jews and Jewish heritage in Europe, has been on the rise in recent years and, sadly, 2012 saw a much higher number of such incidents than 2011. Several organisations monitoring anti-Semitism recently reported a string of anti-Jewish incidents in several widely separate European countries, including France, Belgium, Britain, Germany, Poland, Hungary and Ukraine. In Ukraine swastikas and neo-Nazi symbols were sprayed on synagogues and other Jewish heritage sites, such as the former house of Golda Meir and a monument to the author Sholom Aleichem. In Poland the walls of a newly dedicated Jewish cemetery in Myslenice were sprayed with terrifying slogans such as 'Murder the Jews'. On 16 March 2013, at an anti-communist demonstration in Krakow, horrifying and provocative slogans included 'down with Judaism' and 'hit them once with the sickle and twice with the hammer'.

1. What steps has the Commission taken since the Toulouse killings to stop the rise of anti-Semitism in Europe?
2. What action does the Commission plan to take in order to stop the growth of religious intolerance in Europe?
3. Has the Commission established a formal system to monitor anti-Semitism in Europe and in neighbouring countries?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(14 May 2013)

The Commission condemns all forms and manifestations of anti-Semitism, as they are incompatible with the values on which the EU is founded.

The Commission uses all the instruments at its disposal, in line with the powers conferred to the Union by the Treaties, to fight against all forms of intolerance. The Commission is committed to fighting against these phenomena by making use of all powers available under the Treaties, including by monitoring closely the implementation of EU legislation on hate speech and hate crime, namely the framework Decision on racism and xenophobia prohibiting racist or xenophobic speech and crime, and the Audiovisual Media Services Directive banning racist speech in audiovisual media services, such as TV broadcasts and video-on-demand services. It is however for national authorities, including the courts, to look into individual cases and to determine whether they represent incitement to violence or hatred.

The Commission is also providing financial support to stakeholders' activities aimed for instance at promoting better interfaith and intercultural understanding and improved tolerance in the EU ⁽¹⁾. Furthermore, financial support is given to stakeholders' activities aimed at combating racism and xenophobia on the ground, commemorating the victims of the Holocaust, and activities aimed at promoting tolerance and intercultural and interreligious understanding. The Fundamental Rights Agency also collects data on issues of racism and xenophobia ⁽²⁾. The results of its survey of Jewish people's experiences and perceptions of anti-Semitism are expected to be published in autumn 2013.

⁽¹⁾ For further information on the Commission's work in this field, see:
http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/racism-xenophobia/index_en.htm

⁽²⁾ For further information about the Commission's activities in this field, please see the website of the Directorate-General Justice at:
http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/racism-xenophobia/index_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003401/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)**

(26 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Il Presidente Obama invita a designare Hezbollah come un'organizzazione terroristica

Il 21 marzo 2013, in un discorso reso in occasione della visita a Gerusalemme, il Presidente degli Stati Uniti Barack Obama ha affermato che i governi stranieri dovrebbero classificare il movimento sciita libanese Hezbollah come «organizzazione terroristica» e che «ogni paese che riconosce il valore della giustizia dovrebbe definire Hezbollah per quello che è: un'organizzazione terroristica».

Obama ha aggiunto che «il mondo non può tollerare un'organizzazione che uccide civili innocenti, accumula missili per colpire le città e appoggia il massacro di uomini, donne e bambini in Siria».

Si ritiene che i commenti siano rivolti all'Unione europea, la quale si rifiuta tuttora di classificare il gruppo come organizzazione terroristica per non creare instabilità nella regione. Recentemente, tuttavia, un tribunale di Cipro ha condannato un militante di Hezbollah, con cittadinanza svedese, con l'accusa di aver progettato attacchi contro interessi israeliani nell'isola. Il gruppo Hezbollah è attivo in diversi Stati membri dell'UE, dove raccoglie fondi e mantiene attiva la rete.

1. Qual è la posizione del Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante riguardo ai recenti commenti del Presidente Obama circa l'inserimento di Hezbollah in una lista nera?
2. Alla luce della condanna penale di un militante di Hezbollah pronunciata a Cipro, è disposto il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante a prendere provvedimenti per rivedere la sua attuale posizione in merito alla designazione del gruppo Hezbollah?
3. Qual è la posizione del Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante circa il coinvolgimento di Hezbollah nel sostegno al regime siriano del Presidente Bashar al-Assad?

Risposta dell'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(8 luglio 2013)

I commenti del presidente degli Stati Uniti sono in linea con la politica invalsa degli Stati Uniti che, nel 1995, hanno iscritto l'Hezbollah sull'elenco statunitense delle organizzazioni terroristiche straniere.

Per quanto concerne l'Unione europea, qualsiasi modifica dell'elenco unionale delle organizzazioni terroristiche richiede una decisione unanime degli Stati membri. L'Hezbollah è stato oggetto, in tale contesto, di discussioni in diverse occasioni in passato, ma tra gli Stati membri non si è mai registrato un consenso. Particolari sulla procedura per l'iscrizione di un'organizzazione nell'elenco unionale sono stati forniti nella risposta della Commissione alla precedente interrogazione scritta E-001611/2013⁽¹⁾. Il processo a Cipro è stato condotto nel quadro della procedura penale. Il tribunale ha menzionato l'Hezbollah quale organizzazione criminale senza formulare conclusioni o riferimenti in tema di terrorismo.

L'UE sostiene la politica che il Libano conduce per dissociarsi dal conflitto siriano, quale instaurata dai leader del paese nel 2011 e concordata dai partiti politici libanesi. È essenziale che in Libano questa politica sia rispettata nella pratica da tutti gli attori.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq#sidesForm>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003401/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(26 March 2013)**

Subject: VP/HR — President Obama calls for designation of Hezbollah as a terrorist organisation

On 21 March 2013 US President Barack Obama said in a speech, while visiting Jerusalem, that foreign governments should blacklist the Lebanese Shiite Hezbollah as a 'terrorist organisation'. He said, 'every country that values justice should call Hezbollah what it truly is — a terrorist organisation'.

Obama added that the 'world cannot tolerate an organisation that murders innocent civilians, stockpiles rockets to shoot at cities, and supports the massacre of men, women and children in Syria'.

The comments are believed to be addressed to the European Union, which still refuses to designate the group as a terrorist organisation, on the basis that this could cause instability in the region. However, a court in Cyprus recently convicted a Hezbollah operative with Swedish citizenship of planning to launch attacks against Israeli interests on the island. Hezbollah is active in a number of EU Member States, where it works to raise funds and maintain an active network.

1. What is the Vice-President/High Representative's position regarding the latest comments by President Obama on blacklisting Hezbollah?
2. In light of the criminal conviction of a Hezbollah operative in Cyprus, is the Vice-President/High Representative prepared to take steps to reconsider its current position regarding the designation of Hezbollah?
3. What is the Vice-President/High Representative's position regarding Hezbollah's involvement in supporting the Syrian regime of President Bashar al-Assad?

**Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(8 July 2013)**

The comments of the President of the United States are consistent with the long-standing policy of the United States, which placed Hizbullah on the US list of foreign terrorist organisations in 1995.

With regard to the European Union, all amendments to the EU list of terrorist organisations require a unanimous decision of Member States. Hizbullah was, in this context, discussed on several occasions in the past, but there has never been consensus among Member States. Details on the procedure for the designation of an organisation in the EU list has been provided in the Commission's answer to previous Written Question E-001611/2013 ⁽¹⁾. The respective trial in Cyprus was conducted in the criminal justice framework. The court referred to Hizbullah as a criminal organisation, without making any terrorism-related conclusions or references.

The EU supports Lebanon's policy of dissociation from the Syrian conflict, as established by the country's leaders in 2011 and agreed by Lebanese political parties. It is essential that this policy be respected in practice by all actors in Lebanon.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq#sidesForm>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003402/13
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(26 March 2013)**

Subject: Text alert initiatives

Text alert initiatives are being established among local communities in Ireland. Such initiatives aim to connect local community members with one another and with the police force in the local area. They allow text messages to be sent to all residents in an area to alert them to a crime, and enable residents to report an incident. The aim of these programmes is to reduce crime, increase communication among local residents, create better relations with the police force and provide increased safety and peace of mind for older residents who may be living in isolated areas.

1. Does the Commission recognise the value of such initiatives?
2. Does the Commission believe that text alert initiatives are an effective deterrent with a view to decreasing crime levels in rural areas?
3. If the Commission believes that such initiatives are beneficial to rural areas, what does it intend to do to promote the establishment of similar programmes in rural areas throughout all the Member States?

**Answer given by Mrs Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2013)**

The Commission recognises the value of text alert initiatives to support law enforcement and community engagement in rural areas. Such initiatives should fully respect European and national data protection legislation (as regards those receiving the texts as well as information on the possible suspects).

The European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development has been supporting similar initiatives under its Basic services measure. Member States or regions in charge of Rural Development Programmes will be able to provide for such support under art. 21 of the EAFRD regulation also in the next programming period 2014-2020.

A comparable form of community policing is used in a project to respond to child abductions, with a service set up to alert the public in cases of child abduction and where the life of a child is at risk. Best practice from this project could prove useful for future initiatives.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003403/13
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(26 March 2013)**

Subject: Processed foods in hospitals and nursing homes

A recent report has shown that some hospitals and nursing homes in Ireland are serving processed foods to patients, such as pies containing as little as 10% meat and gougions containing as little as 50% meat.

1. Does the Commission believe that processed foods are suitable to be served to people having ongoing medical treatment?
2. Would the Commission agree that, while patients may need high-protein and high-calorie diets, it is of the utmost importance to ensure that these diets are also as healthy as possible?
3. With the ongoing battle against obesity, especially in younger age groups, would the Commission agree that the use of processed foods in hospitals and nursing homes is counteractive in this regard?
4. Does the Commission have any guidelines in place as to which foods should or should not be served to patients? If not, does the Commission intend to create such guidelines?

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

It is the exclusive responsibility of each Member State to provide appropriate food to the patients at hospitals and nursing homes, which is suitable to the patient's needs. Consequently, the European Commission has not introduced guidelines on foods served in such facilities.

The Commission's Strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity-related health issues ⁽¹⁾ addresses actions to promote healthier diets and food reformulation. Through partnerships with Member States and stakeholders, there is an EU wide focus on reducing for example salt, saturated fat and sugars in food.

Finally, it is essential that actions to promote healthy eating and to fight obesity — also in settings such as hospitals and nursing homes — are developed and carried out by Member States at regional and local levels.

⁽¹⁾ A Strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity related health issues, COM(2007) 279.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003404/13
aan de Commissie
Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE)
(26 maart 2013)

Betref: Herziening energiebeleid EIB en standpunt van de Commissie

In 2011 investeerde de Europese Investeringsbank (EIB) 13 miljard euro oftewel 20 % van haar budget in energieprojecten. Het Parlement heeft er herhaaldelijk bij de EIB op aangedrongen haar beleid van energieleningen te wijzigen en haar activiteiten op één lijn te brengen met de EU-doelstellingen voor een snelle overstap naar een koolstofarme economie ⁽¹⁾.

De herziening van het energiebeleid van de EIB biedt dan ook een unieke gelegenheid om te waarborgen dat toekomstige investeringsbeslissingen aansluiten bij de EU-doelstellingen op het gebied van klimaat en energie.

1. Hoe luidt het standpunt van de Commissie ten aanzien van de herziening van het energiebeleid van de EIB? Welke rol dient de EIB volgens de Commissie te spelen bij de overstap van de EU naar een grondstoffenefficiënte en op hernieuwbare energie gebaseerde economie op de lange termijn (2050) en hoe kan deze analyse van de rol van de EIB worden omgezet in concrete aanbevelingen voor de herziening van haar energiebeleid?
2. Is de Commissie het eens met de visie van de EIB dat investeringen in elektriciteitscentrales die fossiele brandstoffen gebruiken een positieve impact kunnen hebben op het bereiken van de klimaatdoelstellingen van de EU? Zo niet, zal de Commissie actief aandringen op geleidelijke stopzetting van leningen aan energie-investeringen die niet in overeenstemming zijn met de klimaatdoelstellingen van de EU, en met name met de Routekaart naar een concurrerende koolstofarme economie in 2050 (COM(2011)0112 definitief)?
3. Deelt de Commissie de opvatting dat EIB-investeringen in energie-efficiëntie aan de vraagzijde en nieuwe hernieuwbare energiebronnen kunnen bijdragen tot de zekerheid van de energievoorziening door de afhankelijkheid van de EU van ingevoerde koolwaterstoffen te verminderen en meer aandacht te schenken aan concurrentievermogen en duurzaamheid?
4. Hoe denkt de Commissie, gezien de komende publicatie van het Groenboek van de Commissie over de doelstellingen voor 2030, de EIB ertoe aan te zetten langetermijndoelstellingen voor haar leningen op het gebied van energie en klimaat te aanvaarden?

Antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie
(23 mei 2013)

De Commissie verwijst het geachte Parlementslid naar haar antwoord op schriftelijke vraag E-000366/2013 van de heer Belet.

Het kredietbeleid van de EIB in de energiesector, dat momenteel wordt herzien, is gericht op het leveren van concurrerende, duurzame en continue geleverde energie aan de consument.

De activiteiten van de EIB zijn afgestemd op de prioriteiten van het energie- en klimaatbeleid van de EU: de EIB neemt met name ook een schaduwprijs voor koolstof op in zijn economische beoordeling van projecten. Deze prijs bedraagt op dit moment 30 euro per uitgestoten ton CO₂ en zal volgens het basisscenario in 2030 50 euro per ton CO₂ bedragen.

Na een openbare raadpleging zal de EIB naar verwachting in de zomer van 2013 een herzien beleid inzake kredietverstrekking voor energie voorstellen. De Commissie werkt momenteel samen met de EIB, onder meer via haar vertegenwoordiger in de Raad van bewind van de EIB, om te garanderen dat het toekomstige kredietbeleid de prioriteiten van het EU-energiebeleid weerspiegelt. Deze zijn onder meer aangewezen in de Europa 2020-strategie, in het energie-infrastructuurpakket, in het Energiestappenplan 2050 — met name de „no regrets“-oplossingen (infrastructuur, efficiëntie, hernieuwbare energiebronnen en de afbouw van subsidies voor milieuvriendelijke fossiele brandstoffen) — en in het onlangs aangenomen groenboek over een kader voor het klimaat- en energiebeleid voor 2030.

⁽¹⁾ Resolutie van 29 maart 2012 over het jaarverslag 2010 van de EIB, par. 102, en resolutie van 7 april 2011 over het jaarverslag 2009 van de EIB, par. 21.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003404/13
to the Commission
Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE)
(26 March 2013)**

Subject: EIB energy policy review and the Commission's position

In 2011 the European Investment Bank (EIB) invested EUR 13 billion, or 20% of the bank's budget, in energy projects. Parliament has repeatedly called on the EIB to change its energy lending policy and to bring its operations fully into line with EU objectives for a swift transition to a low-carbon economy ⁽¹⁾.

The review of EIB energy policy therefore provides a unique opportunity to ensure that future investment decisions are in line with EU climate and energy targets.

1. What is the Commission's position on the EIB energy lending policy review? What role does the Commission think the EIB should play in the EU's transition towards a resource-efficient and renewables-based economy in the long-term perspective (2050) and how does this analysis of the EIB's role translate into concrete recommendations for its energy policy review?
2. Does the Commission share the EIB's view that investments in fossil fuel power plants can have a potentially positive impact in achieving the EU's climate objectives? If not, will the Commission actively push for a phase-out of lending to energy investments that are incompatible with the EU's climate objectives and, in particular, with the Roadmap for moving to a competitive low carbon economy in 2050 (COM(2011)0112 final)?
3. Does the Commission share the view that EIB investment in demand-side energy efficiency and new renewable energy sources can contribute to the security of energy supply by reducing EU dependency on imported hydrocarbons and focusing on competitiveness and sustainability?
4. With the upcoming publication of the Commission's green paper on 2030 targets, how does the Commission intend to encourage the EIB to take on board long-term targets for its energy and climate lending?

**Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(23 May 2013)**

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-000366/2013 by Mr Belet.

The EIB's lending policy in the energy industry, which is currently under revision, focuses on supplying customers with competitive, sustainable and secure energy.

The EIB's activity is aligned to the EU's energy and climate policy priorities, notably the EIB includes carbon pricing in economic appraisal of projects with a shadow price of EUR 30 per tCO₂ emitted today to EUR 50 per tCO₂ by 2030 under a central scenario.

In summer 2013, following a public consultation, the EIB is expected to issue a reviewed energy lending policy. The Commission is currently cooperating with the EIB, including through its representative on the EIB Board of Directors, to ensure that the future lending policy reflects the EU energy policy priorities. These have been identified *inter alia* in the Europe 2020 strategy, the Energy Infrastructure Package, the Energy 2050 Roadmap — in particular the 'no regrets' solutions (infrastructure, efficiency as well as renewables, phasing out of harmful fossil fuels subsidies) — and the recently adopted Green Paper on a framework 2030 for climate and energy policies.

⁽¹⁾ Resolution of 29 March 2012 on the EIB Annual Report 2010, paragraph 102, and resolution of 7 April 2011 on the EIB Annual Report 2009, paragraph 21.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003405/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(26 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Club de fútbol propiedad de un banco nacionalizado

Bankia deberá hacerse con las acciones de la Fundación del Valencia, dueña del club. Así parece que lo va a decidir el Juzgado de lo Contencioso Administrativo nº 3 de Valencia, que podría anular el aval que el Instituto Valenciano de Finanzas (un órgano dependiente de la Generalitat) concedió en 2009 a la Fundación del Valencia CF para que adquiriera el grueso de los títulos del club. La sentencia dejaría sin efecto la garantía que se esgrimió para acceder a un crédito de Bancaja por valor de 81 millones, lo que en la práctica convertiría a la entidad bancaria (ahora Bankia, intervenida por el Estado) en el máximo accionista del Valencia CF ⁽¹⁾. El MoU del rescate bancario español dice en su punto 15 del capítulo sobre «Recapitalización, reestructuración y/o resolución» que «The restructuring plans should be based on significant downsizing of unprofitable business with a focus on divestitures wherever feasible».

Este punto fue confirmado en el plan de reestructuración de Bankia ⁽²⁾. El día 6 de marzo, en un comunicado de prensa de la Comisión sobre ayudas de Estado en el fútbol holandés se decía: «strongly believe that professional football clubs should be well managed and not ask for help from the tax-payer when facing financial difficulties» ⁽³⁾. La deuda del Valencia CF es de 350 millones, la mayor parte de ella con garantía hipotecaria ⁽⁴⁾.

Teniendo en cuenta que BFA-Bankia es ahora de propiedad estatal, y la relación que tendría con el Valencia CF, ¿será vigilante la Comisión para asegurar que el Valencia CF no recibe ayudas de Estado?

De acuerdo con el MoU, ¿consideraría la Comisión que Bankia debería vender su participación en el Valencia CF con el objetivo de reducir pérdidas en su balance?

Respuesta del Sr. Almunia en nombre de la Comisión
(7 de junio de 2013)

Tras tener conocimiento de los artículos periodísticos sobre las garantías concedidas por el Instituto Valenciano de Finanzas, la Comisión ha pedido a las autoridades españolas información adicional sobre esa medida. En caso de que detectara que se han concedido ayudas estatales al Valencia CF, consideraría la adopción de las medidas pertinentes con arreglo a las normas sobre ayudas estatales del Tratado.

En cuanto a la reestructuración de BFA/Bankia, el 28 de noviembre de 2012 la Comisión aprobó el plan de reestructuración presentado por las autoridades españolas tras llegar a la conclusión de que las ayudas estatales otorgadas a esa entidad en virtud de dicho plan son compatibles con el artículo 107, apartado 3, letra b), del Tratado, que autoriza las ayudas estatales para poner remedio a una perturbación grave en la economía de un Estado miembro.

Los servicios de la Comisión están supervisando la aplicación de la Decisión y los compromisos asumidos al efecto. En el marco de la profunda reestructuración prevista en el plan para BFA/Bankia y con el fin de evitar cualquier falseamiento indebido de la competencia, una de las medidas será la venta de las participaciones no estratégicas de dicha entidad definidas en el plan o que resulten de la ejecución de garantías concedidas por ella durante los últimos años. No obstante, la identidad exacta de dichas participaciones y el calendario de las ventas se considera secreto comercial y no puede revelarse, pues su difusión podría influir materialmente en el proceso de venta.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.lavanguardia.com/local/valencia/20130312/54368291736/un-juez-convierte-a-bankia-duena-del-valenciacf.html>

⁽²⁾ <http://www.expansion.com/2013/02/14/empresas/banca/1360865943.html>

⁽³⁾ http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-192_en.htm

⁽⁴⁾ <http://www.gurusblog.com/archives/valencia-cf-nacionalizado/21/01/2013/>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003405/13
to the Commission**

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)

(26 March 2013)

Subject: Football club owned by a nationalised bank

Bankia will be forced to acquire the shares of the Valencia Football Club Foundation, which owns the club. That is likely to be the judgment of the Valencian Administrative Court No 3, which could withdraw the backing that the Valencian Finance Institute (a body run by the Valencian regional government) applied to the Valencia Football Club Foundation in 2009 in order for it to acquire the bulk of the club's shares. The judgment would render null and void the guarantee that was provided to access a Bancaja loan of EUR 81 million, which, in practice, would make the banking house (now Bankia, having been rescued by the State) the majority shareholder in Valencia FC ⁽¹⁾. The Memorandum of Understanding on the bailout of the Spanish banking system states in point 15 of the chapter on 'Recapitalisation, restructuring and/or resolution' that 'The restructuring plans should be based on significant downsizing of unprofitable business with a focus on divestitures wherever feasible'.

This point was confirmed in Bankia's restructuring plan ⁽²⁾. A Commission press release on 6 March 2013 concerning state aid for Dutch football, contained the following statement 'strongly believe that professional football clubs should be well managed and not ask for help from the tax-payer when facing financial difficulties' ⁽³⁾. Valencia FC's debt amounts to EUR 350 million, most of which is mortgage secured ⁽⁴⁾.

Bearing in mind that BFA-Bankia is now state-owned, and the relationship that it would have with Valencia FC, will the Commission be vigilant to ensure that Valencia FC does not receive state aid?

Pursuant to the memorandum of understanding, does the Commission believe that Bankia should sell its shares in Valencia FC in order to reduce losses on its balance sheet?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission

(7 June 2013)

Following press reports about guarantees provided by the Valencia Finance Institute, the Commission has asked the Spanish authorities for more information on this measure. Were the Commission to identify state aid as having been granted to FC Valencia, it would consider the appropriate steps to take under the state aid rules of the Treaty.

Concerning the restructuring of BFA/Bankia, the Commission approved on 28 November 2012 the restructuring plan submitted by the Spanish authorities and found that the state support granted to BFA/Bankia pursuant to this restructuring plan is compatible with Article 107(3)(b) of the Treaty which allows state aid to remedy a serious disturbance in a Member State's economy.

The Commission is currently monitoring the implementation of the decision and the commitments made therein. As a consequence of the deep restructuring foreseen in BFA/Bankia's plan and in order to avoid undue distortions of competition, one of the measures will be the sale of BFA/Bankia's participations in non-strategic participations identified in the plan or resulting from the execution of guarantees granted by the BFA/Bankia over the past years. The exact identity of these participations and the timetable for the sales is, however, considered a business secret and cannot be disclosed as it could materially influence the sale process.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.lavanguardia.com/local/valencia/20130312/54368291736/un-juez-convierte-a-bankia-duena-del-valenciacf.html>

⁽²⁾ <http://www.expansion.com/2013/02/14/empresas/banca/1360865943.html>

⁽³⁾ http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-192_en.htm

⁽⁴⁾ <http://www.gurusblog.com/archives/valencia-cf-nacionalizado/21/01/2013/>

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003406/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE) y Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(26 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Respeto a los valores fundamentales en la EU

El 8 de marzo de 2011, el Tribunal Europeo de Derechos Humanos condenó al Reino de España a indemnizar con 23 000 euros a la víctima por no haber investigado los malos tratos denunciados por la demandante tras su detención el año 2002 ⁽¹⁾.

El 24 de julio de 2012 el Tribunal Europeo de Derechos Humanos condenó al Reino de España a indemnizar con 30 000 euros a la víctima por no investigar la posible **discriminación** sufrida por una ciudadana nigeriana que, en julio de 2005, fue **insultada y agredida** por agentes de la Policía Nacional en plena calle en Palma de Mallorca ⁽²⁾.

El pasado 16 de octubre de 2012 el Tribunal Europeo de Derechos Humanos condenó al Reino de España a indemnizar con 24 000 euros a la víctima por no investigar los posibles malos tratos que dijo recibir durante su detención en el 2003 ⁽³⁾.

Los valores fundamentales consagrados en los Tratados europeos, tales como la democracia, los derechos fundamentales y el Estado de Derecho deben ser protegidos vigorosamente.

¿Tiene previsto la Comisión crear un nuevo instrumento «rápido» y «eficaz» para obligar a los Estados miembros de la UE a respetar los valores fundamentales de la democracia y el Estado de Derecho, tal y como piden Alemania, Holanda, Dinamarca y Finlandia? ⁽⁴⁾

En caso afirmativo, ¿incluiría ese instrumento sanciones como la suspensión de ayudas de fondos europeos a los Estados que no respeten estos principios, tal y como piden Alemania, Holanda, Dinamarca y Finlandia?

Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión
(6 de junio de 2013)

La carta de los cuatro ministros de Asuntos Exteriores a que se refiere su Señoría refleja las preocupaciones ya abordadas por el Presidente Barroso en su discurso sobre el estado de la Unión de septiembre de 2012, en el que hizo hincapié en la necesidad de reforzar los fundamentos de la UE, tales como el respeto de nuestros valores fundamentales, el Estado de derecho y la democracia. El Presidente Barroso aludió en su carta a la necesidad de «un conjunto de instrumentos mejor desarrollado, no solo la alternativa entre la mano suave de la persuasión política y la mano dura del artículo 7 del Tratado» ⁽⁵⁾.

Un nuevo mecanismo tendrá éxito si todos los Estados miembros lo consideraran legítimo y útil, así como una contribución positiva a los esfuerzos de reforma. Para ello, hará falta ganarse la confianza a lo largo del tiempo, aprovechando la experiencia práctica con los instrumentos a disposición de la Comisión, incluida el cuadro de indicadores de la justicia. La Comisión presentará a su debido tiempo sus reflexiones sobre los nuevos instrumentos para garantizar el respeto de los valores fundamentales de la Unión Europea.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.publico.es/espana/365092/espana-condenada-por-no-investigar-torturas-a-un-detenido>

⁽²⁾ <http://www.elmundo.es/elmundo/2012/07/24/espana/1343154621.html>

⁽³⁾ <http://www.europapress.es/euskadi/noticia-otamendi-satisfecho-fallo-dice-hubo-otros-torturados-anuncia-acto-agradecer-solidaridad-20121016111452.html>

⁽⁴⁾ <http://www.elperiodico.cat/ca/noticias/internacional/alemanya-tres-paisos-mes-demanen-mecanismes-per-protgegir-democracia-2335375>

⁽⁵⁾ Se puede consultar en: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-12-596_es.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003406/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE) and Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(26 March 2013)

Subject: Respect for fundamental values in the EU

On 8 March 2011, the European Court of Human Rights sentenced the Kingdom of Spain to pay compensation of EUR 23 000 to a victim for failing to investigate the ill-treatment he claimed to have suffered after his arrest in 2002 ⁽¹⁾.

On 24 July 2012, the European Court of Human Rights sentenced the Kingdom of Spain to pay compensation of EUR 30 000 to the victim for failing to investigate the possible discrimination suffered by a Nigerian woman who, in July 2005, was insulted and attacked by members of the National Police in the middle of the street in Palma de Mallorca ⁽²⁾.

On 16 October 2012, the European Court of Human Rights sentenced the Kingdom of Spain to pay compensation of EUR 24 000 to a victim for failing to investigate the possible ill-treatment he claimed to have received during his arrest in 2003 ⁽³⁾.

The fundamental values enshrined in the European Treaties, such as democracy, fundamental rights and the rule of law, must be vigorously protected.

Does the Commission intend to create a new 'fast' and 'effective' instrument to oblige EU Member States to respect the fundamental values of democracy and the rule of law, as requested by Germany, the Netherlands, Denmark and Finland? ⁽⁴⁾

If so, would this instrument include sanctions such as the suspension of EU funding for Member States that do not respect these principles, as requested by Germany, the Netherlands, Denmark and Finland?

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

The letter of the four Ministers of Foreign Affairs to which the Honourable Member refers reflects the concerns that President Barroso already raised in his State of the Union address in September 2012, in which he underlined the need to strengthen the foundations of the EU, such as the respect for our fundamental values, for the rule of law and democracy. President Barroso referred in this letter to the need for 'a better developed set of instruments — not just the alternative between the "soft power" of political persuasion and the "nuclear option" of Article 7 of the Treaty' ⁽⁵⁾.

A successful new mechanism will have to be considered as legitimate and worthwhile by all Member States and a positive contribution to reform efforts. This will need the building of confidence over time, drawing on the practical experience with tools that the Commission has at its disposal, including the Justice Scoreboard. The Commission will in due time presents its reflections on further instruments to ensure compliance with EU fundamental values.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.publico.es/espana/365092/espana-condenada-por-no-investigar-torturas-a-un-detenido>.

⁽²⁾ <http://www.elmundo.es/elmundo/2012/07/24/espana/1343154621.html>

⁽³⁾ <http://www.europapress.es/euskadi/noticia-otamendi-satisfecho-fallo-dice-hubo-otros-torturados-anuncia-acto-agradecer-solidaridad-20121016111452.html>

⁽⁴⁾ <http://www.elperiodico.cat/ca/noticias/internacional/alemanya-tres-paisos-mes-demanen-mecanismes-per-protégir-democracia-2335375>

⁽⁵⁾ Available at: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-12-596_en.htm

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003407/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Marietta Giannakou (PPE)
(26 Μαρτίου 2013)

Θέμα: Αναγκαστικοί γάμοι ανηλίκων και εκπαίδευση

Ένα από τα σοβαρότερα ζητήματα παραβίασης ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων στην Τουρκία είναι το θέμα των αναγκαστικών γάμων ανηλίκων. Μεγάλη σημασία για την ανατροπή αυτής της κατάστασης έχει η εκπαίδευση, η ενημέρωση και η μόρφωση των νεαρών γυναικών, καθώς οι σχετικές έρευνες δείχνουν ότι φτωχά και αμόρφωτα κορίτσια υποχρεούνται με μεγαλύτερη συχνότητα στη σύναψη αναγκαστικού γάμου.

Στην Τουρκία, μεγάλο ποσοστό του γυναικείου πληθυσμού είναι ανεκπαιδευτο και το 40% των ανηλίκων γυναικών υφίστανται βία μέσα στην οικογένεια και εξαναγκασμό σε γάμο για πολιτισμικούς ή οικονομικούς λόγους. Παρόλη την σύγχρονη πληροφόρηση, εγκλήματα τιμής συνεχίζουν να απειλούν τις ανήλικες στην Τουρκία. Το 80% των ανηλίκων των αγροτικών και απομονωμένων, κυρίως, επαρχιών της χώρας εξαναγκάζονται σε γάμο πριν τα 18, γεγονός παράνομο και αντίθετο με την τουρκική νομοθεσία. Οι αναγκαστικοί γάμοι ανηλίκων εκθέτουν συχνά τις νεαρές στους κινδύνους της ανήλικης εγκυμοσύνης λόγω έλλειψης πρόνοιας και πληροφόρησης. Πολλές νεαρές χάνουν τη ζωή τους κατά τη διάρκεια της εγκυμοσύνης, αφήνοντας τα νεογέννητά τους ορφανά.

Το ίδιο πρόβλημα εντοπίζεται ακόμη και σε τουρκικούς πληθυσμούς που έχουν μεταναστεύσει στην Ευρώπη. Στη Γερμανία, όπου αριθμούνται πάνω από τρία εκατομμύρια κάτοικοι τουρκικής καταγωγής, η μεγάλη πλειοψηφία των περιστατικών αναγκαστικών γάμων περιλαμβάνει μέλη της τουρκικής κοινότητας.

Στο πλαίσιο αυτό και σύμφωνα με το θετικό διάλογο με την Τουρκία, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— έχει λάβει νεότερα στοιχεία σχετικά με το ζήτημα και, αν ναι, πώς σκοπεύει να ενισχύσει την προσπάθεια εξάλειψης των γάμων αυτών και των εγκλημάτων τιμής, να ενημερώσει και να μορφώσει τους πληθυσμούς στις προβληματικές περιοχές σχετικά με τα δικαιώματά τους και να προωθήσει τον σεβασμό των δικαιωμάτων των γυναικών;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(22 Μαΐου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή είναι ενήμερη για το ζήτημα που έθεσε το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου και θα ήθελε να αναφερθεί στην οικεία Έκθεση Προόδου του 2012 για την Τουρκία⁽¹⁾, όπου αναφέρεται ότι «το ζήτημα των πρόωγων και αναγκαστικών γάμων παραμένει σοβαρό πρόβλημα».

Τα πλέον πρόσφατα διαθέσιμα στατιστικά στοιχεία μπορούν να ανακτηθούν από τη Δημογραφική Έρευνα Υγείας (DHS) του 2008 και από την τελευταία έκθεση για την κατάσταση του παγκόσμιου πληθυσμού από το 2011 που συνέταξε το Ταμείο των Ηνωμένων Εθνών για τη Δημογραφία (UNFPA). Σύμφωνα με τα στατιστικά αυτά στοιχεία, περίπου το 14% των γυναικών ηλικίας 20-24 ετών παντρεύτηκαν πριν από την ηλικία των 18 ετών και το 5.1% του συνόλου των γεννήσεων αφορούν κορίτσια ηλικίας 15-19 ετών.

Οι τουρκικές αρχές έχουν επίγνωση του προβλήματος και πραγματοποιήθηκαν βήματα βελτίωσης της κατάστασης των γυναικών στην Τουρκία. Σημαντικό βήμα ήταν η θέσπιση νέου νόμου για την προστασία των γυναικών και των μελών της οικογένειας από τη βία. Άλλο βήμα αποτέλεσε η επικαιροποίηση του εθνικού σχεδίου δράσης για την καταπολέμηση της βίας κατά των γυναικών (2012-2016). Η Τουρκία είναι, επιπλέον, μέρος στις σχετικές διεθνείς συμβάσεις, όπως είναι η Σύμβαση των Ηνωμένων Εθνών για τα δικαιώματα του παιδιού (CRC). Η Επιτροπή στηρίζει τις προσπάθειες της Τουρκίας με έργα που χρηματοδοτούνται μέσω του μηχανισμού προενταξιακής βοήθειας (IPA).

Η Τουρκία, ως χώρα που διαπραγματεύεται την προσχώρησή της στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, πρέπει να εξασφαλίσει τη συμμόρφωσή της με τα πολιτικά κριτήρια, μεταξύ των οποίων συγκαταλέγονται ο σεβασμός των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων, των οποίων κρίσιμο μέρος είναι τα δικαιώματα των γυναικών και η ισότητα των φύλων.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/detailed-country-information/turkey/index_en.htm

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003407/13
to the Commission
Marietta Giannakou (PPE)
(26 March 2013)**

Subject: Forced marriages and education of minors

Forced marriages involving minors are one of the most serious human rights violations in Turkey. Educating, informing and teaching young women play a major role in preventing this situation and related studies illustrate that forced marriages are more frequent among poor, uneducated girls.

A large proportion of the female population in Turkey is uneducated and 40% of underage women suffer violence within the family and are forced into marriage for cultural or financial reasons. Despite modern means of communication, underage girls in Turkey still risk becoming victims of crimes of honour. 80% of underage girls in rural and isolated regions of the country are forced into marriage before the age of 18, which is illegal and prohibited under Turkish law. Forced marriages expose underage girls to the risks inherent in underage pregnancy, due to a lack of welfare and information services. Numerous young girls die during pregnancy, leaving their new-born babies orphaned.

The same problem even occurs within immigrant Turkish communities in Europe. In Germany, where there are more than three million inhabitants of Turkish origin, the large majority of forced marriages involve members of the Turkish community.

In light of the above and the positive dialogue with Turkey, will the Commission say:

- Has it obtained more recent data on this problem and, if so, how does it intend to step up efforts to eliminate such marriages and crimes of honour, inform and educate inhabitants of problem areas about their rights and promote respect for women's rights?

**Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(22 May 2013)**

The Commission is aware of the issue raised by the Honourable Member and would like to refer to its 2012 Progress Report on Turkey ⁽¹⁾, where it is stated that 'the issue of early and forced marriages remains a serious concern'.

The most recent statistics available can be retrieved from the 2008 Demographic Health Survey (DHS) and the United Nations Population Fund's (UNFPA) latest State of World Population Report from 2011. These statistics estimate that around 14% of women aged 20-24 were married before age 18, and 5.1% of all births are to girls aged 15-19.

The Turkish authorities are aware of the issue and steps towards an improvement for the situation of women in Turkey were taken. One major step was the introduction of a new Law to Protect Women and Family Members from Violence. Another step was the updating of the National Action Plan on Combatting Violence Against Women (2012-2016). Turkey is furthermore party to the relevant international conventions, such as the UN Convention on the Right of the Child (CRC). The Commission supports Turkey's efforts through projects funded through the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA).

Turkey, as a country negotiating to become a member of the European Union, needs to ensure compliance with the political criteria, of which respect for human rights, including women's rights and gender equality, is a crucial part.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/detailed-country-information/turkey/index_en.htm

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003408/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Toussas (GUE/NGL)
(26 Μαρτίου 2013)

Θέμα: Σε άμεσο κίνδυνο η δημόσια υγεία και το περιβάλλον από τη λειτουργία σταθμού μεταφόρτωσης απορριμμάτων στο Σταυρό — Κλάδεμα Διδύμων του Δήμου Ερμιονίδας

Η αντιλαϊκή πολιτική της κυβέρνησης ΝΔ-ΠΑΣΟΚ-ΔΗΜΑΡ και των προηγούμενων κυβερνήσεων ΝΔ και ΠΑΣΟΚ, από κοινού με την ΕΕ, επιδεινώνει δραματικά τη ζωή της εργατικής-λαϊκής οικογένειας και στο Δήμο Ερμιονίδας Αργολίδας της Περιφέρειας Πελοποννήσου. Η πολιτική αυτή, την οποία υπηρετούν οι τοπικές αρχές, έχει σωρεύσει τεράστια προβλήματα για τους εργαζόμενους και τους κατοίκους, καταστρέφει το περιβάλλον και θέτει σε κίνδυνο τη δημόσια υγεία. Μεθοδευμένα οξύνουν το πρόβλημα της διαχείρισης απορριμμάτων, για να το αξιοποιήσουν με την παράδοση της διαχείρισης σε μονοπωλιακούς ομίλους, μέσω Συμβάσεων ΣΔΠ.

Η πλειοψηφία του Περιφερειακού Συμβουλίου Πελοποννήσου, σε συμπαιγνία με την κυβέρνηση, στις 1.7.2012, έλαβε απόφαση για την παύση της λειτουργίας των ΧΑΔΑ, δημιουργώντας αδιέξοδο, αφού στην περιοχή δεν υπάρχει νόμιμος χώρος εναπόθεσης απορριμμάτων. Στη συνέχεια, αποφάσισε τη μεταφορά μέρους του τεράστιου όγκου απορριμμάτων από όλη την Περιφέρεια στο ΧΥΤΑ Φυλής, στην Αττική, έναντι υπηλότατου αντιτίμου και μεταφορικών. Έτσι, θησαυρίζουν οι επιχειρηματικοί όμιλοι από χρήματα που καλούνται να πληρώσουν οι εργαζόμενοι. Η μονάδα «προσωρινής αποθήκευσης» δεμάτων απορριμμάτων, στον Σταυρό-Κλάδεμα Διδύμων Ερμιονίδας, λειτουργώντας ως ανοικτή χωματερή, συσσωρεύσει σε δύο χρόνια πάνω από 42 000 τόνους σε δέματα και 35 000 τόνους χύδην απορρίμματα. Λόγω της ανεξέλεγκτης εναπόθεσης απορριμμάτων και της ανύπαρκτης εποπτείας του χώρου, έχουν εκδηλωθεί πυρκαγιές από την ανάφλεξη απορριμμάτων, που μπορεί να έχουν οδυνηρές συνέπειες για το περιβάλλον και την ασφάλεια των κατοίκων.

Παρά τις διαμαρτυρίες και κινητοποιήσεις των κατοίκων, κυβέρνηση, Περιφέρεια και Δήμος αρνούνται να πάρουν μέτρα για την παύση της λειτουργίας της ανοικτής χωματερής και να προστατεύσουν το περιβάλλον και την δημόσια υγεία. Οι εργαζόμενοι κάτοικοι με απόφαση του Τοπικού Συμβουλίου Διδύμων περιφρουρούν το χώρο και απαγορεύουν την εναπόθεση νέων δεμάτων απορριμμάτων, για να προφυλάξουν στοιχειωδώς το περιβάλλον και την υγεία τους.

Πώς τοποθετείται η Επιτροπή στην απόφαση του Περιφερειακού Συμβουλίου να λειτουργεί μονάδα «προσωρινής αποθήκευσης» δεμάτων απορριμμάτων που συγκεντρώνει χιλιάδες τόνους απορριμμάτων σε ανοικτή χωματερή, στην θέση Σταυρός-Κλάδεμα, καθώς και στα αιτήματα των κατοίκων να ληφθούν άμεσα μέτρα για την απομάκρυνση των δεμάτων, την άμεση παύση λειτουργίας της μονάδας και την δημιουργία αποκλειστικά δημόσιου ενιαίου φορέα διαχείρισης απορριμμάτων, χωρίς οικονομική επιβάρυνση των κατοίκων και καμία ανάμειξη ιδιωτών;

Απάντηση του κ. Ροτοτσνίκ εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(30 Ιουλίου 2013)

Όσον αφορά την ανεξέλεγκτη απόρριψη στον χώρο εναπόθεσης απορριμμάτων στο Σταυρό — Κλάδεμα Διδύμων του Δήμου Ερμιονίδας, το Δικαστήριο, με την απόφαση της 6ης Οκτωβρίου 2005 (υπόθεση C-502/03), καταδίκασε την Ελλάδα για τη διάθεση οικιακών αποβλήτων κατά ανεξέλεγκτο και παράνομο τρόπο, και δήλωσε ότι η Ελλάδα παρέλειψε να συμμορφωθεί με τις υποχρεώσεις που υπέχει βάσει της οδηγίας 75/442/ΕΟΚ περί των στερεών αποβλήτων, όπως τροποποιήθηκε και κωδικοποιήθηκε με την οδηγία 2008/98/ΕΚ (οδηγία πλαίσιο για τα απόβλητα⁽¹⁾). Στην εν λόγω απόφαση διαπιστώθηκε ότι στην Ελλάδα λειτουργούσαν τουλάχιστον 1 125 παράνομοι ή μη ελεγχόμενοι χώροι εναπόθεσης απορριμμάτων εκτός από αυτόν που αναφέρει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος. Δεδομένου ότι στις 21.2.2013 δεν είχαν ακόμη κλείσει όλοι οι παράνομοι χώροι εναπόθεσης απορριμμάτων (λειτουργούν ακόμη 78), η Επιτροπή αποφάσισε να παραπέμψει εκ νέου την υπόθεση στο Δικαστήριο και να ζητήσει την επιβολή χρηματικών ποινών (C-378/13).

Όσον αφορά τη σύσταση δημόσιου ενιαίου φορέα διαχείρισης απορριμμάτων, χωρίς οικονομική επιβάρυνση των κατοίκων και καμία ανάμειξη ιδιωτών, η Επιτροπή θα ήθελε να τονίσει ότι το οργανωτικό πλαίσιο της διαχείρισης των αποβλήτων αποτελεί αποκλειστική ευθύνη των κρατών μελών.

(¹) EE L 312 της 22.11.2008.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003408/13
to the Commission**

Georgios Toussas (GUE/NGL)

(26 March 2013)

Subject: Direct threat to public health and the environment from landfill site in Stavros-Kladema Didymon in the Municipality of Ermionida

The anti-grassroots policy applied by the New Democracy/PASOK/Democratic Left government and by previous New Democracy and PASOK governments, together with the EU, is having a drastic effect on the lives of working and grassroots classes in the Municipality of Ermionida Argolidas in the region of the Peloponnese. This policy, which is being applied by the local authorities, has caused enormous problems for workers and residents and is destroying the environment and putting public health at risk. It is methodically exacerbating the problem of waste management, in order to make money by contracting waste management out to monopoly groups under PPPs.

On 1 July 2012, the Peloponnese Regional Council, in collusion with the government, decided by a majority to stop operating the local landfill; however, as there is no regulated waste disposal site, this created a deadlock. It then decided to move some of the huge amount of waste from the entire region to the Fyli landfill in Attica, for extortionate fees and transport costs. Thus, business groups are raking in money which the workers are being forced to pay. The unit at which packaged waste is 'stored temporarily' in Stavros-Kladema Didymon in Ermionida, which operates as an open landfill, has collected over 42 000 tonnes of packaged waste and 35 000 of loose waste in two years. Due to uncontrolled dumping and inadequate supervision of the site, fires have broken out from the spontaneous combustion of the waste, which may have serious consequences for the environment and the safety of local residents.

Despite protests and demonstrations by local residents, the government, region and municipality have refused to take measures to close the dump and protect the environment and public health. Following a decision by the Didyma local council, workers and residents have surrounded the site in order to prevent more packaged waste from being dumped and provide some sort of rudimentary protection for their environment and health.

What is the Commission's view of the decision by the Regional Council to operate a 'temporary storage' unit for packaged waste which has collected thousands of tonnes of waste in an open landfill in Stavros-Kladema and of residents' demands that immediate action should be taken to remove the packaged waste, close the unit and set up a single government-owned waste management agency at no cost to local residents and with no private-sector involvement?

Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission

(30 July 2013)

Concerning uncontrolled dumping at the landfill Stavros-Kladema Didymon in Ermionida in its judgment of 6 October 2005 (Case C-502/03), the Court condemned Greece for the disposal of household waste in an uncontrolled and illegal manner, and declared that it had failed to comply with its obligations under Directive 75/442/EEC on waste as amended, now codified by Directive 2008/98/EC (Waste Framework Directive⁽¹⁾). The judgment established that at least 1.125 illegal or uncontrolled landfills were operational in Greece, including the one referred to by the Honourable Member. As all illegal landfills have still not been closed on 21.2.2013 (still 78 illegal landfills operating), the Commission decided to refer the case back to the Court and to ask for financial penalties to be imposed (C-378/13).

Concerning the setting up of a single government-owned waste management agency at no cost to local residents and with no private-sector involvement the Commission would like to stress that the organisational framework of waste management is the sole responsibility of Member States.

(¹) OJ L 312, 22.11.2008.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003409/13
à la Commission
Françoise Grossetête (PPE)
(26 mars 2013)

Objet: Règlements d'application de la directive éco-conception

La directive éco-conception est en application depuis 2009. La démarche poursuivie sur le plan européen est positive, grâce à l'établissement d'un cadre pour la fixation d'exigences en matière d'éco-conception applicables aux produits consommateurs d'énergie.

Toutefois, le fonctionnement du marché intérieur de l'énergie montre aujourd'hui que la valeur de l'énergie a un coût variable au cours du temps. Or, la directive éco-conception ne tient pas compte des externalités ni de leur coût. Ainsi, baisser la consommation d'énergie aux heures creuses pour l'augmenter aux heures de pointe va à l'encontre de la volonté affichée de réduire les émissions de CO₂, puisque le mix énergétique à la pointe de consommation est tout à fait défavorable en comparaison au mix en heures creuses. De même, cela suppose un renforcement des réseaux électriques pour intégrer l'impact sur la puissance de pointe des nouveaux équipements admissibles. Au final, cela représente un coût supplémentaire pour les consommateurs.

Comment la Commission s'assure-t-elle que les externalités et leur coût sont pris en compte dans les règlements d'application de la directive éco-conception?

Comment s'assure-t-elle que les économies réalisées sur la facture d'énergie ne sont pas annulées par une augmentation des coûts des externalités (investissements nécessaires sur le réseau électrique et accroissement des émissions de CO₂)?

Réponse donnée par M. Oettinger au nom de la Commission
(17 mai 2013)

Selon l'analyse de la Commission, les dispositions d'exécution en matière d'écoconception ⁽¹⁾ n'ont pas d'incidence sur la période de consommation d'énergie. En revanche, elles permettent une réduction globale de la consommation d'énergie qui entraîne généralement une diminution des capacités requises de production, de transport et de distribution, et contribuent à alléger la pression exercée sur le réseau. Ainsi, l'écoconception contribue à réduire les coûts et les émissions de CO₂.

Les propositions législatives en matière d'écoconception sont précédées d'études techniques préparatoires, qui incluent des estimations des coûts directs et indirects et des économies que la réglementation permettra de réaliser. Le cas échéant, les incidences sur l'ensemble du système énergétique peuvent être prises en compte. Les hypothèses formulées dans les modèles de coûts, notamment sur la façon dont les produits sont généralement utilisés aux heures de pointe et en heures creuses, sont vérifiées avec les parties prenantes pour s'assurer qu'elles sont réalistes.

En ce qui concerne les externalités de la consommation d'énergie, la Commission a pris un certain nombre d'initiatives (directive sur l'efficacité énergétique ⁽²⁾ et task force sur les réseaux intelligents ⁽³⁾, par exemple) afin de mettre en place les structures et instruments nécessaires pour permettre une «réponse adaptée à la demande», c'est-à-dire un outil servant à déplacer le pic de consommation vers les heures creuses et à mieux exploiter les sources d'énergie renouvelables disponibles. En outre, le plan de travail «Écoconception» pour la période 2012-2014 ⁽⁴⁾ prévoit que le domaine des appareils intelligents/compteurs intelligents fera l'objet d'études approfondies.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 2009/125/CE du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 21 octobre 2009 établissant un cadre pour la fixation d'exigences en matière d'écoconception applicables aux produits liés à l'énergie (JO L 285 du 31.10.2009, p. 10).

⁽²⁾ Directive 2012/27/UE du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 25 octobre 2012 relative à l'efficacité énergétique (JO L 315 du 14.11.2012, p. 1).

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/energy/gas_electricity/smartgrids/taskforce_fr.htm

⁽⁴⁾ Établissement du plan de travail 2012-2014 au titre de la directive relative à l'écoconception, SWD(2012) 434 final,

http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sustainable-business/documents/eco-design/working-plan/files/comm-swd-2012-434-ecodesign_en.pdf

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003409/13
to the Commission
Françoise Grossetête (PPE)
(26 March 2013)**

Subject: Implementing regulations of the Ecodesign Directive

The Ecodesign Directive has been in force since 2009. The approach adopted at EU level is positive, thanks to the establishment of a framework for the setting of ecodesign requirements for energy-using products.

However, the functioning of the internal energy market today shows that the value of energy has a varying cost over time, but the Ecodesign Directive does not take into account externalities or their cost. Therefore, lowering energy consumption at off-peak times in order to increase it at peak times goes against the stated intention to reduce CO₂ emissions since the energy mix during peak consumption is very unfavourable compared with the mix at off-peak times. Likewise, that entails strengthening electricity networks in order to incorporate the impact of the new admissible equipment on the peak power. In the end, that represents an additional cost for consumers.

How is the Commission ensuring that externalities and their cost are taken into account in the implementing regulations of the Ecodesign Directive?

How is it ensuring that the savings made on energy bills are not cancelled out by an increase in the cost of externalities (necessary investments in the electricity network and higher CO₂ emissions)?

**Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(17 May 2013)**

According to the analysis of the Commission, Ecodesign ⁽¹⁾ implementing regulations do not have an impact on the time of the energy consumption. Instead they yield an overall reduction of energy consumption which generally leads to a decrease in the need for generation, transmission and distribution capacities and help to relieve pressure on the network. Thus, Ecodesign contributes to bringing down costs and CO₂-emissions.

Ecodesign legislative proposals are preceded by technical preparatory studies, which include estimates of the direct and indirect costs and savings that the regulation will introduce. Where relevant, impacts on the wider energy system can be taken into account. Assumptions made in cost models, including patterns on how products are typically used at peak and off-peak times, are checked with stakeholders to ensure they are realistic.

Regarding the externalities of energy consumption, the Commission has established a number of policy initiatives (e.g. Energy Efficiency Directive ⁽²⁾ and Smart Grids Task Force ⁽³⁾) to put in place the structures and instruments that are necessary to enable 'demand response' which is a tool to shift consumption peak to off peak times and to better use the availability of renewable energy sources. Also, the Ecodesign Working Plan 2012-2014 ⁽⁴⁾ has identified smart appliances/smart meters as an area for further study.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 2009/125/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 October 2009 establishing a framework for the setting of ecodesign requirements for energy-related products, OJ L 285, 31.10.2009, pp. 10-35.

⁽²⁾ Directive 2012/27/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2012 on energy efficiency, OJ L 315, 14.11.2012, pp. 1-56.

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/energy/gas_electricity/smartgrids/taskforce_en.htm

⁽⁴⁾ Establishment of the Working Plan 2012-2014 under the Ecodesign Directive, SWD(2012) 434 final.

http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sustainable-business/documents/eco-design/working-plan/files/comm-swd-2012-434-ecodesign_en.pdf

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003410/13
alla Commissione**

Matteo Salvini (EFD)

(26 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Costo eccessivo dei libri scolastici in Italia rispetto agli altri paesi UE

L'Europa riconosce e promuove da sempre il diritto allo studio e all'accesso alla cultura, indipendentemente dal reddito.

Coerentemente con tale impostazione, molti paesi europei hanno stabilito che è compito dello Stato farsi carico integralmente o quasi dei costi legati all'istruzione dei cittadini, incluse le spese derivanti dall'acquisto obbligatorio dei libri scolastici approvati dal ministero competente e adottati dalle scuole, testi che vengono pertanto forniti dallo Stato oppure venduti a prezzi calmierati.

In Italia, invece, i costi dei libri scolastici si riversano interamente sul bilancio delle famiglie, già provate dalla crisi, e il tetto di spesa fissato dal ministero, peraltro già elevato — si pensi che per uno studente del terzo anno di liceo classico è ammessa, per l'anno scolastico 2012/2103, una spesa fino a 382 euro — viene spesso ampiamente superato: nelle scuole italiane è prassi diffusa, infatti, fornire a inizio anno, in allegato all'elenco dei testi obbligatori — il cui costo complessivo è pari o di poco inferiore alla soglia ministeriale — un secondo elenco contenente dei testi che, formalmente, risulterebbero facoltativi, ma il cui acquisto viene di fatto richiesto a tutti gli alunni.

In un'ottica di integrazione europea e di riconoscimento e tutela del diritto allo studio, chiediamo alla Commissione quali iniziative intenda intraprendere per favorire un'effettiva ed equa tutela di tale diritto per tutti i cittadini dell'Unione.

Risposta di Androulla Vassiliou a nome della Commissione

(6 maggio 2013)

Nel campo dell'istruzione, della formazione professionale e della cultura il trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea (TFUE) conferisce all'Unione esclusivamente la competenza per svolgere azioni intese a sostenere, coordinare o completare l'azione degli Stati membri (articolo 6 del TFUE). Gli Stati membri sono principalmente responsabili per quanto riguarda il contenuto dell'insegnamento e l'organizzazione del sistema di istruzione (articolo 165 del TFUE) e l'Unione deve rispettare le diversità nazionali e regionali in ambito culturale (articolo 167 del TFUE). Ne deriva che il diritto generale allo studio e all'accesso alla cultura, indipendentemente dal reddito, non ha una base giuridica nella normativa UE. La Commissione non ha quindi autorità per intervenire nelle questioni sollevate dall'onorevole deputato, le quali rimangono di responsabilità degli Stati membri e, sulla base del principio di sussidiarietà, sono meglio trattate a livello nazionale.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003410/13
to the Commission
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(26 March 2013)**

Subject: Excessive cost of school books in Italy compared with other EU countries

Europe has always recognised and encouraged the right to study and to have access to culture, regardless of income.

In line with this approach, many EU countries have decreed that it is the responsibility of the State to meet all (or almost all) of the costs of the education of its citizens, including expenditure arising from the mandatory purchase of school books approved by the relevant ministry and adopted by the schools, texts which are therefore provided by the State or sold at controlled prices.

In Italy, however, the costs of school books must be covered in full by the budgets of families who are already afflicted by the crisis, and the expenditure ceiling set by the ministry, which is already high — consider that for a student in the third year of secondary school, for the 2012/2013 school year, expenditure of up to EUR 382 is allowed — is often considerably exceeded: in fact in Italian schools it is common practice to issue, at the start of the year, in addition to the list of mandatory texts — whose overall cost is equal to or only slightly under the ministerial threshold — a second list containing texts which are officially optional, but which all students are actually required to purchase.

With a view to European integration and recognition of the right to study, we would ask the Commission which initiatives it intends to implement to foster the effective and fair protection of this right for all EU citizens.

**Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(6 May 2013)**

In the fields of education, vocational training and culture, the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) only confers on the Union the competence to carry out actions to support, coordinate or supplement the actions of the Member States (Article 6 TFEU). Member States are in fact primarily responsible for the content of the teaching and the organisation of their education systems (Article 165 TFEU) and the Union must respect national and regional diversity in cultural matters (Article 167 TFEU). It follows that a general right to study and to have access to culture, regardless of income, has no basis in EC law. The Commission has consequently no authority to intervene with regard to the issues raised by the Honourable Member, which remain the responsibility of the Member States and according to the principle of subsidiarity are better tackled at national level.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003411/13
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(26 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Possibili violazioni del diritto comunitario e interferenze in merito alle procedure di approvazione del progetto di un rigassificatore a Zaule, nel porto della città di Trieste

Nel porto di Trieste, a Zaule, la multinazionale Gas Natural Fenosa ha proposto, attraverso la società Gas Natural Rigassificazione Italia S.p.A., la costruzione di un terminale di rigassificazione di gas naturale liquefatto. A questo progetto si oppongono per motivi di danno ambientale, portuale e rischio di incidenti catastrofici i cittadini, le ONG ambientaliste e le autorità locali e della confinante Repubblica di Slovenia, nonché la TAL, l'oleodotto transalpino che da Zaule rifornisce Germania, Austria e Repubblica Ceca.

Il problema è all'attenzione del Parlamento europeo con le petizioni 483/2007 e 1147/2008 di Greenaction Transnational e 1472/2009 di Alpe Adria Green. Attualmente, il ministero dell'Ambiente italiano ha in corso una nuova procedura di VIA ai sensi della direttiva 2011/92/UE.

Nonostante tale procedura di valutazione non sia ancora conclusa, il ministro italiano dello Sviluppo economico, delle infrastrutture e dei trasporti Corrado Passera ha dichiarato alla stampa di Trieste il 22 luglio 2012 ⁽¹⁾ che il terminale di rigassificazione «si deve fare a tutti i costi». Recentemente, alcuni quotidiani di Trieste del 19, 22 e 23 marzo 2013 ⁽²⁾ hanno affermato e documentato che funzionari di quel ministero starebbero sostenendo presso la Commissione europea (DG Energia — Unità mercato interno I: Reti e iniziative regionali) il tentativo di Gas Natural Fenosa di aggirare le opposizioni italiane e slovene inserendo il rigassificatore di Zaule fra le 13 infrastrutture energetiche prioritarie che verranno previste e finanziate attraverso il piano per una rete energetica europea integrata per il 2020 e oltre.

Lo scrivente chiede alla Commissione:

1. se e con quali procedure il rigassificatore in questione possa venire inserito e finanziato dall'UE tra le infrastrutture energetiche prioritarie, nonostante le opposizioni succitate;
2. se le informazioni in possesso della Commissione possono escludere che il progetto comporti violazioni alle direttive 2012/18/UE sugli incidenti rilevanti, 2011/92/UE sulla procedura VIA, con particolare riferimento all'articolo 7, e 2001/42/CE sulla procedura VAS.

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(29 maggio 2013)

Per quanto riguarda i progetti nel campo del gas proposti nel Golfo di Trieste, incluso quello di Zaule, la Commissione ha sottoposto a una valutazione continua tutte le informazioni inoltrate. Ad oggi non è stata riscontrata nessuna prova relativa alla violazione del diritto dell'UE, tra l'altro perché non è stata ancora concessa alcuna autorizzazione per lo sviluppo del progetto e perché non è ancora stato dato il via alla costruzione di nessuno dei progetti. Di fatto, dalla valutazione di impatto ambientale aggiuntiva avviata nel gennaio 2013 è emerso che il progetto di Zaule non è compatibile con il traffico marittimo attuale e futuro nel porto di Trieste. Il 15 aprile 2012 il Ministro dell'Ambiente italiano ha firmato un decreto con cui si dispone che il promotore del progetto (Gas Natural) debba individuare un nuovo sito dove realizzare l'impianto o che le autorità portuali triestine debbano rivedere il piano regolatore portuale al fine di garantirne la compatibilità con il progetto di Zaule.

La Commissione continuerà a seguire attentamente gli sviluppi del caso e a valutare tutte le informazioni a lei trasmesse da tutte le parti per assicurare il pieno rispetto delle disposizioni del diritto UE.

Al momento è in corso l'elaborazione un elenco unionale di progetti di interesse comune nel quadro del regolamento sugli orientamenti per le TEN-E. Si prevede che tale elenco entri in vigore alla fine del 2013 o all'inizio del 2014. Il progetto di Zaule potrebbe esservi incluso. Tuttavia l'effettiva inclusione sarà subordinata, ad esempio, all'esito della ricerca di un nuovo sito per il progetto o di un'altra soluzione al problema ambientale summenzionato, nonché alla relativa comunicazione alla Commissione nei tempi prestabiliti. I progetti di interesse comune beneficeranno di procedure di concessione più rapide e di un migliore trattamento normativo, nonché della possibilità di accedere ai finanziamenti del nuovo meccanismo per collegare l'Europa. I progetti nominati dovranno tuttavia rispettare il diritto dell'UE, ivi compresa la legislazione ambientale.

⁽¹⁾ <http://ilpiccolo.gelocal.it/cronaca/2012/07/22/news/passera-il-rigassificatore-di-zaule-si-deve-fare-a-tutti-i-costi-1.5437103>

⁽²⁾ <http://www.lavoceditrieste.net/2013/03/19/passera-e-gas-natural-forzano-da-bruxelles-il-rigassificatore-che-trieste-rifiuta/> (La Voce di Trieste del 22.3.2013, edizione a stampa), e <http://ilpiccolo.gelocal.it/cronaca/2013/03/23/news/rigassificatore-pressing-di-passera-sull-ue-a-bruxelles-1.6747668>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003411/13
to the Commission**

Andrea Zaroni (ALDE)

(26 March 2013)

Subject: Possible infringements of EC law and interference in the authorisation procedures for a projected regasification plant at Zaule, in the port of Trieste

Gas Natural Fenosa, a multinational, represented by Gas Natural Rigassificazione Italia S.p.A., an Italian company, has put forward a proposal to build an LNG (liquefied natural gas) regasification plant at Zaule, in the port of Trieste. In view of the potential hazards, ranging from damage to environment and the port to cases of full-blown disaster, the project is being opposed by citizens, environmentalist NGOs, the local authorities, the authorities in neighbouring Slovenia, and the operators of the Transalpine Pipeline (TAL), which, starting in Zaule, supplies oil to Germany, Austria, and the Czech Republic.

This matter was brought to the attention of the European Parliament by petitions 483/2007 and 1147/2008, by Greenaction Transnational, and petition 1472/2009, by Alpe Adria Green. The Italian Ministry of the Environment is currently carrying out a fresh EIA procedure under Directive 2011/92/EU.

Although that assessment procedure is still in progress, the Italian Minister for Economic Development, Infrastructure, and Transport, Corrado Passera, is on record as saying — in an interview with the Trieste press published on 22 July 2012 ⁽¹⁾ — that the regasification plant has to be built at all costs. Recent editions of several Trieste newspapers (19, 22, and 23 March 2013 ⁽²⁾) have carried reports, backed by corroborative evidence, that ministry officials are seeking to secure support within the Commission (Energy DG — unit B.1, Internal Market I: Networks and Regional Initiatives) for the attempt by Gas Natural Fenosa to circumvent the Italian and Slovenian opposition by having the Zaule regasification plant included among the 13 energy infrastructure priorities to be laid down in, and financed under, the blueprint for an integrated European energy network for 2020 and beyond.

1. Can the Commission say whether, and by what procedures, the regasification plant in question could be classed as an energy infrastructure priority, and as such receive EU funding, in spite of the opposition in the quarters listed above?
2. In the light of the information in its possession, can it rule out the possibility that the project would entail infringements of Directive 2012/18/EU on major accidents, Directive 2011/92/EU on the EIA procedure, with particular reference to Article 7, and Directive 2001/42/EC on the SEA procedure?

Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission

(29 May 2013)

As regards the gas projects proposed in the Gulf of Trieste, including Zaule, the Commission has continued assessing all information brought to its attention. So far, no evidence of a breach of EC law has emerged *inter alia* because no development consent has yet been granted and construction has not started for any of the projects. In fact, additional environmental impact assessment launched in January 2013 has found that the Zaule project is not compatible with the current and future maritime traffic in the Trieste port. On 15 April 2013 the Italian Environment Minister signed a decree according to which the project promoter (Gas Natural) should identify a new site or the Trieste Port Authority should amend the Regulatory Port Plan to make it compatible with the Zaule project.

The Commission will continue to follow developments closely and to assess all information provided by any party, to make sure the relevant provisions of EC law are duly observed.

Union-wide list of projects of common interest (PCIs) under the new TEN-E Guidelines Regulation is currently being established and should enter into force by late 2013/early 2014. The Zaule project could potentially be included in this list. However, this will depend on whether e.g. a new location for the project or another solution to the above-referenced environmental problem can be found and communicated to the Commission in time. Projects labelled as PCIs will benefit from faster permit procedures as well as improved regulatory treatment and will be eligible for funding under the new Connecting Europe Facility (CEF). However, PCIs must respect EC law, including EU environmental law.

⁽¹⁾ <http://ilpiccolo.gelocal.it/cronaca/2012/07/22/news/passera-il-rigassificatore-di-zaule-si-deve-fare-a-tutti-i-costi-1.5437103>

⁽²⁾ <http://www.lavoceditrieste.net/2013/03/19/passera-e-gas-natural-forzano-da-bruxelles-il-rigassificatore-che-trieste-rifiuta/> (*La Voce di Trieste*, 22.3.2013, printable version), and <http://ilpiccolo.gelocal.it/cronaca/2013/03/23/news/rigassificatore-pressing-di-passera-sull-ue-a-bruxelles-1.6747668>

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003413/13
a la Comisión**

Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(26 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Estereotipos de género de la franquicia Princlandia

En España opera una franquicia autorizada llamada Princlandia con más de 48 centros repartidos a lo largo de toda la geografía del país, Italia y otros países del mundo. Dichos centros son calificados por la compañía como «el primer SPA infantil de Europa», en dichos centros se maquilla y somete a diferentes tratamientos de belleza tan solo a niñas de entre 4 y 12 años.

El Pleno del Parlamento Europeo aprobó el pasado 13 de marzo de 2013 una Resolución «sobre la eliminación de los estereotipos de género en la EU» (P7_TA(2013)0074) por la que se insta a la acción de las Instituciones europeas, así como a los Estados miembros a actuar y ejercer sus competencias correspondientes en esta materia. Dentro de dicha Resolución se llama a la acción de Comisión y Estados miembros para eliminar el origen de dichos estereotipos de género, así como a la concienciación de los niños europeos en los temas relativos a los estereotipos de género.

La citada franquicia Princlandia incumple la práctica totalidad de los puntos establecidos en dicha resolución, al inculcar a las niñas pequeñas estereotipos de género basados en instituciones anacrónicas donde la mujer no es más que un objeto de intercambio y nunca debe trabajar, donde su único fin es «ser guapa». Divide sexualmente a las niñas y las especializa en tareas como el maquillaje, la manicura, los cortes de pelo, etc. lo que sin duda alguna afectará a su socialización como individuo pleno y no como «princesitas». El riesgo del efecto educativo sobre los estereotipos de género que tiene este tipo de actividades es patente y por eso consideramos que este tipo de negocios no deberían existir.

Sin embargo, resultan aún más graves los premios que las instituciones están dando a dicho tipo de negocio. La Xunta de Galicia (España) ha premiado esta actividad el pasado 2 de marzo como «concepto nacional más novedoso», así como el pasado 3 de diciembre de 2012 recibió el segundo premio como «mejor franquicia en el mundo» en Florencia, Italia.

¿Considera la Comisión que dicha franquicia se atiene a lo expuesto en la citada Resolución?, ¿como plantea la Comisión poner en práctica lo estipulado en dicha Resolución?

¿Considera que la Comisión debe instar a los Estados miembros para regular o hacer efectiva la regulación en materia de género para intervenir sobre la franquicia Princlandia?

¿Considera que la Xunta de Galicia debe retirar el premio otorgado a dicha franquicia por reproducir los estereotipos de género y contradecir la citada Resolución?

Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión

(27 de mayo de 2013)

La Comisión está comprometida con la igualdad entre hombres y mujeres y en la lucha contra los estereotipos de género, dentro de los límites de sus competencias. Por ejemplo, en el pasado, la Comisión tomó la iniciativa de proponer varias Directivas que prohibían la discriminación por razón de género.

Con arreglo a los Tratados de la Unión Europea, las Resoluciones del Parlamento Europeo como las citadas por Su Señoría no son instrumentos jurídicos vinculantes. Por consiguiente, la Comisión no tiene potestad para garantizar automáticamente su aplicación.

No obstante, como guardiana de los Tratados, la Comisión ha tomado y tomará todas las medidas necesarias para garantizar la transposición correcta y completa en todos los Estados miembros de las Directivas de la Unión Europea sobre la igualdad entre hombres y mujeres.

Por otro lado, corresponde a las autoridades nacionales, en el ejercicio de sus competencias, la adopción de medidas contra los estereotipos de género.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003413/13
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(26 March 2013)**

Subject: Gender stereotyping by the Princlandia franchise

An authorised franchise called Princlandia is operating in Spain. It has over 48 centres located across the country, and more in Italy and in other countries around the world. The company describes these centres as 'Europe's first spa for girls'. They provide makeovers and various beauty treatments solely for girls aged between 4 and 12.

On 13 March 2013, Parliament passed a resolution in plenary on 'eliminating gender stereotypes in the EU' (P7_TA(2013)0074), urging European institutions and Member States to act and exercise their competences as appropriate to this matter. This Resolution calls on the Commission and Member States to act in order to eliminate the causes of these gender stereotypes, and to raise awareness about gender stereotypes amongst European children.

The Princlandia franchise fails to comply with almost all of the content of this Resolution. It instils into young girls gender stereotypes based on anachronistic institutions in which women are merely objects to be exchanged and should never work, and in which their only purpose is to 'be beautiful'. It sets girls aside on the basis of their gender and teaches them skills in make-up, manicures and hairstyling, for example, which will undoubtedly affect their development as rounded individuals rather than 'little princesses'. Activities of this sort pose an obvious educational risk in terms of gender stereotyping and we therefore believe that undertakings of this type should not exist.

Even more serious a matter, however, are the awards institutions are giving this kind of undertaking. On 2 March 2012, the Galician regional government (Spain) awarded this operation a prize for the 'most innovative national concept'. On 3 December 2012 it received its second prize as 'best franchise in the world' in Florence, Italy.

Does the Commission believe that this franchise is in line with the aforementioned Resolution? How does the Commission intend to implement the provisions of this Resolution?

Does the Commission believe that Member States should be urged to regulate or implement regulation on gender issues in order to deal with the Princlandia franchise?

Does it believe that the Galician regional government should withdraw the award given to this franchise for reproducing gender stereotypes and contradicting the aforementioned Regulation?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(27 May 2013)**

The Commission is committed to equality between men and women and to fight against gender stereotypes within the limits of its competences. For example, in the past the Commission took the initiative of proposing several Directives prohibiting gender based discrimination.

According to the European Union Treaties, resolutions of the European Parliament, such as the one the Honourable Member refers to, are not binding legal instruments. Thus, the Commission per se does not have the power to automatically ensure their implementation.

Nevertheless, as guardian of the Treaties, the Commission has taken and will take all necessary measures to ensure the correct and complete transposition in all Member States of the European Union Directives on equality between men and women.

In addition, it is for national authorities in the exercise of their competences to take measures against gender stereotypes.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003414/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(26 Μαρτίου 2013)

Θέμα: Επανασχεδιασμός σταθμού Βενιζέλου στο μετρό Θεσσαλονίκης και ευρωπαϊκή χρηματοδότηση

Μετά από αρχαιολογικές ανασκαφές, στο πλαίσιο εργασιών κατασκευής του σταθμού Βενιζέλου του μετρό Θεσσαλονίκης, αποκαλύφθηκε ένα μοναδικό αρχαιολογικό σύνολο, το κέντρο της βυζαντινής Θεσσαλονίκης. Συγκεκριμένα, ήρθε στο φως ο κεντρικός οδικός άξονας της βυζαντινής πόλης σε ολόκληρο το πλάτος του και σε μήκος 75 μέτρων στρωμένος με μαρμάρινες πλάκες, 16 αιώνες από τότε που σχεδιάστηκε, τον 4ο αιώνα μ.Χ. Έχουν βρεθεί επίσης δημόσια κτίρια που βρισκόταν στα νότια του δρόμου και στέγαζαν εμπορικές χρήσεις.

Λόγω της σημασίας της βυζαντινής Θεσσαλονίκης, ως δεύτερης σε σημασία πόλης της Βυζαντινής Αυτοκρατορίας μετά την Κωνσταντινούπολη, οι βυζαντινές αρχαιότητες της Θεσσαλονίκης προστατεύονται από την Unesco. Επίσης, σύμφωνα με τον Χάρτη της Βενετίας και όλες τις διεθνείς συμβάσεις προστασίας της πολιτιστικής κληρονομιάς, το αρχιτεκτονικό σύνολο που βρέθηκε είναι αναγκαίο να διασωθεί in situ, καθώς έχει ιδιαίτερη σημασία για την ιστορική τοπογραφία της πόλης.

Είναι αναγκαίο να εξαντληθούν όλες οι δυνατότητες για τη συνύπαρξη των αρχαίων και του σταθμού. Να βρεθεί δηλαδή μία τεχνική και αρχιτεκτονική λύση για την ταυτόχρονη λειτουργία σταθμού και έκθεσης των αρχαιοτήτων στον φυσικό τους χώρο ώστε να διαφυλαχθεί η πολιτιστική κληρονομιά της Θεσσαλονίκης.

Δεδομένου ότι για την κατασκευή του μετρό έχει εξασφαλιστεί χρηματοδότηση από το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης (Γ' και Δ' ΚΠΣ), ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Θα επιτρέψει τη συνέχιση της χρηματοδότησης του έργου του μετρό Θεσσαλονίκης από το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης σε περίπτωση επανασχεδιασμού της κατασκευής του συγκεκριμένου σταθμού ώστε να παραμείνουν οι αρχαιότητες στο φυσικό τους χώρο;

Απάντηση της κ. Βασιλείου εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(23 Μαΐου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή θα ήθελε να παραπέμψει τον κύριο βουλευτή στην απάντησή της στη γραπτή ερώτηση E-001616/2013 ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/el/parliamentary-questions.html>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003414/13
to the Commission
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(26 March 2013)**

Subject: New plans for Venizelou station on Thessaloniki metro and European financing

Archaeological excavations during works to construct Venizelou station on the Thessaloniki metro have uncovered a unique archaeological site: the centre of Byzantine Thessaloniki. The main road through the Byzantine city, which is paved with marble, has been uncovered across its entire width and over a length of 75 metres, 16 centuries after it was built in the 4th century A.D. Public buildings used for commercial purposes have also been found on the south side of the road.

Due to the importance of Byzantine Thessaloniki, as the second most important city in the Byzantine Empire after Constantinople, Byzantine antiquities in Thessaloniki are protected by Unesco. Also, according to the Venice Charter and every other international convention to protect cultural heritage, the architectural site discovered needs to be conserved *in situ*, as it is very important to the historical layout of the city.

Every possible way of enabling the site and the station to function side by side needs to be exhausted. In other words, a technical and architectural solution needs to be found so that the station and an exhibition of the archaeological site can function simultaneously, in order to preserve the cultural heritage of Thessaloniki.

As construction of the metro is being financed by the European Regional Development Fund (CSF III and IV), will the Commission say:

Will it leave financing of the Thessaloniki metro project by the European Regional Development Fund in place if the station in question is re-planned, so that the archaeological site can be preserved *in situ*?

**Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(23 May 2013)**

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to written question E-001616/2013 ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html>

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003415/13
an die Kommission
Jürgen Klute (GUE/NGL)
(26. März 2013)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Weiterbehandlung des Curuguay-Falls

In früheren Antworten auf Anfragen zu den der Vorfällen in Curuguay (Paraguay) und deren Behandlung durch die zuständigen Behörden erklärte die Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin, dass die EU-Delegation in Asunción das Rechtsverfahren gegen die 14 Kleinbauern verfolgt und darüber berichtet. Dieser Angelegenheit gebührt höchste Aufmerksamkeit, denn die Vorfälle, die sich am 15. Juni 2012 in Curuguay ereigneten, führten unmittelbar zum politischen Verfahren gegen den damaligen Präsidenten Fernando Lugo und zu seiner anschließenden Amtsenthebung.

Zahlreiche Aspekte des Rechtsverfahrens werfen jedoch Zweifel auf, ob Mindeststandards im Hinblick auf ein ordentliches Verfahren eingehalten wurden. Besonders besorgniserregend erscheint, dass

- der für diesen Fall zuständige Staatsanwalt (Jalil Rachid) ein enger Freund der Familie Riquelme ist: Sein Vater war eng mit Blas Riquelme befreundet, der die umstrittenen Marina-Cue-Ländereien für sich beansprucht;
- Jalil Rachid selbst auf einer Pressekonferenz erklärte, er hätte nicht herausfinden können, wer die Polizisten getötet hätte, aber er hätte die 12 Bauern angeklagt, weil es außer Frage stehe, dass die Polizisten aus dem Hinterhalt überfallen wurden⁽¹⁾;
- die Angeklagten in der Sache Marina Cue in Präventivhaft gehalten wurden, obwohl keine Beweise vorgelegt wurden, die den Verdacht, dass die Angeklagten die Straftat begangen hätten, tatsächlich belegen, was eindeutig ein Verstoß gegen die Prozessordnung ist.

Bisher hat das Verfahren das Leben von Vidal Vega gekostet, der ein Hauptzeuge der Verteidigung war und ermordet wurde, und das Leben mehrerer anderer der Angeklagten, die in den Hungerstreik getreten sind, gefährdet.

Hält es die Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin angesichts der schweren Bedenken hinsichtlich der Unparteilichkeit, der Unabhängigkeit und des Rechts auf ein faires Verfahren, die aufgrund der genannten Punkte aufgeworfen werden, und angesichts der offensichtlichen Unfähigkeit der paraguayischen Behörden, einen anderen Weg einzuschlagen, nicht für unbedingt notwendig, dass sich die EU für die Entsendung einer internationalen Mission einsetzt, die das Massaker von Curuguay aufklären soll, das der Demokratie in Paraguay so schwer geschadet hat?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(24. Mai 2013)

Die EU verfolgt die Vorfälle im Zusammenhang mit dem Massaker in Curuguay und die Tötung von Vidal Vega sehr aufmerksam.

Da die polizeilichen Ermittlungen in beiden Fällen derzeit noch nicht abgeschlossen sind, erscheint es gegenwärtig allerdings nicht angebracht, öffentlich Stellung zu nehmen oder die Situation zu bewerten.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.elnuevoherald.com/2013/03/13/1429847/paraguay-piden-atencion-para-presas.html>

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003415/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Jürgen Klute (GUE/NGL)
(26 March 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Follow-up to the Curuguaty case

In previous replies to inquiries regarding Paraguay's Curuguaty events and the handling of these by the relevant authorities, the Vice-President/High Representative has declared that the legal process against the 14 peasants is being followed and reported by the EU delegation in Asuncion. Attention to this matter is of the utmost importance, since the events that took place in Curuguaty on 15 June 2012 were the direct cause of the political trial against former president Fernando Lugo and of his subsequent impeachment.

However, many aspects of the legal procedure raise doubts as to whether minimum compliance with due process has been observed. We are particularly concerned that:

- the public prosecutor responsible for this case (Jalil Rachid) is a close friend of the Riquelme family: his father was an intimate friend of Blas Riquelme, who claims ownership of the disputed Marina Cue lands;
- Mr Rachid himself stated during a press conference that he had not been able to find out who killed the policemen, but had decided to indict the 12 croppers because 'it was very clear that the police were ambushed' ⁽¹⁾;
- in clear contravention of the code of judicial procedure, the Marina Cue defendants have been held in preventive imprisonment despite the fact that no evidence has been produced which could reasonably support the assumption that they were the perpetrators of the offence.

So far this trial has cost the life of Vidal Vega, a key witness for the defence who was murdered, and has put in jeopardy the lives of several of the accused who went on hunger strike.

In view of the serious doubts as to impartiality, independence and the right to a fair trial raised by the above, and the apparent inability on the part of the Paraguayan authorities to adopt a different course of action, does the Vice-President/High Representative not think it essential that the EU encourage the sending of an international mission to attempt to shed light on the Curuguaty massacre, which has done such serious damage to democracy in Paraguay?

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

The EU is critically observing events around the Curuguaty massacre and the killing of Mr Vidal Vega.

Police investigations on both cases are ongoing and it seems thus inappropriate to take any public position and express any judgment on the situation for the moment.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.elnuevoherald.com/2013/03/13/1429847/paraguay-piden-atencion-para-presas.html>

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003416/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(26 Μαρτίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ανακτήσεις σε σχέση με το οικονομικό έτος 2010 για τη ΓΔ AGRI

Σύμφωνα με την ετήσια έκθεση δραστηριοτήτων 2011 της ΓΔ AGRI, το 2011 (σε σχέση με το οικονομικό έτος 2010), ο κανόνας 50/50 εφαρμόστηκε με τις αποφάσεις της Επιτροπής 2011/272/ΕΕ της 29ης Απριλίου 2011, που ενέκριναν όλες τις εκκρεμείς περιπτώσεις μη ανάκτησης που χρονολογούνται από το 2006 ή το 2002 (περιπτώσεις 4 ή 8 ετών αντίστοιχα). Ποσό ύψους 27,8 εκατ. ευρώ βάρυνε με τον τρόπο αυτό τα κράτη μέλη και 29,3 εκατ. ευρώ καλύφθηκε από τον προϋπολογισμό της ΕΕ για λόγους μη ανάκτησης (από τα 50,7 εκατ. ευρώ που δηλώθηκαν μη ανακτηθέντα από τα κράτη μέλη, τα 21,5 εκατ. ευρώ είχαν ήδη εκκαθαριστεί δυνάμει του κανόνα 50/50 και, ως εκ τούτου, η απώλεια μοιράζεται μεταξύ της ΕΕ και των κρατών μελών). Ένα επιπλέον ποσό ύψους 0,6 εκατ. ευρώ έχει βαρύνει τα κράτη μέλη στις αρχές του 2012 από τις μεταγενέστερες αποφάσεις της Επιτροπής για την εκκαθάριση των λογαριασμών για το οικονομικό έτος 2010 των οργανισμών εκείνων πληρωμών που διαχωρίστηκαν τον Απρίλιο του 2011.

Θα μπορούσε η Επιτροπή να παράσχει μια λεπτομερή ανάλυση των κρατών μελών που είχαν χρεωθεί το ποσό των 27,8 εκατ. ευρώ και, επίσης, σε σχέση με το περαιτέρω ποσό των 0,6 εκατ. ευρώ που χρεώθηκε στη συνέχεια;

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003417/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(26 Μαρτίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ανακτήσεις σε σχέση με το οικονομικό έτος 2010 για τη ΓΔ AGRI

Σύμφωνα με την ετήσια έκθεση δραστηριοτήτων 2011 της ΓΔ AGRI, το 2011 και βάσει των διαθεσίμων το Μάρτιο του 2012 πληροφοριών, τα κράτη μέλη ανέκτησαν 172,7 εκατ. ευρώ από τους δικαιούχους κατά το οικονομικό έτος 2011 και το συνολικό ποσό η ανάκτηση του οποίου έως τα τέλη του ίδιου έτους εκκρεμεί, ανέρχεται σε 1 206,9 εκατ. ευρώ. Οι οικονομικές συνέπειες της μη ανάκτησης για τις περιπτώσεις που χρονολογούνται από το 2007 ή το 2003, θα πρέπει να καθορίζονται σύμφωνα με τον κανόνα 50/50, καταλογίζοντας στα ενδιαφερόμενα κράτη μέλη 12,6 εκατ. ευρώ περίπου. Επιπλέον, 25,7 εκατ. ευρώ περίπου θα βαρύνουν τον προϋπολογισμό της ΕΕ για τις περιπτώσεις που αναφέρθηκαν ως μη ανακτήσιμες κατά τη διάρκεια του οικονομικού έτους 2011. Συνεπεία της εφαρμογής του κανόνα 50/50 για έκτη φορά από την καθιέρωσή του, υψηλά μη ανακτηθέντα ποσά έχουν ήδη χρεωθεί στα κράτη μέλη για τις δαπάνες του ΕΓΤΕ (458 εκατομμύρια ευρώ). Ως εκ τούτου, από το ποσό των 1 206,9 εκατ. ευρώ που πρέπει να ανακτηθεί από τους τελικούς δικαιούχους στα τέλη του οικονομικού έτους 2011, το εκκρεμούν ποσό που οφείλεται στον προϋπολογισμό της ΕΕ περιορίστηκε στα 943,5 εκατομμύρια.

Θα μπορούσε η Επιτροπή να παράσχει:

1. Μια λεπτομερή κατανομή ανά κράτος μέλος του ποσού των 12,6 εκατ. ευρώ, με το οποίο θα επιβαρυνθούν τα κράτη μέλη;
2. Μια λεπτομερή κατανομή ανά κράτος μέλος του ποσού των 458 εκατ. ευρώ σε μη ανακτηθέντα ποσά που έχουν χρεωθεί στις δαπάνες του ΕΓΤΠΕ;
3. Μια λεπτομερή κατανομή ανά κράτος μέλος του εκκρεμούντος ποσού που πρέπει να ανακτηθεί από τους τελικούς δικαιούχους μετά την εφαρμογή του κανόνα 50/50 (π.χ. το ποσό των 943,5 εκατ. ευρώ);

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Ciolos εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(15 Μαΐου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή διαβιβάζει απευθείας στο αξιότιμο μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου, καθώς και στη γραμματεία του Κοινοβουλίου δύο πίνακες που περιέχουν τις ζητηθείσες πληροφορίες.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003416/13
to the Commission**

Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)

(26 March 2013)

Subject: Recoveries relating to the financial year 2010 by DG AGRI

According to the 2011 Annual Activity Report of DG AGRI, in 2011 (in connection with the financial year 2010) the 50/50 rule was applied by Commission Decision 2011/272/EU of 29 April 2011, which cleared all pending non-recovered cases dating from 2006 or 2002 (cases that were 4 or 8 years old respectively). EUR 27.8 million was charged to the Member States in this way, and EUR 29.3 million was borne by the EU budget for reasons of irrecoverability (out of EUR 50.7 million declared irrecoverable by the Member States, EUR 21.5 million had already been cleared under the 50/50 rule, so that the loss was shared between the EU and the Member States). A further EUR 0.6 million was charged to Member States in early 2012 by subsequent Commission Decisions on clearance of the accounts for the 2010 financial year of those paying agencies whose accounts were disjoined in April 2011.

Could the Commission provide us with a detailed breakdown of the Member States that were charged the EUR 27.8 million and the subsequent EUR 0.6 million?

**Question for written answer E-003417/13
to the Commission**

Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)

(26 March 2013)

Subject: Recoveries relating to the financial year 2011 by DG AGRI

According to the 2011 Annual Activity Report of DG AGRI, based on the information available in March 2012, Member States recovered EUR 172.7 million from beneficiaries during financial year 2011, and the overall outstanding amount still to be recovered from the beneficiaries at the end of that financial year was EUR 1 206.9 million. The financial consequences of non-recovery for cases dating from 2007 or 2003 will be determined in accordance with the 50/50 rule by charging the Member States concerned approximately EUR 12.6 million. Moreover, some EUR 25.7 million will be borne by the EU budget for cases reported irrecoverable during financial year 2011. As a result of the application of the 50/50 rule for the sixth time since its introduction, major non-recovered sums have already been charged to the Member States for EAGF expenditure (EUR 458 million). Consequently, of the EUR 1 206.9 million to be recovered from the final beneficiaries at the end of financial year 2011, the amount outstanding owed to the EU budget was limited to EUR 943.5 million.

Could the Commission provide:

1. A detailed breakdown by Member State of the EUR 12.6 million that the Member States will be charged?
2. A detailed breakdown by Member State of the EUR 458 million in non-recovered sums charged for EAGF expenditure?
3. A detailed breakdown by Member State of the outstanding amount that needs to be recovered from the final beneficiaries after the application of the 50/50 rule (i.e. the EUR 943.5 million)?

Joint answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission

(15 May 2013)

The Commission is sending direct to the Honourable Member and to Parliament's Secretariat two tables containing the information requested.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003418/13
to the Commission
Nessa Childers (S&D)
(26 March 2013)**

Subject: Transparency of Commission expert groups

Expert groups provide expertise on a multitude of important issues, guiding the Commission's thinking and shaping legislation on important public issues such as regulation of banks, food safety standards and the privatisation of public services.

The Commission recently outlined the progress it had made and the steps it had taken towards meeting the conditions outlined by Parliament with a view to preventing industry dominance by these influential advisory groups.

Would the Commission agree that very little progress has been made in meeting Parliament's conditions?

How will the Commission ensure that in future the composition of expert groups is balanced, there is a ban on lobbyists sitting in a personal capacity, public calls for applications are issued, and full transparency measures are implemented?

**Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(25 April 2013)**

Commission expert groups do not take binding decisions, although they may formulate opinions and recommendations or submit reports. They are first and foremost *fora* for discussion and brainstorming, the primary function of which is to provide the Commission with high-level expertise.

The Commission considers that significant progress was made in improving the implementation of Commission's rules on expert groups and remains committed to ensure full implementation of those rules in the future. The Commission has provided clear evidence that it has met its engagements, by making important efforts to respond to Parliament's concerns. This has led the EP to lift the reserve previously placed in the 2012 budget with regard to expert groups.

The composition of many groups was rebalanced since 2012. Unfortunately, for certain groups despite calls for application and direct invitations from Commission departments, it was not possible to appoint enough new members; this is often due to the limited number of applications received and to the fact that some applications were not deemed suitable in relation to the work to be performed. However, Commission services remain prepared to examine possible additional applications from interested NGOs or civil society groups.

Over the past few years, the Commission has put a lot of efforts to enhance transparency. The Register of expert groups has been greatly improved; it now includes, *inter alia*, relevant documents produced by groups and a 'News Section' including calls for applications.

Following a screening of the groups which include members appointed in a personal capacity, Commission services recognised that experts of many groups were incorrectly displayed on the Register; this was corrected.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003419/13
aan de Commissie
Marietje Schaake (ALDE)
 (26 maart 2013)

Betref: Tegenstrijdige verklaringen van commissaris Füle en speciale EU-vertegenwoordiger Léon over het „meer voor meer“-beginsel en Egypte

Op 20 maart 2013 stelde de Commissie het pakket „Europees nabuurschapsbeleid“ ⁽¹⁾ voor. Ter gelegenheid daarvan gaf Štefan Füle, commissaris voor Uitbreiding en Europees nabuurschapsbeleid, een toespraak voor de Commissie buitenlandse zaken van het Parlement ⁽²⁾, en had hij een onderhoud met de pers ⁽³⁾. Die pers citeerde de commissaris achteraf als volgt: „Egypte moet dit jaar en volgend jaar presteren in ruil voor die 5 miljard euro“, „Dit is hoe we ons punt kunnen maken“ en „Egypte behoort tot dusver niet tot de landen die onder het „meer voor meer“-beginsel vallen of in aanmerking komen voor bijkomende middelen“ ⁽⁴⁾. Deze verklaringen werden echter niet opgenomen in de schriftelijke neerslag van de toespraak van de commissaris of van zijn ontmoeting met de pers. Op 21 maart 2013 kwam een Egyptische krant met een reactie van Bernardino Léon, de speciale vertegenwoordiger van de EU voor het zuidelijke Middellandse Zeegebied, op de uitspraken van commissaris Füle. Het artikel gaf aan dat „de ambassade verklaarde dat Füle het specifiek over extra middelen voor democratische hervormingen had, niet over steun in het algemeen. Speciale EU-vertegenwoordiger Bernardino Léon had aan Al-Masry Al-Youm verteld dat Europa het in november eens was geraakt over een toewijzing van 5,6 miljard EUR aan Egypte“ ⁽⁵⁾.

1. Kan de Commissie de aan commissaris Füle toegeschreven uitspraken bevestigen en onderschrijven? Zo ja, in welk licht moeten de reacties van de heer Léon dan worden gezien? Waarom zijn de uitspraken niet opgenomen in de schriftelijke neerslag van de ontmoeting met de pers?
2. Kan de Commissie toelichting geven bij de „extra middelen“ waar de heer Léon het over had? Kan zij aangeven om wat voor geld en hoeveel geld het gaat, waarvoor het zal worden gebruikt en onder welke voorwaarden Egypte er aanspraak op kan maken?
3. Kan de Commissie bevestigen dat er tot dusver geen geld is toegewezen aan Egypte of andere landen van het Europees nabuurschapsbeleid uit hoofde van het „meer voor meer“-beginsel? Zo niet, waarom niet?
4. Kan de Commissie bevestigen dat, zolang de nieuwe verordening betreffende het Europees nabuurschapsinstrument niet is vastgesteld door de Commissie, de Raad en het Parlement, de „meer voor meer“-benadering eigenlijk niet wordt ingevuld met concrete financiële mechanismen?
5. Kan de Commissie duidelijk maken wie de hoofdverantwoordelijkheid voor het „meer voor meer“-beginsel draagt? Is dat de commissaris voor Uitbreiding en Europees nabuurschapsbeleid of de hoge vertegenwoordiger?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
 (14 juni 2013)

Overeenkomstig de nieuwe benadering van het ENB ⁽⁶⁾ met grotere nadruk op het „meer voor meer“-beginsel, heeft de Commissie in 2011 twee programma's opgezet (het Spring-programma ⁽⁷⁾ voor zuidelijke buurlanden en EaPIC ⁽⁸⁾ voor oostelijke buurlanden) die in extra financiële middelen voorzien voor partners die op het gebied van democratische en politieke hervormingen vooruitgang hebben geboekt. Voor de periode 2012-2013 bedragen deze extra financiële middelen 742 miljoen euro. Slechts een deel ervan is uitbetaald. De Spring- en EaPIC-programma's zijn voorlopers van een permanent mechanisme dat in de nieuwe ENI ⁽⁹⁾-verordening zal worden opgenomen. Commissaris Füle beslist in nauwe samenwerking met de hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter over de toewijzing van extra financiële middelen.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/news/index_en.htm

⁽²⁾ http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-13-246_en.htm?locale=en

⁽³⁾ http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-13-245_en.htm?locale=en

⁽⁴⁾ <http://news.yahoo.com/eu-tells-egypt-better-reforms-face-aid-cuts-084407960.html>

⁽⁵⁾ <http://www.egyptindependent.com/news/eu-embassy-denies-rumors-cutting-egypt-aid>

⁽⁶⁾ Europees nabuurschapsbeleid.

⁽⁷⁾ SPRING: Support for Partnership Reform and Inclusive Growth (steun voor partnerschap, hervorming en inclusieve groei).

⁽⁸⁾ Eastern Partnership Integration and Cooperation (Integratie- en Samenwerkingsprogramma in het kader van het Oostelijk Partnerschap).

⁽⁹⁾ Europees nabuurschapsinstrument (ENI).

De bijstand van 5 miljard euro die op 14 november 2012 in het kader van de taskforce EU-Egypte is toegezegd, bestaat uit gezamenlijke verbintenissen voor 2012-2013 uit ENPI⁽¹⁰⁾-middelen van de EU voor bilaterale samenwerking, tot 500 miljoen euro macrofinanciële bijstand van de EU -waarvoor een overeenkomst tussen Egypte en het IMF⁽¹¹⁾ een eerste voorwaarde is — en tot jaarlijks 1 miljard euro aan mogelijke toewijzingen van respectievelijk de EIB⁽¹²⁾ en de EBWO⁽¹³⁾. Tot dusver is slechts een klein deel van de toewijzing van de EU (met betrekking tot de EU-programma's voor 2012 voor een bedrag van 183 miljoen euro) toegewezen. Projecten die door de EIB en de EBWO worden gefinancierd, moeten aan de procedures van deze instellingen voldoen.

Zoals commissaris Füle in zijn toespraak van 20 maart 2013 heeft aangegeven, is in het kader van het Spring-programma 90 miljoen euro toegewezen aan Egypte. Aangezien Egypte nog niet heeft ingestemd met de voorwaarden die aan de uitbetaling ervan zijn verbonden, zijn deze financiële middelen nog niet uitgekeerd. Zoals de hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter in het debat in het Parlement op 13 maart 2013 heeft aangegeven, „is [de totale EU-financiering] afhankelijk van overeenkomsten met het IMF en, wat net zo belangrijk is, van de vooruitgang in de politieke dialoog”.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Europees nabuurschaps- en partnerschapsinstrument.
⁽¹¹⁾ Internationaal Monetair Fonds.
⁽¹²⁾ Europese Investeringsbank.
⁽¹³⁾ Europese Bank voor wederopbouw en ontwikkeling.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003419/13
to the Commission
Marietje Schaake (ALDE)
(26 March 2013)**

Subject: Conflicting statements by Commissioner Füle and EU Special Representative León on 'more for more' and Egypt

On 20 March 2013 the Commission presented the 'European Neighbourhood Policy package' (the 'Package') ⁽¹⁾. On that occasion Štefan Füle, Commissioner for Enlargement and Neighbourhood Policy, gave a speech to Parliament's Foreign Affairs Committee ⁽²⁾ and participated in a press point ⁽³⁾. Subsequent press reports quoted the Commissioner as having made the following statements: 'Egypt has to deliver for those up to 5 billion euros this year and next', 'This is the way how we could strengthen our point' and 'Egypt has not been one of those countries benefiting from the "more-for-more" principle and extra resource' ⁽⁴⁾. However, these statements are not included in the transcript of the Commissioner's speech to Parliament or in the press point. On 21 March 2013 an Egyptian newspaper, referring to remarks made by Bernardino León, EU Special Representative for the Southern Mediterranean Region, in response to the statements by Commissioner Füle, stated that 'the embassy said Füle was talking specifically about extra money earmarked for democratic reforms, not about aid in general. EU representative Bernardino León had told Al-Masry Al-Youm that Europe agreed in November to support Egypt with 5.6 billion euros' ⁽⁵⁾.

1. Can the Commission confirm and endorse the statements which Commissioner Füle is quoted as having made? If so, how should the responses by Mr León be interpreted? Why are the quotations not included in the transcript of the press point?
2. Can the Commission comment on the 'extra money' Mr León talked about, and specify what money this is, how much is involved, what it will be used for and under what conditions it could be granted to Egypt?
3. Can the Commission confirm that, to date, no money has been granted to Egypt or any other European Neighbourhood Policy country under the 'more for more' principle? If not, why not?
4. Can the Commission confirm that, until the new European Neighbourhood Instrument Regulation is adopted by the Commission, the Council and Parliament, 'more for more' does not formally exist in terms of concrete financial mechanisms?
5. Can the Commission explain whether the Commissioner for Enlargement and Neighbourhood Policy or the High Representative is the Commissioner with prime responsibility for the 'more for more' principle?

**Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(14 June 2013)**

In line with the new approach to the ENP ⁽⁶⁾ stressing the 'more for more' principle, the Commission has launched in 2011 two programmes (SPRING ⁽⁷⁾ for Southern neighbours and EaPIC ⁽⁸⁾ for Eastern neighbours) channelling additional resources to partners that have demonstrated progress in democratic and political reforms. These funds amount to EUR 742 million over the 2011-2013 period. Only part of this funding has been disbursed. SPRING and EaPIC programmes are precursors of a more permanent mechanism to be reflected in the new ENI ⁽⁹⁾ regulation. Decisions on allocations of additional funding are taken by Commissioner Füle in full cooperation with the HR/VP.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/news/index_en.htm

⁽²⁾ http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-13-246_en.htm?locale=en

⁽³⁾ http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-13-245_en.htm?locale=en

⁽⁴⁾ <http://news.yahoo.com/eu-tells-egypt-better-reforms-face-aid-cuts-084407960.html>

⁽⁵⁾ <http://www.egyptindependent.com/news/eu-embassy-denies-rumors-cutting-egypt-aid>

⁽⁶⁾ European Neighbourhood Policy.

⁽⁷⁾ Support to Partnership, Reform and Inclusive Growth.

⁽⁸⁾ Eastern Partnership Integration and Cooperation.

⁽⁹⁾ European Neighbourhood Instrument.

Regarding the EUR 5 billion package announced in the framework of the EU-Egypt Task Force on 14 November 2012, it consists of the combined commitments for 2012-2013 from the EU bilateral ENPI⁽¹⁰⁾ funding, EU Macro-Financial Assistance of up to EUR 500 million — for which an Egypt-IMF⁽¹¹⁾ arrangement is a precondition — and the possible allocations of up to EUR 1 billion annually by the EIB⁽¹²⁾ and the EBRD⁽¹³⁾ respectively. Until now, only a fraction of the EU allocation (relating to EU programmes for 2012 amounting to EUR 183 million) has been committed. Projects financed by the EIB and EBRD will have to follow the procedures of these institutions.

As Commissioner Füle indicated in his intervention on 20 March 2013, EUR 90 million have been allocated to Egypt under SPRING, but these funds have not yet been disbursed as the conditionalities linked to the disbursement have not yet been agreed by Egypt. As the HR/VP indicated in the debate at Parliament on 13 March 2013, the overall EU funding 'does depend on agreements with the IMF and, just as importantly, the movement on the political dialogue'.

⁽¹⁰⁾ European Neighbourhood & Partnership Instrument.
⁽¹¹⁾ International Monetary Fund.
⁽¹²⁾ European Investment Bank.
⁽¹³⁾ European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003420/13
an die Kommission
Sven Giegold (Verts/ALE) und Helga Trüpel (Verts/ALE)
(26. März 2013)

Betrifft: Auszahlungsstand Kohäsionspolitik und Erasmus

Die Kommission hat Erstattungsanträge im Rahmen der Kohäsionspolitik (Rubrik 1B) aufgrund fehlender Haushaltsmittel nicht zeitgemäß bedient. In Deutschland konnten so zum Stand 31.12.2012 Erstattungsanträge vom ESF in Höhe von 652 Mio. EUR und vom EFRE in Höhe von 714 Mio. EUR nicht erstattet werden, obwohl die Erstattung im Jahr 2012 hätte stattfinden müssen (Quelle: Kommissionsdokument Ref. Ares(2013)78000 — 22.1.2013). Insgesamt muss die Kommission laut eigenen Angaben noch EU-weit Erstattungsanträge im Rahmen der Kohäsionspolitik aus dem Vorjahr in Höhe von 16,2 Mrd. EUR mit Mitteln des Haushalts 2013 bedienen. Die Kommission hatte auch auf das Risiko von Zahlungsschwierigkeiten im Rahmen von Erasmus hingewiesen (MEMO/12/906).

Die Kommission hat im Haushaltsjahr 2012 bei verschiedenen Programmen der Kohäsionspolitik überhaupt keine Zahlungen getätigt, z. B. ESF-Programme (z. B. 2007DE052PO001) und EFRE (z. B. 2007DE161PO002) (Quelle: Kommissionsdokument SFAS_Report_Current_Year_2007-2013 — Tabelle 3a ERDF und Tabelle 3a ESF). Dies ist auch bei anderen Mitgliedstaaten der Fall.

1. In welcher Höhe und zu welchem Zeitpunkt sind seit Oktober 2012 bis heute Erstattungsanträge durch die Bundesländer in Deutschland und das deutsche Bundesprogramm in Bezug auf die Kohäsionspolitik (EFRE, ESF und Interreg), ELER und Erasmus eingegangen? Wann sind die Beträge durch die Kommission erstattet worden?
2. Ist die Kommission momentan in der Lage, die Erstattungsanträge zeitgemäß zu bedienen (Frist von 2 Monaten) oder kommt es zu Verzögerungen? Wie beabsichtigt die Kommission zu gewährleisten, dass über die gesamte Dauer des Haushaltsjahres 2013 das Zahlungsziel von 2 Monaten erfüllt wird?
3. Nach welchen Kriterien und Prioritäten wurden regionale Programme der Kohäsionspolitik bzw. Förderschwerpunkte für Zahlungen ausgewählt? Warum haben zahlreiche Programme im Haushaltsjahr 2012 keine Auszahlungen erhalten? Hat die Kommission Zahlungen aufgrund der angespannten Haushaltslage auch schon vor Oktober 2012 nicht getätigt bzw. verschoben? Wenn ja: in welcher Höhe und für wie lange?

Antwort von Herrn Hahn im Namen der Kommission
(17. Mai 2013)

1. Die Kommission übersendet der Frau Abgeordneten und dem Herrn Abgeordneten persönlich sowie dem Sekretariat des Parlaments eine Tabelle mit den gewünschten Informationen. Für Erasmus leistete die Kommission am 18. Januar 2013 eine zweite Vorauszahlung in Höhe von 12 128 600 EUR (Antrag eingegangen am 29. Oktober 2012).
2. Die Zahlungen erfolgen in der Regel binnen zwei Monaten, allerdings vorbehaltlich der Verfügbarkeit von Haushaltsmitteln⁽¹⁾. Wenn, wie dies derzeit der Fall ist, Liquiditätsengpässe bestehen und keine Haushaltsmittel zur Verfügung stehen, kann die Kommission die Zahlungen nicht fristgerecht leisten.

Die Kommission hat den Höchstbetrag an Einnahmen zur Deckung der EGFL-Ausgaben abgerufen und am 27. März 2013 im Entwurf des Berichtigungshaushaltsplans 2 für die Kohäsionspolitik 9 Mrd. EUR beantragt. Je eher die Haushaltsbehörde den Vorschlag annimmt, desto eher können die Zahlungen rechtzeitig geleistet werden. Der Haushaltsausschuss wurde am 20. Februar darüber in Kenntnis gesetzt, dass aufgrund des größeren Zahlungsrückstands zum Ende des Jahres 2012 die Anfang des Jahres 2013 aufgetretenen Liquiditätsengpässe länger als 2012 fortbestehen könnten.

3. Die Kommission bearbeitet die zuerst eingegangenen Zahlungsanträge für die Kohäsionspolitik zuerst. In Zeiten einer angespannten Haushaltslage wird den Anträgen von Mitgliedstaaten Vorrang eingeräumt, denen Unterstützung im Rahmen von Finanzhilfeprogrammen gewährt wird.

⁽¹⁾ Artikel 87 Absatz 2 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1083/2006 des Rates.

Bei Programmen, für die 2012 keine Zahlungen geleistet wurden, sind entweder im Laufe des Jahres keine Zahlungsanträge eingereicht oder die Zahlungsanträge unterbrochen oder ausgesetzt worden, oder es wurde nur ein Zahlungsantrag eingereicht und zwar so spät zum Jahresende, dass die zur Verfügung stehenden Mittel ausgeschöpft waren, bevor die Anträge bedient werden konnten.

Zwei ESF-Zahlungen ⁽¹⁾ erfolgten aufgrund mangelnder Haushaltsmittel Ende Juli 2012 mit Verzögerung. Den entsprechenden Anträgen wurde Folge geleistet, sowie Ende 2012 zusätzliche Mittel für den ESF zur Verfügung standen. Vor Oktober 2012 waren für den EFRE keine ungewöhnlichen Zahlungsfristen aufgrund fehlender Haushaltsmittel zu verzeichnen.

⁽¹⁾ Programm 2007DE052PO002, Rechnungsdatum 26.7.2012, Betrag: 39 498 400,24 EUR gezahlt am 18.12.2012, sowie Programm 2007DE052PO003, Rechnungsdatum 24.9.2012, Betrag: 36 749 888,47 EUR, gezahlt am 19.12.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003420/13
to the Commission
Sven Giegold (Verts/ALE) and Helga Trüpel (Verts/ALE)
(26 March 2013)

Subject: Level of cohesion policy and Erasmus disbursements

The Commission is behind with the payment of requests for reimbursement under cohesion policy (heading 1B) on account of a lack of budgetary resources. Thus, as at 31 December 2012, it had not been possible for requests for reimbursement from the European Social Fund (ESF) amounting to EUR 652 million and from the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) amounting to EUR 714 million in Germany to be paid, although payments should have been made for reimbursements for 2012 (source: Commission document Ares(2013)78000 — 22 January 2013). According to information provided by the Commission itself, it still has to pay requests for reimbursement under cohesion policy from last year amounting to EUR 16.2 billion EU-wide with funds from the 2013 budget. The Commission has also mentioned the risk of problems with payments in connection with Erasmus (MEMO/12/906).

During the 2012 financial year, the Commission made no payments at all for various cohesion policy programmes e.g. ESF programmes (e.g. 2007DE052PO001) and ERDF programmes (e.g. 2007DE161PO002) (source: Commission document SFAS_Report_Current_Year_2007-2013 — Table 3a ERDF and Table 3a ESF). This is also the case for other Member States.

1. At what times have requests for reimbursement been received since October 2012 to date from the federal states in Germany and the German federal programme relating to cohesion policy (EFRE, ESF and Interreg), the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development and Erasmus, and for what amounts? When were the amounts reimbursed by the Commission?
2. Is the Commission currently in a position to pay the reimbursement requests on time (within a deadline of two months) or will there be delays? How does the Commission intend to ensure that the payment target of two months will be met throughout the entire 2013 financial year?
3. What are the criteria and priorities for selecting regional cohesion policy programmes or support priorities for payment? Why did numerous programmes receive no payments during the 2012 financial year? Were payments postponed or not made by the Commission on account of budgetary constraints before October 2012 too? If so, what were the amounts and for how long were they postponed?

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

1. The Commission is sending direct to the Honourable Member and to Parliament's Secretariat a table containing the information requested. For Erasmus, the Commission paid a second pre-financing amount on 18 January 2013 of EUR 12 128 600 (received 29 October 2012).
2. The payment deadline of 2 months is subject to available funding⁽¹⁾. When there as present are cash flow constraints and a lack of budgetary appropriations the Commission cannot make payments on time.

The Commission has called the maximum amount of revenues for covering EAGF expenditure and requested EUR 9 billion for cohesion policy in the draft amending budget 2 on 27 March 2013. The sooner the budgetary authority adopts the proposal, the sooner it will be possible to make timely payments. The Budget Committee was informed on 20 February that the higher end-2012 backlog means that 'early year' cash flow constraints in 2013 may last longer than in 2012.

3. The Commission is processing cohesion policy payment claims earliest first. During periods of budgetary constraint, priority is given to claims from Member States receiving support under programmes of financial assistance.

Programmes which received no payments in 2012 either did not submit payment claims during the year, had payment claims interrupted or suspended, or submitted only one payment claim and this so close to the end of the year that payment credits had been exhausted before they could be paid.

⁽¹⁾ Article 87 No 2 of Council Regulation 1083/2006.

Two ESF payments ⁽²⁾ were delayed due to the lack of budgetary credits at the end of July 2012. These invoices were paid as soon as additional credits were made available for the ESF at the end of 2012. Before October 2012, there were no abnormal payment times for the ERDF due to lack of budget credits.

⁽²⁾ Programme 2007DE052PO002, invoice date 26.7.2012, amount: 39 498 400.24 paid on 18.12.2012 and programme 2007DE052PO003, invoice date 24.9.2012, amount: 36 749 888.47 paid on 19.12.2012.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003421/13
an die Kommission
Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE)
(26. März 2013)

Betrifft: Kofinanzierung der Neubaustrecke zwischen Wendlingen und Ulm

In seiner Antwort auf meine Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-000566/13 vom 22. Januar 2013 bestätigte Vizepräsident Kallas, „dass die Neubaustrecke Wendlingen-Ulm [...] eine stärkere Steigung aufweist als die Bestandsstrecke über die Geislinger Steige (22,5 mm/m bzw. 22,5 ‰)“.

Des Weiteren führt er aus: „Generell sind stärkere Steigungen, insbesondere für Güterzüge, nachteilig, da die Kostenwirksamkeit und somit die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit sehr von einer hohen Transportkapazität pro Zug bezogen auf eine bestimmte Zugkraft und Leistung abhängen. Der Trend geht daher zu einem größeren Gewicht der Züge und zu längeren Zügen. [...] Nach Kenntnis der Kommission werden für die Neubaustrecke Gewichtsbegrenzungen bzw. eine stärkere Leistung/Zugkraft erwogen“.

1. Hat die Untauglichkeit der Neubaustrecke für den normalen Güterverkehr Auswirkungen auf die finanzielle Unterstützung der EU im Rahmen der Transeuropäischen Verkehrsnetze (TEN-T)? Wenn ja: warum? Wenn nein: warum nicht?
2. Besteht im Rahmen der laufenden Überarbeitung der Leitlinien für die TEN-T die Möglichkeit, die Planung und Förderung der besagten Neubaustrecke auf den Prüfstand zu stellen? Wenn ja: in welcher Form? Wenn nein: warum nicht?
3. Ist der Kommission bekannt, dass die ursprünglich angesetzten Kosten von 2 Mrd. EUR (Stand: 2004) auf mittlerweile rund 3 Mrd. EUR gestiegen sind und dass der deutsche Bundesverkehrsminister Peter Ramsauer am 24. März 2013 gegenüber der Presse deutlich machte⁽¹⁾, dass er von weiteren Kostensteigerungen ausgeht?
4. Bezieht sich der Kofinanzierungssatz der EU von 14,35 % auf die ursprünglich erwarteten oder die tatsächlich eintretenden Kosten?

Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(14. Mai 2013)

1. Wie dem Herrn Abgeordneten bekannt ist, zielt das Vorhaben auf Verbesserungen im Personenfernverkehr sowie im leichten Güterverkehr im Rahmen des vorrangigen Projekts 17 ab (siehe die Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-000566/2013⁽²⁾). Der Vorschlag wurde 2007 von externen Fachleuten geprüft und gemäß den allgemeinen TEN-V-Bedingungen für die Projektfinanzierung als förderfähig eingestuft.
2. Der Beschluss 2007-DE-17200-P ist sowohl für die Kommission als auch für das Bundesverkehrsministerium als Empfänger verbindlich. Bei jeder Änderung des Projekts wäre eine Änderung bzw. in bestimmten Fällen eine Aufhebung des ursprünglichen Beschlusses erforderlich (siehe die Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-009241/2011⁽²⁾).
3. Die Kommission hat bislang aus der Presse Informationen über erwartete Kostensteigerungen erhalten. Diese haben jedoch keinen Einfluss auf die geltenden Finanzierungsbeschlüsse. Der in dem einschlägigen Beschluss angegebene EU-Beitrag ist ein Höchstsatz, so dass etwaige Kostenerhöhungen die EU-Mittelzuweisung nicht beeinflussen.
4. Die Kofinanzierungsrate bezieht sich auf die Kosten der im Beschluss 2007-DE-17200-P genannten Maßnahmen.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.faz.net/aktuell/politik/inland/f-a-z-gespraech-ramsauer-erwartet-weitere-kostensteigerungen-12126703.html>

⁽²⁾ Abrufbar unter: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003421/13
to the Commission**

Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE)
(26 March 2013)

Subject: Co-financing of the new line between Wendlingen and Ulm

In his answer to my question for written answer E-000566/13 of 22 January 2013, Vice-President Kallas confirmed 'that the new line NBS Wendlingen-Ulm involves a steeper gradient ... than the existing line via the Geislinger Steige (22.5 mm/m or %)'.

He also stated: 'Generally, steep gradients are disadvantageous in particular for freight trains, since the cost-efficiency and, consequently, the competitiveness is highly dependent on a high transport capacity per train in relation to a given tractive force and power. Therefore, there is a trend towards increased train weights and lengths. ... As far as the Commission understands, a weight limit or additional power/tractive force [is being] considered along the NBS'.

1. Will the unsuitability of the new line for normal freight traffic affect the financial support provided by the EU within the framework of the trans-European transport networks (TEN-T)? If so, why? If not, why not?
2. Would it be possible, in the context of the ongoing revision of the TEN-T guidelines, to review the planning and support for this new line? If so, in what form? If not, why not?
3. Is the Commission aware that the costs of EUR 2 billion originally quoted (as at: 2004) have now risen to around EUR 3 billion and that the German Minister for Transport, Peter Ramsauer, made it clear to the press on 24 March 2013 ⁽¹⁾ that he anticipates further cost increases?
4. Does the EU's co-financing rate of 14.35% relate to the costs originally expected or to the actual costs?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission

(14 May 2013)

1. The project aims at improvements for long distance passenger services and freight services with light freight trains along Priority Project 17 as the Honourable member is aware (see reply to Written Question E-000566/2013 ⁽²⁾). The proposal was evaluated in 2007 by external experts and was found eligible according to the general TEN-T conditions for financing projects.
2. The decision 2007-DE-17200-P is a binding decision for both the Commission and the Federal Ministry of transport as beneficiary. Any change of the project as such would need an amendment or, in specific cases, a cancellation of the initial decision (see reply to Written Question E-009241/2011 ⁽²⁾).
3. The Commission received information on expected cost increases via the press so far. This does not affect the running funding decisions. The EU contribution stated in the corresponding Decision is a maximum, therefore any cost overruns are not affecting the EU budgetary commitment for the project.
4. The co-financing rate relates to the costs of the actions as identified by Decision 2007-DE-17200-P.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.faz.net/aktuell/politik/inland/f-a-z-gespraech-ramsauer-erwartet-weitere-kostensteigerungen-12126703.html>

⁽²⁾ Available at <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html>

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003422/13
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(26 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: L'UE intervenga sulla sicurezza dei pagamenti effettuati con carte di credito o bancomat nei paesi extra-UE

In un recente documento intitolato «Payment Card Fraud in the European Union» Europol denuncia un significativo assalto alla carte di pagamento europee a causa di diversi o insufficienti standard di sicurezza.

Si legge infatti che l'UE è sempre più esposta alla minaccia di transazioni illegali attuate in paesi quali USA, Repubblica dominicana, Colombia, Russia, Brasile e Messico e che, nel complesso, le organizzazioni criminali, sempre al passo con la tecnologia e in grado di eludere le misure di sicurezza, ne possono trarre profitti illeciti per almeno 1,5 miliardi di euro l'anno.

Europol denuncia inoltre una risposta non armonizzata e non sostenuta da tutti gli attori del settore (società emittenti di carte di credito, centri di elaborazione dati, inquirenti e autorità giudiziarie) nonché la mancanza di normative adeguate per la segnalazione di violazioni di dati alle polizie.

1. Come intende la Commissione provvedere al fine di impedire le transazioni illegali in paesi extra-UE a danno degli utilizzatori europei di carte di credito?
2. Come intende la Commissione intervenire contro l'aumento di violazioni di dati finanziari — anche on line — contro società, persone fisiche e centri di elaborazione dati, relative a carte di credito basate nell'UE?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(6 giugno 2013)

Per quanto riguarda la sicurezza dei pagamenti effettuati con carte di pagamento, i rischi per i consumatori in caso di frode sono contemplati nella direttiva sui servizi di pagamento (2007/64/CE)⁽¹⁾, nonché nei contratti conclusi tra utilizzatori e fornitori di servizi di pagamento e nelle norme sui regimi delle carte di pagamento. Questi tre strumenti giuridici definiscono i diritti e gli obblighi degli utilizzatori di dette carte in caso di frode. In linea di massima, le conseguenze finanziarie delle frodi sono a carico dei consumatori soltanto se loro stessi hanno agito in modo fraudolento o hanno commesso una negligenza grave. La Commissione non può impedire il verificarsi di transazioni illegali nei paesi al di fuori dell'UE, ma il sistema succitato tutela gli utilizzatori europei di carte di pagamento dalle conseguenze della frode.

Il ruolo della Commissione nella prevenzione della frode si concentra sulle misure giuridiche, quali, ad esempio, la tutela degli utilizzatori dei servizi di pagamento, nonché la tutela dei loro dati personali. Sotto il profilo tecnico e operativo, la sicurezza dei pagamenti a livello dell'UE è di competenza della Banca centrale europea (ad esempio, tramite il Forum europeo per la sicurezza dei pagamenti al dettaglio, Secure Pay) e il Centro europeo per la criminalità informatica, recentemente istituito presso Europol, che, nell'ambito della propria missione, si impegna a contrastare le frodi nell'ambito delle carte di pagamento.

La Commissione sta attualmente esaminando i requisiti giuridici che potranno rafforzare la sicurezza delle operazioni di pagamento on line. Le nuove disposizioni potrebbero essere integrate nella proposta di modifica della direttiva sui servizi di pagamento (2007/64/CE) nella seconda metà di quest'anno.

⁽¹⁾ GUL 319/1 del 5 dicembre 2007.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003422/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(26 March 2013)**

Subject: Request for the EU to take action on the security of payments made with credit or debit cards in countries outside the EU

In a recent document entitled 'Payment Card Fraud in the European Union', Europol reported major payment card fraud caused by divergent or insufficient security standards.

In fact, the report states that the EU faces ever greater exposure to the threat of illegal transactions carried out in countries such as the USA, the Dominican Republic, Colombia, Russia, Brazil and Mexico and that organised crime groups, always in step with technology and able to circumvent security measures, can make an overall illegal profit of at least EUR 1.5 billion per year.

Furthermore, Europol highlights the lack of both a harmonised response supported by other stakeholders in the sector (credit card issuers, data processing centres, investigators and legal authorities) and of suitable legislation for reporting data violations to the police.

1. What measures does the Commission intend to take to prevent illegal transactions in countries outside the EU to the detriment of European credit card users?
2. What steps does the Commission intend to take to combat the increase in the number of financial data violations — including online — against companies, individuals and data processing centres, related to credit cards based in the EU?

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

The security risks for consumers in the context of card fraud are addressed by the Payment Services Directive (2007/64/EC) ⁽¹⁾, as well as in contracts between payment users and payment service providers and by card scheme rules. These three tools define the rights and obligations of card users in case of fraud. In principle, consumers bear the financial consequences of the fraud only if they have themselves acted fraudulently or with gross negligence. The Commission cannot prevent illegal transactions in countries outside the EU from happening, but the abovementioned system protects European card users from the consequences of fraud.

The Commission's role as regards fraud prevention is focused on legal measures, as e.g. the protection of payment service users and the protection of their personal data. From a technical and operational point of view, payment security at the EU level is addressed by the European Central Bank (e.g. through the European Forum on the Security of Retail Payment (Secure Pay) and the newly established European Cybercrime Centre at Europol, which as part of its mission is dedicated to fighting payment card fraud.

The Commission is currently considering legal requirements that will increase the security of the online payment transactions. These are likely to be included in the proposal for the revised Payment Services Directive (2007/64/EC) later this year.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 319/1, 5.12.2007.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-003424/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(26 martie 2013)

Subiect: Embargo asupra importurilor de sămânță de cartof din UE

Federația Rusă are în vedere instituirea unui embargo asupra importurilor de sămânță de cartof provenind din statele membre UE, precum și asupra altor importuri vegetale. Autoritățile ruse au anunțat inițial data de 1 aprilie 2013 ca termen pentru instituirea acestui embargo, amânându-l ulterior pentru data de 1 iunie 2013. Comisia este rugată să precizeze pe ce se fundamentează dialogul cu Federația Rusă, în vederea împiedicării acestui demers.

Răspuns dat de dl Borg în numele Comisiei
(23 mai 2013)

Rusia și-a anunțat intenția de a interzice, începând cu 1 iunie 2013, importul din UE de cartofi de sămânță, cartofi pentru depozitare, plante fructifere și ornamentale destinate plantării.

Comisia a subliniat necesitatea de a justifica o interdicție pe baza unor riscuri fitosanitare care nu au fost demonstrate în mod clar pentru produsele vizate. Rusia ar trebui să adopte o abordare proporțională pentru gestionarea acestor riscuri, în conformitate cu standardele internaționale stabilite de Convenția internațională pentru protecția plantelor.

Respectarea acestor standarde face parte din obligațiile asumate de Rusia ca membru al OMC.

Comisia a fost de acord să abordeze preocupările exprimate de Rusia cu privire la:

- trasabilitatea și fiabilitatea certificării transporturilor de plante destinate plantării provenite dintr-un stat membru, dar exportate de un alt stat membru și
- statutul indemn de dăunători al transporturilor, în conformitate cu dispozițiile legislației ruse.

În plus, la cererea Rusiei, Comisia explorează, împreună cu statele membre, eventuale condiții de import pentru coniferele și cartofii provenind din Rusia. Aproape niciuna dintre țările terțe, inclusiv Rusia, nu poate exporta aceste produse către UE, cu excepția cazului în care se acordă o derogare. S-a solicitat Rusiei să furnizeze dosare tehnice în sprijinul cererilor de export formulate. Numai după punerea la dispoziție a dosarelor menționate și cu condiția ca acestea să fie considerate satisfăcătoare, Comisia va formula un proiect de act legislativ pentru o derogare.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003424/13
to the Commission**

Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)

(26 March 2013)

Subject: Embargo on imports of seed potatoes from the EU

The Russian Federation is considering imposing an embargo on imports of seed potatoes from EU Member States, as well as on other vegetable imports. The Russian authorities initially announced a date of 1 April 2013 as a deadline for imposing the embargo, and later postponed it until 1 June 2013. Can the Commission specify what the basis of the dialogue with the Russian Federation to prevent such action is?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission

(23 May 2013)

Russia announced its intention to ban, as from 1 June 2013, import from the EU of seed potatoes, ware potatoes, plants for planting of fruit and ornamental plants.

The Commission has underlined the need to justify a ban based on phytosanitary risks, which have not been clearly demonstrated for the targeted commodities. Russia should adopt a proportionate approach for managing those risks, in accordance with international standards set by the International Plant Protection Convention. Respecting those standards is part of Russia's obligation as a WTO member.

The Commission has agreed to address the Russian concerns about:

- traceability and reliability of certification for consignments of plants for planting originating in one Member State but exported by another Member State and
- on the consignments' pest free origin, as regulated by Russian legislation.

Furthermore, at Russia's request, the Commission is exploring, with Member States, possible import conditions for coniferous plants and potatoes from Russia. These commodities cannot be exported to the EU by almost all third countries including Russia, unless a derogation is granted. Russia has been asked to provide technical dossiers in support of their export requests. Once these dossiers are available and should they be considered satisfactory, only then would the Commission formulate a draft act for a derogation.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-003425/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(26 martie 2013)

Subiect: Restabilirea încrederii în produsele alimentare europene

Producătorii agricoli și procesatorii români, precum și cei din alte state membre, se află în situația de a înregistra pierderi importante pentru anul 2013 din cauza suspiciunilor larg mediatizate legate de calitatea și siguranța produselor alimentare.

În sectorul vânzării de carne de vită și cal, pierderile ar putea ajunge, numai în România, la 30 de milioane de euro până la sfârșitul anului în curs. De asemenea, sunt afectate piața laptelui și a cărnii de pasăre.

Comisia este rugată să precizeze:

1. care sunt măsurile avute în vedere pentru a preveni pierderile pentru agricultori, procesatori și comercianți, determinate de suspiciunile privind siguranța alimentară și mediatizarea acestora;
2. care sunt măsurile avute în vedere pentru a restabili încrederea consumatorilor în produsele alimentare europene;
3. care sunt măsurile avute în vedere pentru a evita scăderea exporturilor de alimente în afara Uniunii Europene, pe fondul acestei crize.

Răspuns dat de dl Cioloș în numele Comisiei
(29 mai 2013)

1. Comisia urmărește îndeaproape evoluțiile pieței, dar consideră că în prezent nu există perturbări ale pieței care să justifice intervențiile pe piață.
 2. A fost identificat un set de acțiuni pentru a consolida sistemul UE și a restabili încrederea consumatorilor. Domeniile prioritare identificate includ măsuri mai eficiente de combatere a fraudei în domeniul alimentar, întărirea regulilor privind pașapoartele pentru cai și controale oficiale mai eficiente.
 3. Nu există dovezi privind un eventual impact direct al fraudei legate de prezența (neindicată pe etichetă) a cărnii de cal în produsele din carne de vită asupra exporturilor europene de alimente în general. Dinamica exporturilor diverselor produse alimentare depinde de mai mulți factori.
-

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003425/13
to the Commission**

Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)

(26 March 2013)

Subject: Restoring confidence in European food products

Romanian agricultural producers and processors, as well as those from other Member States, are set to record significant losses for 2013 due to the widely publicised suspicions regarding the quality and safety of food products.

In the beef and horsemeat sectors, the losses could reach EUR 30 million in Romania alone by the end of this year. The milk and poultry markets are also affected.

Can the Commission answer the following questions?

1. What measures does it have in mind to prevent the losses for farmers, processors and traders that have been caused by the suspicions regarding food safety and the media coverage of these?
2. What measures does it have in mind to restore consumer confidence in European food products?
3. What measures does it have in mind to prevent a drop in food exports outside the European Union as a result of this crisis?

Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission

(29 May 2013)

1. The Commission follows market developments closely, but sees currently no market disturbances that would justify market interventions.
 2. A set of actions was identified to strengthen EU system and restore consumer confidence. Priority areas identified include action to better tackle food fraud, strengthened rules on horse passports and more effective official controls.
 3. There is no evidence that there is a direct impact of the fraud of unlabelled horsemeat in beef products on European food exports in general. The dynamic of exports of the different food products depends on various factors.
-

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-003426/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(26 martie 2013)

Subiect: Riscul de deces în utilizarea Azitromicinei

Potrivit unui avertisment emis de Federația Americană a Alimentelor și Medicamentelor (FDA), azitromicina vândută sub denumirea de Zithromax poate cauza aritmii cardiace care ar putea determina decesul pacienților. Riscul crescut de deces prin boli cardiovasculare pe care îl prezintă acest antibiotic folosit de două decenii în tratarea infecțiilor respiratorii a fost semnalat și de cercetătorii Universității Vanderbilt și New England Journal of Medicine.

Comisia este rugată să precizeze dacă are în considerare aceste studii și dacă intenționează să monitorizeze această problemă.

Răspuns dat de dl Borg în numele Comisiei
(6 mai 2013)

Antibioticele care conțin azitromicină sunt medicamentele pentru care autorizațiile de introducere pe piață au fost acordate de către statele membre.

Ca urmare a informațiilor publicate privind azitromicina și riscul de deces ca urmare a afecțiunilor cardiovasculare ⁽¹⁾, autoritățile medicale naționale din UE evaluează riscul aritmiilor potențial letale în cadrul unei revizuii a rapoartelor periodice actualizate privind siguranța. Evaluarea este coordonată de (câte) un organism de reglementare reprezentând autoritățile naționale de reglementare a medicamentelor din statele membre ale UE. În plus, Agenția Europeană pentru Medicamente a început să evalueze rezultatele studiului¹ în cadrul reuniunii sale din 8-11 aprilie 2013 ⁽²⁾.

Evaluarea în desfășurare de la nivelul UE va lua în considerare necesitatea unei actualizări a informațiilor privind prescripțiile medicamentelor care conțin azitromicină în UE, inclusiv necesitatea intensificării avertizărilor privind factorii de risc pentru aritmie. Între timp, pacienții au fost sfătuiți să nu înceteze niciun tratament care li s-a prescris, înainte de a se adresa medicului sau farmacistului lor.

⁽¹⁾ Ray WA, Murray KT, Hall K, Arbogast PG, Stein CM. Azithromycin and the Risk of Cardiovascular Death. N Engl J Med 2012;366:1881-90.

⁽²⁾ http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Agenda/2013/04/WC500142006.pdf

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003426/13
to the Commission**

Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)

(26 March 2013)

Subject: Risk of death through using Azithromycin

According to a warning issued by the American Food and Drug Administration (FDA), azithromycin sold under the Zithromax brand can cause cardiac arrhythmia that could lead to the death of patients. The increased risk of death through cardiovascular diseases posed by this antibiotic, which has been used in treating respiratory infections for the past two decades, was also raised by researchers from Vanderbilt University and New England Journal of Medicine.

Can the Commission specify whether it has considered these studies and intends to monitor this issue?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission

(6 May 2013)

Azithromycin-containing antibiotics are medicinal products for which the marketing authorisations have been granted by the Member States.

Following the publication on azithromycin and the risk of cardiovascular death ⁽¹⁾, national medicines authorities in the EU are assessing the risk of potentially fatal arrhythmias as part of a review of periodic safety update reports. The assessment is coordinated by a regulatory body representing national medicines regulatory authorities of the EU Member States. In addition, the European Medicines Agency has started to assess the results of the study¹ at its meeting of 8 to 11 April 2013 ⁽²⁾.

The ongoing EU assessment will consider the need for an update of the prescribing information for azithromycin-containing medicines in the EU, including the need for strengthened warnings on the risk factors for arrhythmias. In the meantime, patients have been advised not to stop taking any treatments they have been prescribed without speaking to their doctor or pharmacist.

⁽¹⁾ Ray WA, Murray KT, Hall K, Arbogast PG, Stein CM. Azithromycin and the Risk of Cardiovascular Death. *N Engl J Med* 2012;366:1881-90.

⁽²⁾ http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Agenda/2013/04/WC500142006.pdf

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-003427/13
a la Comisión
Raúl Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(26 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Aprobación del proyecto de la Comisión Nacional de Mercados y Competencia

El pasado 20 de marzo se llevó a cabo en el Congreso español la aprobación del proyecto de la Comisión Nacional de Mercados y Competencia. Dicho proyecto fue seguido estrechamente por la Comisión Europea, que planteó serias dudas sobre el mismo. Así, después de una carta que envió personalmente la Comisaria Neelie Kroes al Ministro José Manuel Soria con fecha de 11 de febrero de 2013 y una reunión entre ambos que tuvo lugar durante el Mobile World Congress el pasado 26 de febrero, la Comisión dejó clara su preocupación por el proyecto.

Las modificaciones que se han realizado durante el trámite parlamentario no alcanzarían totalmente el compromiso que adquirieron ambas partes. No se conservan todas las competencias actuales en materia de regulación en el sector de las telecomunicaciones, ya que por ejemplo se traspasa al ministerio la competencia sobre tasas. Tampoco se asegura la independencia del regulador, al dejar en manos de un Estatuto Orgánico, redactado por el Gobierno, la definición de las funciones y organización. Además, siguen sin resolverse algunas anomalías, como el hecho de que sea el regulador con menos competencias y el único que no tiene ninguna función respecto a los usuarios de los servicios de telecomunicaciones.

Dado que no se garantizan todos los compromisos que adquirieron Comisión y Gobierno, ¿qué acciones piensa llevar a cabo la Comisión ante este proyecto?

¿Qué opinión tiene la Comisión respecto a que el nuevo regulador único sea el regulador con menores competencias de la UE y que no tenga competencias en usuarios?

Respuesta de la Sra. Kroes en nombre de la Comisión
(15 de abril de 2013)

Tal como señalamos en nuestra respuesta a la pregunta escrita E-2282/13, la Comisión ha mantenido contactos con el Ministro español de industria para expresarle sus dudas sobre varios aspectos relacionados con la asignación de competencias en el sector de las comunicaciones electrónicas a las autoridades reguladoras nacionales españolas y ha recibido garantías del Gobierno español de que se tendrán en cuenta esas dudas en la ley final por la que se cree la Comisión Nacional de Mercados y Competencia (CNMC). La Comisión sabe que, recientemente, se han propuesto diversas enmiendas al proyecto de ley.

En lo que respecta a las atribuciones del regulador, tal como señalamos en nuestra respuesta a la pregunta escrita E-10181/2012, la Comisión concede gran importancia a los requisitos relativos al ajuste de las tareas realizadas por las autoridades reguladoras a los objetivos políticos y a los principios reglamentarios que figuran en el marco de la UE.

La Comisión seguirá atentamente la finalización del proceso legislativo en España para cerciorarse de que la legislación española cumple plenamente la normativa de la UE y, si queda pendiente algún tema, actuará según corresponda.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-003427/13
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(26 March 2013)**

Subject: Adoption of the bill to set up a National Commission for Markets and Competition

On 20 March 2013 the lower house of the Spanish Parliament adopted the bill to set up a National Commission for Markets and Competition. This bill had been followed closely by the Commission, which had raised serious doubts about it. Accordingly, after a letter, dated 11 February 2013, sent personally by Commissioner Neelie Kroes to Minister Jose Manuel Soria, and a meeting between the two that took place during the Mobile World Congress on 26 February, the Commission made clear its concerns about the bill.

The amendments made during the parliamentary process do not, apparently, fully meet the agreement reached by both parties. Not all the current powers relating to regulation in the telecommunications sector have been retained, given that, for example, responsibility for taxes is being transferred to the ministry. Nor is the independence of the regulator guaranteed, since the definition of its functions and organisation will be left up to an 'organic statute', drafted by the government. In addition, a number of anomalies remain unresolved, such as the fact that the regulator in question is the one with the fewest powers and the only one that has no role in relation to the users of telecommunications services.

Given that all the commitments undertaken by the Commission and the government have not been guaranteed, what measures will the Commission take in relation to this bill?

What is the Commission's view of the fact that the new single regulator will be the regulator with the fewest powers in the EU and will have no powers in relation to users?

**Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(15 April 2013)**

As indicated in our reply to Written Question E-2282/13, the Commission has been in close contact with the Spanish Minister of Industry to reiterate concerns on a number of issues relating to the attribution of competences in the electronic communications sector to national regulatory authorities in Spain and has received the assurance from the Spanish Government that these concerns will be addressed in the final law creating the National Commission for Markets and Competition (CNMC). The Commission is aware that a number of amendments have been recently proposed to the draft law.

Regarding the powers of the regulator, as indicated in our reply to Written Question E-10181/2012, the Commission attaches great importance to the requirements regarding the alignment of the tasks carried out by the regulators with the policy objectives and regulatory principles contained in the EU framework.

The Commission is committed to follow-up closely the finalisation of the legislative process in Spain to ensure full compliance of the Spanish legislation with EC law and will address any remaining issues, as appropriate.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003428/13
a la Comisión**

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)

(26 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Agenda Digital para Europa

El 70 % por ciento de la población europea vive en áreas urbanas y con tendencia a ir creciendo. Así, la CE ha establecido Internet como uno de los puntos prioritarios en la estrategia 2020 la Agenda Digital para Europa (DAE). El objetivo es maximizar el potencial social y económico, elemento, huelga decir, fundamental para la actividad social y económica. Precisamente es fundamental la gestión de servicios conectados y el traslado de dicha información relevante para las partes interesadas y los gestores políticos que han de tomar decisiones.

A la luz de lo anterior y teniendo en cuenta los fondos de cohesión para el nuevo marco 2020, y «Ciudades y comunidades inteligentes — Cooperación de Innovación Europea», ¿tiene la CE pensado crear un paquete de medidas para entidades locales que contengan estándares de sensores, conexiones de los sensores con centro de recopilación de datos y programario de tratamiento de datos?

Respuesta de la Sra. Kroes en nombre de la Comisión

(17 de mayo de 2013)

Las actividades de normalización de sensores reciben un apoyo continuo gracias al esfuerzo investigador europeo actual, por ejemplo, los esfuerzos de normalización de sensores de la comunicación de máquina a máquina (M2M) del Instituto Europeo de Normas de Telecomunicación (ETSI) y de la Organización Internacional de Normalización (ISO).

Cabe esperar que, al amparo de la iniciativa «Ciudades y Comunidades Inteligentes — Cooperación de Innovación Europea (SCC-EIP)», esfuerzos similares al anterior se integren en el contexto de un conjunto más amplio de infraestructuras y, con el propósito de incrementar la interoperabilidad entre los diversos sistemas de información (por ejemplo, transporte y energía), se consigan unos servicios mejores, más innovadores y ventajosos económicamente para los ciudadanos, ciudades más sostenibles así como más y mejores conocimientos técnicos para nuestras industrias. Un requisito previo para cosechar los beneficios mencionados, no obstante, es garantizar el acceso a los datos de forma gratuita o a un bajo coste, en particular a los datos públicos ⁽¹⁾, un área de gran importancia en el marco de la Agenda Digital. Otro esfuerzo principal del SCC-EIP es reunir a todas las distintas partes interesadas en el contexto urbano (en particular, las autoridades locales) con el fin de garantizar una amplia cobertura de las necesidades, una rápida adopción de soluciones y un beneficio para todos.

La interconexión central y la plataforma de comunicación en las actividades anteriores es el Internet de los objetos, un área de máxima prioridad de la Agenda Digital y un área de especial énfasis en el marco de los actuales programas de investigación (un énfasis que se espera continúe y se vea reforzado en el marco de Horizonte 2020).

Habida cuenta de que los planes de ejecución de la anterior Cooperación de Innovación Europea, así como del primer programa de trabajo de Horizonte 2020, se encuentran actualmente en fase de desarrollo, la Comisión estará en condiciones de proporcionar respuestas más concretas a su pregunta en los próximos meses.

⁽¹⁾ Véase en particular <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/pillar-i-digital-single-market/action-3-open-public-data-resources-re-use> y http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/policy/psi/index_en.htm

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003428/13
to the Commission**

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(26 March 2013)

Subject: Digital Agenda for Europe

Seventy per cent of Europeans live in urban areas and this trend is increasing. The Commission has therefore identified the Internet as one of the priority areas in the 2020 strategy's Digital Agenda for Europe (DAE). The objective is to maximise social and economic potential, which is clearly fundamental for social and economic activity. The management of connected services and the transfer of this relevant information to the interested parties and political decision-makers is particularly important.

In the light of the above, and taking into account the cohesion funds for the new 2020 framework and 'Smart Cities and Communities — European Innovation Partnership', does the Commission intend to create a package of measures for local authorities containing standards for sensors and connections between sensors and the data collection centre and data processing programme?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission

(17 May 2013)

Standardisation activities on sensors are an area of ongoing support under the European research efforts today, for instance the ETSI Machine-To-Machine (M2M) and ISO sensor standardisation efforts.

Under the 'Smart Cities and Communities — European Innovation Partnership (SCC-EIP)' it is expected that efforts like the above will be integrated in the context of a broader set of infrastructures and with the aim to increase interoperability across various information systems (e.g. transport, energy) and this is expected to lead to better, more innovative, and cost efficient services for the citizens; more sustainable cities; and more and better know-how for our relevant industries. A pre-requisite to reap the above benefits, however, is to ensure the free or low cost access to data — particularly to public data ⁽¹⁾ — an area of high importance under the Digital Agenda. At the core also of the effort of the SCC-EIP is to bring together all different stakeholders in a city context (notably local authorities) in order to ensure broad coverage of needs, fast uptake of solutions, and benefit for all.

The central interconnection and communication platform in the above developments is the Internet of Things, a top priority area again of the Digital Agenda and an area of high emphasis under the current research programmes (an emphasis that is expected to be continued and be further reinforced under Horizon 2020).

As the implementation plans of the above European Innovation Partnership as well as the first Horizon 2020 work-programme are currently under development, the Commission will be able to provide more concrete answers to your question in the coming months.

⁽¹⁾ See in particular <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/pillar-i-digital-single-market/action-3-open-public-data-resources-re-use> and http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/policy/psi/index_en.htm

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003429/13
a la Comisión**

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)

(26 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Smart Cities

Uno de los objetivos básicos de la estrategia de la UE para el horizonte 2020 es la Agenda Digital para Europa (DAE). De hecho, se busca la maximización de los recursos disponibles para incrementar el potencial económico y social de Internet. Un uso más amplio y efectivo de las tecnologías digitales proporcionará los mecanismos necesarios para dar respuestas a los desafíos actuales como, por citar sólo algunos, una mejor calidad de vida, un mejor eficiente uso del transporte o un aire de calidad.

A la luz de lo anterior y teniendo en cuenta los Fondos de Cohesión para el horizonte 2020, Smart Cities y Communities European innovation:

1. ¿Ha planteado la CE dar la posibilidad de analizar las diferentes nodos de cableado de fibra óptica existentes y unirlos?
2. ¿Cree la CE que unir las redes de fibra óptica incrementaría el potencial económico y social de Internet y así ayudaría a dar respuesta a los desafíos definidos en la estrategia 2020?

Respuesta de la Sra. Kroes en nombre de la Comisión

(27 de mayo de 2013)

La conectividad de banda ancha resulta esencial para fomentar el crecimiento y la innovación, así como para la cohesión social y territorial en Europa. La Comisión Europea trabaja en la creación de un marco político y reglamentario óptimo para su desarrollo ⁽¹⁾. Las inversiones necesarias para poner al día las redes existentes o desplegar infraestructuras nuevas y conectarlas procederán principalmente de inversores comerciales, pero también se precisará de fondos públicos para alcanzar los ambiciosos objetivos establecidos por la Agenda Digital para Europa. Los Fondos Estructurales y de Inversión Europeos apoyarán la inversión en infraestructuras en el ámbito de las tecnologías de la información y la comunicación.

Como señala el informe sobre la competitividad digital de 2010 ⁽²⁾, la industria de las TIC contribuye enormemente al crecimiento de la economía europea y representa el 5 % del PIB. Un simple aumento del 10 % en la implantación de la banda ancha podría generar un incremento del 1-1,5 % del PIB anual o mejorar la productividad laboral en un 1,5 % a lo largo de los próximos cinco años. Además, crearía 1,2 millones de puestos de trabajo en la construcción de infraestructuras a corto plazo, y hasta 3,8 millones en el conjunto de la economía a largo plazo. Se espera, por otra parte, que la introducción de procesos relacionados con internet permita considerables mejoras de la productividad en las industrias tradicionales ⁽³⁾.

Además, unas infraestructuras mejoradas que hagan posible una conectividad a alta velocidad son la base para el desarrollo de servicios y tecnologías nuevos o esenciales, como las redes inteligentes, la informática en nube, las tecnologías P2P, las redes sociales, la sanidad electrónica o los servicios audiovisuales de alta definición, interactivos y a la carta, y constituyen un factor de capacitación particularmente importante en el proceso de aportar inteligencia a nuestras ciudades.

⁽¹⁾ Véase por ejemplo la reciente propuesta de Reglamento del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo relativo a medidas para reducir el coste del despliegue de las redes de comunicaciones electrónicas de alta velocidad.

⁽²⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/newsroom/cf/itemdetail.cfm?item_id=5789

⁽³⁾ Comunicación de la Comisión al Parlamento Europeo, al Consejo, al Comité Económico y Social Europeo y al Comité de las Regiones «La Agenda Digital para Europa — Motor del crecimiento europeo», COM(2012) 784 final.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003429/13
to the Commission**

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)

(26 March 2013)

Subject: Smart Cities

One of the basic objectives of the EU strategy for Horizon 2020 is the Digital Agenda for Europe (DAE). This seeks to maximise available resources in order to increase the economic and social potential of the Internet. Wider and more effective use of digital technologies will provide the mechanisms needed to respond to current challenges, such as better quality of life, more efficient use of transport and improved air quality, to name but a few.

In the light of the above, and taking into account the cohesion funds for Horizon 2020 and 'Smart Cities and Communities — European Innovation Partnership':

1. Has the Commission considered the possibility of analysing the different existing fibre optic cable nodes and connecting them?
2. Does the Commission believe that connecting fibre optic networks would increase the economic and social potential of the Internet and therefore help to respond to the challenges identified in the 2020 strategy?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission

(27 May 2013)

Broadband connectivity is essential to foster growth and innovation and for social and territorial cohesion in Europe. The European Commission is working to create the best policy and regulatory framework for its development ⁽¹⁾. The investments required to upgrade existing networks or roll out new infrastructure and connect them shall primarily come from commercial investors but public funding will be required to achieve the ambitious targets set by Digital Agenda for Europe. The EU Structural and Investment Funds will support investments in infrastructure in the area of Information and communication technologies.

As shown by the 2010 Digital Competitiveness Report ⁽²⁾ the ICT industry is an important contributor to the growth of the European economy and represents 5% of GDP. Just a 10% increase in broadband take up could yield a 1-1.5% increase in annual GDP or could raise labour productivity by 1.5% over the next five years. Furthermore, this should create 1.2 million jobs in infrastructure construction in the short term, rising to 3.8 million jobs throughout the economy in the long term. In addition, the introduction of Internet-related processes is expected to lead to massive gains in productivity in traditional industries ⁽³⁾.

In addition improved infrastructures providing high-speed connectivity are the basis for the development of new or essential services and technologies such as smart grids, cloud computing, peer-to-peer technologies, social networks, eHealth, high-definition, interactive, on demand audiovisual services and a particularly important enabler in the context of smartening up our cities.

⁽¹⁾ See for instance the recent proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on measures to reduce the cost of deploying high-speed electronic communications networks.

⁽²⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/newsroom/cf/itemdetail.cfm?item_id=5789.

⁽³⁾ Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions 'The Digital Agenda for Europe — Driving European growth digitally', COM(2012) 784 final.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-003430/13
adresată Comisiei
Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE)
(26 martie 2013)

Subiect: Compatibilitatea libertății media cu drepturile fundamentale ale UE

În urma unei recomandări a Grupului la nivel înalt al Comisiei, comisarul Neelie Kroes a lansat recent două consultări cu privire la libertatea media și la pluralism.

Pentru a asigura compatibilitatea legislațiilor naționale privind mijloacele de informare în masă cu drepturile fundamentale ale UE este, într-adevăr, necesară o monitorizare strictă a acestora.

Vă voi da un exemplu recent care a afectat sectorul zootehnic românesc, din cauză că o parte a mijloacelor de informare în masă internaționale nu a respectat prezumția de nevinovăție în timp ce cercetările privind scandalul cărnii de cal erau încă în curs de desfășurare. În pofida răspunsului prompt al României privind scandalul cărnii de cal, o parte a acestora a prezentat România ca fiind „vinovată”. Din câte cunosc, niciunul dintre mijloacele de informare în masă care au formulat acuzații nu s-a scuzat public pentru alegerile neîntemeiate. Daunele aduse imaginii României nu au fost însă reparate.

Acesta este un bun exemplu de utilizat și analizat în cadrul consultărilor cu privire la libertatea media și pluralism, pentru a mări gradul de responsabilitate al acestora pentru efectele negative pe care le-ar putea provoca în cazuri cum este cel menționat mai sus. Pe acest fond, întrebarea mea este:

cum intenționează Comisia să asigure compatibilitatea libertății media cu drepturile fundamentale ale UE?

Răspuns dat de dna Kroes în numele Comisiei
(8 mai 2013)

Libertatea și pluralismul mass-media, elemente esențiale aflate la baza societăților noastre democratice, sunt consacrate în tratat, prevăzute la articolul 11 din Carta drepturilor fundamentale a Uniunii Europene, precum și la articolul 10 din Convenția europeană a drepturilor omului. Comisia este puternic angajată în direcția asigurării libertății de exprimare, în limita competențelor sale.

În ceea ce privește chestiunea adusă în discuție de distinsul membru, am dori să facem trimitere în mod special la Directiva 2010/13/UE (Directiva serviciilor mass-media audiovizuale sau DSMAV), care include dispoziții privind dreptul la replică, chiar dacă acestea sunt limitate la transmisiunile de televiziune. În plus, Recomandarea din 2006 a Parlamentului European și a Consiliului privind protecția minorilor și a demnității umane, precum și dreptul la replică îndeamnă statele membre să ia în considerare introducerea, în dreptul lor intern, a unor măsuri, a unor practici referitoare la dreptul la replică sau a altor măsuri reparatorii echivalente în legătură cu mass-media online, cu respectarea corespunzătoare a prevederilor legislației lor naționale și constituționale ⁽¹⁾.

Comisia a instituit un grup independent la nivel înalt pentru libertatea și pluralismul mass-media; la 21 ianuarie 2013, acest grup și-a prezentat raportul, care include o gamă largă de recomandări. Comisia a lansat recent două consultări publice, prima pe tema întregului raport și a doua pe tema independenței autorităților naționale de reglementare în domeniul audiovizualului. Răspunsurile la aceste consultări vor contribui la evaluarea necesității de a se adopta măsuri suplimentare de către Uniunea Europeană, în limitele competențelor sale.

⁽¹⁾ Recomandarea Parlamentului European și a Consiliului din 20 decembrie 2006 privind protecția minorilor și a demnității umane, precum și dreptul la replică în legătură cu competitivitatea industriei europene de servicii de informare audiovizuale și online (JO L 378, 27.12.2006, p. 72-77).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003430/13
to the Commission
Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE)
(26 March 2013)**

Subject: Compatibility of media freedom with EU fundamental rights

Commissioner Neelie Kroes recently launched two consultations on media freedom and pluralism following a recommendation from the Commission's high level group.

There is a genuine need to closely monitor national media laws to ensure their compatibility with fundamental EU rights.

The Romanian zootechnic sector was recently affected when international media questioned the sector's involvement in the horsemeat scandal, while investigations were still ongoing. Despite Romania's prompt response to the horsemeat scandal, certain sections of the media presented Romania as a guilty party. As far as I know, the media responsible for these accusations have not yet made a public apology for the unfounded allegations, and so the damage done to Romania's image has gone unrepaired.

This is a good example which should be used and analysed in the consultations on media freedom and pluralism in order to make the media accept more responsibility for the negative effects it can have in cases such as the one above.

In this light, how does the Commission intend to ensure the compatibility of media freedom with EU fundamental rights?

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

Freedom and pluralism of media constitute essential foundations of our democratic societies, enshrined in the Treaty, in Article 11 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union as well as Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights. The Commission is strongly committed towards ensuring freedom of expression within its competences.

As regards the matter addressed by the Honourable Member, we would point specifically to Directive 2010/13/EU (Audiovisual Media Services Directive or AVMSD) which includes provisions on the right of reply, however limited to television broadcasting. Furthermore, the 2006 Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the protection of minors and human dignity and on the right of reply recommends that the Member States consider the introduction of measures into their domestic law or practice regarding the right of reply or equivalent remedies in relation to online media, with due regard for their domestic and constitutional legislative provisions ⁽¹⁾.

The Commission set up an independent High Level Group on Media Freedom and Pluralism which presented its report on 21 January 2013 which includes a large array of recommendations. The Commission has recently launched two public consultations, the first one on the entire report and the second one on the independence of National Audio-Visual Regulatory Authorities. Responses to those consultations will contribute to assessing whether additional actions should be undertaken by the European Union within the limits of its competences.

⁽¹⁾ Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 December 2006 on the protection of minors and human dignity and on the right of reply in relation to the competitiveness of the European audiovisual and online information services industry — OJ L 378, 27.12.2006, pp. 72-77.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003431/13
à la Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(26 mars 2013)

Objet: Une remise en cause du principe d'égalité entre hommes et femmes

Le 8 mars 2013, à l'occasion de la journée internationale de la femme, un opérateur ferroviaire a organisé une action promotionnelle en appliquant des prix inférieurs au coût normal d'utilisation. Ces billets à bas prix étaient seulement à destination des femmes.

Cette promotion est l'exemple type d'une discrimination fondée sur le sexe. En effet, les hommes et les femmes ne sont pas traités de manière égale puisque les femmes sont ici traitées d'une manière plus favorable. Cette offre commerciale remet ainsi en cause le principe d'égalité entre hommes et femmes.

Ce principe est néanmoins l'un des principes fondamentaux du droit communautaire. Tout d'abord, la directive 2004/113/CE du Conseil mettant en œuvre le principe de l'égalité entre les femmes et les hommes dans l'accès aux biens et services et la fourniture de biens et services interdit les discriminations fondées sur le sexe dans l'accès et la fourniture de biens et services. Les hommes et les femmes doivent pouvoir accéder de la même manière aux biens et aux services proposés.

Par ailleurs, l'article 21 de la Charte européenne des droits fondamentaux interdit lui aussi la discrimination fondée sur le sexe.

1. Alors que la Commission n'a cessé d'adopter des résolutions en faveur de l'égalité entre les femmes et les hommes (Feuille de route (2006-2010), Stratégie pour l'égalité entre les hommes et les femmes (2012-2015), une Charte des femmes, etc.), ne pense-t-elle pas que cette action commerciale représente une infraction, à la fois, à la directive 2004/113/CE et à l'article 14 de la Convention européenne des Droits de l'homme?
2. Face au manque d'efficacité de l'application des mesures actuelles concernant l'interdiction de discrimination fondée sur le sexe, la Commission prévoit-elle de proposer au Conseil les mesures nécessaires à une application plus effective de ce principe?
3. Enfin, la législation européenne prévoit-elle des sanctions pour un non-respect du principe d'égalité entre les hommes et les femmes?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Reding au nom de la Commission
(14 mai 2013)

1. La directive 2004/113/CE⁽¹⁾ interdit toute discrimination entre hommes et femmes en ce qui concerne l'accès et la fourniture de biens et services. La Commission s'assure de la transposition correcte et complète de la directive dans chaque État membre. Il revient aux États membres d'assurer l'application concrète du principe d'égalité de traitement par les prestataires de services. Dans le cas mentionné par l'Honorable Parlementaire, la Commission reconnaît la différence de traitement entre hommes et femmes mais ne dispose pas des informations nécessaires pour l'évaluation complète de l'existence d'une éventuelle discrimination résultant de l'action promotionnelle évoquée. Il faut cependant noter que cette action a été limitée dans le temps (soit au 8 mars 2013) et dans le nombre de billets proposés. Des différences de prix entre hommes et femmes n'apparaissent pas exister en dehors de cette journée promotionnelle unique. Vu la nature isolée de cette action et en l'absence d'un problème lié à la législation d'un État membre, la Commission n'a pas de raison d'intervenir.

2. La Commission adoptera un rapport en 2014 sur la mise en œuvre de la directive dans les États membres. Ce rapport évaluera la nécessité de proposer d'éventuels amendements afin d'assurer la pleine application du principe d'égalité de traitement entre hommes et femmes dans l'accès aux biens et services.

3. Conformément à l'article 14 de la directive, il relève de la compétence des États membres de déterminer les sanctions applicables en cas de violation des dispositions nationales adoptées en application de la directive. La Commission s'assure que chaque État a mis en place des sanctions effectives, proportionnées et dissuasives, applicables en cas de discrimination.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 2004/113/CE du Conseil mettant en œuvre le principe de l'égalité entre les femmes et les hommes dans l'accès aux biens et services et la fourniture de biens et services.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003431/13
to the Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(26 March 2013)

Subject: The principle of gender equality called into question

On the occasion of International Women's Day, 8 March 2013, a rail operator organised a promotion offering discounted prices with respect to the normal cost of services. These low-cost tickets were only intended for women.

This promotion is a typical example of discrimination based on gender. Men and women are not treated equally since in this case, women are treated more favourably. This commercial offer thereby calls into question the principle of gender equality.

However, this principle is one of the fundamental principles of EC law. Firstly, Council Directive 2004/113/EC implementing the principle of equal treatment between men and women in the access to and supply of goods and services prohibits discrimination on grounds of sex in the access to and supply of goods and services. Men and women must be able to access goods and services offered in the same way.

Furthermore, Article 21 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union also prohibits discrimination based on gender.

1. While the Commission constantly adopts resolutions in favour of equality between men and women (Roadmap (2006-2010), Strategy for equality between men and women (2012-2015), a Women's Charter, etc.), does it not believe that this commercial action violates both Directive 2004/113/EC and Article 14 of the European Convention on Human Rights?
2. Given the ineffective application of current measures prohibiting discrimination on grounds of sex, does the Commission intend to propose to the Council the measures necessary to ensure a more effective application of this principle?
3. Lastly, does EC law provide for sanctions where the principle of equality between men and women is not respected?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(14 May 2013)

1. Directive 2004/113/EC ⁽¹⁾ prohibits all discrimination between men and women in the access to and supply of goods and services. The Commission is responsible for ensuring that the Directive is transposed correctly and in full in each Member State. It is up to the Member States to make sure that service providers apply the principle of equal treatment in practice. In the case cited by the Honourable Member, the Commission recognises that there was a difference in treatment between men and women, but does not have the necessary information to fully assess whether the promotional measure resulted in discrimination. It must be noted, however, that this promotion was offered for a limited time period (8 March 2013) and a limited number of tickets. Differences in prices for men and women do not appear to have applied apart from on this single promotional day. Given the isolated nature of the promotion, and in the absence of a problem with the legislation of a Member State, there is no reason for the Commission to intervene.
2. The Commission will adopt a report in 2014 on the implementation of the Directive in the Member States. The report will assess whether it is necessary to propose any amendments in order to ensure the full application of the principle of equal treatment between men and women in the access to goods and services.
3. In accordance with Article 14 of the Directive, the Member States are responsible for determining the penalties applicable to infringements of the national provisions adopted pursuant to the Directive. The Commission must ensure that each Member State has introduced effective, proportionate and dissuasive penalties applicable to cases of discrimination.

⁽¹⁾ Council Directive 2004/113/EC implementing the principle of equal treatment between men and women in the access to and supply of goods and services.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003432/13
à la Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(26 mars 2013)

Objet: Les coûts externes de l'automobile dans l'Union européenne

Selon une étude menée par le Département des sciences des transports de l'Université allemande de Dresde, les voitures utilisées dans l'Union européenne à 27 externaliseraient environ 373 milliards d'euros par an vers d'autres personnes, d'autres régions et d'autres générations. En effet, les voitures ne couvrent pas la totalité de leurs coûts externes (externalités négatives liées à la pollution, à l'émission de gaz à effet de serre, aux nuisances sonores, aux accidents automobiles, etc.) et d'autres acteurs que les utilisateurs doivent ou devront un jour payer la facture.

Il est tout à fait compréhensible que, face à ce constat, l'Union européenne mette en place des mesures afin de tenter de lutter contre ces coûts externes. C'est notamment le cas lorsque l'Union européenne tente de favoriser la création de nouvelles technologies visant à obtenir des réductions des émissions de gaz à effet de serre ou lorsqu'elle incite les constructeurs automobiles à produire des voitures plus respectueuses de l'environnement. Il en va de même pour les mesures relatives au niveau sonore des véhicules lorsque l'Union européenne s'engage à réduire les externalités sonores des véhicules à moteur afin de protéger la santé publique et l'environnement.

Néanmoins, au fur et à mesure que s'ajoutent des mesures de lutte contre les coûts externes de l'utilisation des voitures au sein de l'Union européenne, les constructeurs automobiles se voient constamment imposer de nouvelles normes et de nouvelles mesures. Ces entreprises ne peuvent pas indéfiniment augmenter les prix de leurs produits afin d'internaliser ces coûts externes liés à l'utilisation de voitures. Cela constitue pour ces entreprises une charge de plus en plus lourde, notamment en situation de crise économique.

1. Afin de réduire cette charge administrative et financière pour les constructeurs automobiles, ne serait-il pas judicieux que la Commission mette en place une mesure commune d'internalisation de l'ensemble des coûts externes liés à l'utilisation des voitures, plutôt que de multiplier les mesures isolées?
2. Par ailleurs, alors que le nombre d'immatriculation des voitures neuves a baissé de 10,5 % depuis 2012, comment la Commission envisage-t-elle de prendre en compte les externalités de l'utilisation des voitures sans pénaliser le secteur automobile?

Réponse donnée par M. Tajani au nom de la Commission
(30 mai 2013)

L'étude mentionnée par l'Honorable Parlementaire recommande que des efforts supplémentaires soient accomplis pour faire en sorte que les effets externes induits soient davantage pris en compte dans le coût d'utilisation des véhicules. Dans ce contexte, il convient de noter que les coûts mentionnés dans l'étude ne traduisent qu'indirectement les effets réels, auxquels il n'est possible de faire face qu'en calculant le coût d'utilisation des voitures et en établissant une réglementation à la source. La Commission est en train d'élaborer une nouvelle proposition de tarification routière juste et efficace, qui pourrait prévoir un nouveau cadre pour l'internalisation des coûts externes du transport routier au moyen de péages et de droits d'utilisation. Cependant, ces politiques de lutte contre les effets négatifs de l'utilisation des véhicules à moteur seraient moins efficaces sans obligations bien ciblées en matière d'homologation.

Par ailleurs, la Commission est pleinement consciente du fait que l'industrie automobile évolue dans un environnement commercial difficile en Europe et elle aide activement ce secteur à relever les défis auxquels il est confronté. Dans le plan d'action CARS 2020 ⁽¹⁾, la Commission a rappelé qu'elle s'était engagée en faveur d'une application globale et cohérente des principes de réglementation intelligente, ce qui suppose, dans le cadre de l'analyse d'impact, une analyse rigoureuse de la compétitivité des principales initiatives futures qui auront des répercussions sensibles sur l'industrie automobile.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2012) 636 du 8 novembre 2012.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003432/13
to the Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(26 March 2013)**

Subject: External costs of motor vehicles in the EU

According to a study carried out by the Department of Transport Science of the University of Dresden, Germany, cars used in the EU-27 cost other people, regions and generations roughly EUR 373 billion per year. Indeed, cars do not cover all of their external costs (negative externalities related to pollution, the emission of greenhouse gas, noise pollution, car accidents, etc.), and people other than users have to pay, or will one day have to pay, the bill.

It is completely understandable that, in view of these findings, the EU is putting in place measures to try to combat these external costs. This is the case, in particular, when the EU tries to promote the creation of new technologies that aim to reduce greenhouse gas emissions or when it encourages car manufacturers to produce cars that are more environmentally friendly. The same applies to measures regarding the noise level of vehicles when the EU undertakes to reduce the noise externalities of motor vehicles in order to protect public health and the environment.

Nevertheless, as additional measures to combat the external costs of the use of cars within the EU are brought in, new standards and measures are constantly imposed on car manufacturers. These companies cannot indefinitely raise the price of their products in order to internalise these external costs related to car use. This is an increasingly heavy burden for these companies to bear, especially at a time of economic crisis.

1. In order to reduce this administrative and financial burden on car manufacturers, would it not be wise for the Commission to put in place a common measure to internalise all external costs related to the use of cars, rather than to increase the number of separate measures?
2. Moreover, whereas the number of new car registrations is down 10.5% since 2012, how does the Commission intend to take into account externalities related to car use without penalising the automobile industry?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2013)**

The study mentioned by the Honourable Member recommends that additional efforts should be made to better factor externalities into the cost of driving. In this context, it is important to keep in mind that the cost figures presented in the study are proxies for real effects, which can be effectively addressed only through a combination of pricing the use of vehicles and regulation at source. The Commission is currently preparing a new proposal on fair and efficient road pricing, which might contain a new framework for the internalisation of external costs of road transport through tolls and user charges. However, such policies for combating the negative effects arising from motor vehicle use would be less effective without well-targeted type-approval requirements.

The Commission is also fully aware that the automotive industry is confronted with a difficult market environment in Europe and actively supports the sector in meeting the challenges it is facing. In the CARS 2020 Action Plan ⁽¹⁾ the Commission reiterated its commitment to applying the principles of smart regulation in a comprehensive and consistent manner. This includes, as part of the impact assessment, a rigorous competitiveness proofing of all major future initiatives with a significant impact on the automotive industry.

(1) COM(2012) 636 of 8 November 2012.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003433/13
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Raimon Obiols (S&D)
(26 de marzo de 2013)**

Asunto: VP/HR — Conflicto del Sahara Occidental

Christopher Ross, enviado especial del Secretario General de la ONU para el Sahara Occidental, se encuentra actualmente de misión por el Magreb con el objetivo de avanzar en la resolución del conflicto sahariano que dura desde hace 38 años.

A fecha de hoy, el conflicto existente en el Sahara Occidental adquiere una mayor gravedad debido a la inestabilidad en la región del Sahel y al riesgo real de propagación del terrorismo.

- ¿Tiene previsto la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante reunirse próximamente con el enviado especial de la ONU?
- ¿Está previsto realizar alguna iniciativa o declaración de apoyo al Sr. Ross, como han hecho los Estados Unidos o el Grupo de Amigos del Sahara Occidental en la ONU?
- ¿Está previsto tratar el conflicto sahariano con las autoridades marroquíes en el marco de las negociaciones con la UE con vistas a la eventual aprobación de un nuevo acuerdo comercial completo que el Presidente, Sr. Barroso, anunció durante su reciente visita a Rabat?

**Respuesta de la Alta Representante/Vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(6 de mayo de 2013)**

La UE sigue preocupada por las repercusiones del conflicto del Sahara Occidental para la seguridad y la cooperación en la región. La UE ha instado reiteradamente a todas las partes a que se abstengan de actos violentos y que respeten los derechos humanos.

La AR/VP reitera su pleno apoyo a los esfuerzos del Secretario General de las Naciones Unidas, elogia el trabajo de su Enviado Personal, el Embajador Christopher Ross, y alienta a las partes a trabajar en favor de una solución política justa, duradera y aceptable para las partes que contemple la autodeterminación de la población del Sáhara Occidental, de acuerdo con las Resoluciones del Consejo de Seguridad de las Naciones Unidas. No está previsto por el momento ningún encuentro con el Sr. Ross.

Las cuestiones relacionadas con el Sáhara Occidental se abordan regularmente en el marco del diálogo político UE-Marruecos en las reuniones de los organismos conjuntos establecidos en virtud del Acuerdo de Asociación.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003433/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

Raimon Obiols (S&D)

(26 March 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Conflict in Western Sahara

Christopher Ross, the UN Secretary-General's Personal Envoy for Western Sahara, is currently on mission in the Maghreb aiming to make progress towards resolving the Saharan conflict, which has been ongoing for 38 years.

The conflict in Western Sahara has now become a more serious matter due to the instability of the Sahel region and the real risk of the spread of terrorism.

— Does the Vice-President/High Representative intend to meet with the UN Special Envoy soon?

— Are there plans to present any initiatives or declarations of support for Mr Ross at the UN as the United States and the Group of Friends of Western Sahara have done?

— Are there plans to raise the issue of the Saharan conflict with the Moroccan authorities within the framework of the EU negotiations aimed at the possible approval of a new comprehensive trade agreement, announced by President Barroso during his recent visit to Rabat?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(6 May 2013)

The EU remains concerned about the implications of the Western Sahara conflict for the security and cooperation in the region. The EU has repeatedly called on all parties to refrain from violence and to respect human rights.

The HR/VP reaffirms her full support for the UN Secretary-General's efforts, commends the work of his Personal Envoy Ambassador Christopher Ross and encourages the parties to work towards achieving a just, lasting and mutually acceptable political solution, which will provide for the self-determination of the people of Western Sahara, in agreement with relevant UN Security Council resolutions. No meeting with Mr Ross is scheduled for the moment.

Western Sahara related issues are regularly discussed in the framework of EU-Morocco political dialogue, at meetings of the joint bodies established under the Association Agreement.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003434/13
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(26 de marzo de 2013)**

Asunto: VP/HR — Negociaciones UE-Mercosur

Varios medios de comunicación han recogido las declaraciones del embajador de Alemania en Paraguay, Claude Robert Ellner, en las que se refería a la postura de la Unión Europea ante la exclusión de Paraguay de Mercosur tras el golpe de Estado parlamentario que provocó la deposición del Presidente Fernando Lugo. El señor embajador afirmó que «no vamos a trabajar con la exclusión de Paraguay» ⁽¹⁾.

Los Estados firmantes de Mercosur, conjuntamente con la República de Bolivia y la República de Chile, suscribieron en 1998 el denominado Protocolo de Ushuaia. Dicho protocolo establecía un compromiso democrático en la región, y recogía en su artículo 5 la posibilidad de hacer efectiva «la suspensión del derecho a participar en los distintos órganos de los respectivos procesos de integración, hasta la suspensión de los derechos y obligaciones emergentes de estos procesos». El artículo 6, además, recoge que dicha decisión debe ser tomada por consenso entre los Estados no afectados por un supuesto caso de ruptura democrática ⁽²⁾.

— ¿Considera la Alta Representante que la UE debe inmiscuirse en los protocolos de relación interna que regulan Mercosur?

— Dada la importancia de conseguir un acuerdo justo y favorable para las dos partes, ¿entiende la Alta Representante que deben continuar las negociaciones con los Estados que forman parte actualmente del Mercosur?

— ¿Entiende la Alta Representante que debe ser el embajador de un Estado miembro quien comunique la postura de la Unión Europea ante una cuestión tan relevante?

**Respuesta de la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(28 de mayo de 2013)**

— La AR/VP emitió una declaración inmediatamente después de los acontecimientos ocurridos el 22 de junio en Paraguay, en la que señalaba que la UE no interferiría en las actividades de la organización regional de la que Paraguay forma parte, sino que se dedicaría más bien a observar y analizar sus reacciones.

La AR/VP se abstuvo de opinar o hacer cualquier declaración pública sobre la idoneidad de las decisiones tomadas por el Mercosur y la Unasur.

— En lo referente a las negociaciones con el Mercosur, cabe señalar que la UE negocia con esta organización regional en bloque y no de forma individual con cada uno de sus miembros, y que la estructura y el funcionamiento de la misma constituyen asuntos internos del Mercosur.

— Las declaraciones atribuidas al Embajador de Alemania han sido sacadas de contexto por la prensa local, y el Embajador, como representante local de la Presidencia de la UE, defiende la línea seguida por la UE que ha sido aquí expuesta.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.abc.com.py/edicion-impresa/politica/la-ue-no-negociara-con-mercosur-si-paraguay-no-integra-la-mesa-542123.html>

⁽²⁾ Protocolo de Ushuaia: <http://www.amersur.org.ar/Integ/ProtocoloUshuaia.htm>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003434/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)

(26 March 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — EU-Mercosur negotiations

Various media sources have published the statements by the German ambassador to Paraguay, Claude Robert Ellner, in which he referred to the European Union's position with regard to Paraguay's exclusion from Mercosur as a result of the parliamentary *coup d'état* which led to deposition of President Fernando Lugo. The ambassador stated that 'we are not going to work with the exclusion of Paraguay' ⁽¹⁾.

The signatory countries of Mercosur, together with the Republic of Bolivia and the Republic of Chile, signed the so-called Ushuaia Protocol in 1998. This Protocol established a democratic commitment in the region and in its Article 5 it provided for the possibility of implementing 'the suspension of the right to participate in various bodies of the respective integration processes, including the suspension of the rights and obligations deriving from those processes'. Furthermore, Article 6 states that such a decision should be taken by consensus amongst the countries not affected by any alleged breach of democracy ⁽²⁾.

— Does the High Representative believe that the EU should interfere in the internal protocols governing Mercosur?

— Given the importance of reaching a fair agreement which is favourable to both parties, does the High Representative feel that negotiations must continue with the States that currently form part of Mercosur?

— Does the High Representative feel it is appropriate for the ambassador of a Member State to communicate the European Union's position on such an important issue?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(28 May 2013)

— The HR/VP issued a statement in the immediate aftermath of the 22 June events in Paraguay indicating that the EU will not interfere with the activities of the regional organisation of which Paraguay is a member, but will rather observe and analyse their reactions.

The HR/VP refrained from issuing any public statement or judgment on the appropriateness of the decisions taken from Mercosur and UNASUR.

— As for the negotiations with Mercosur; the EU negotiates with the regional organisation as a bloc and not with its individual members. Its structure and operation is an internal matter to Mercosur.

— The quote attributed to the German Ambassador was taken out of context by the local press. Representing the EU local Presidency, the Ambassador defends the EU line as given above.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.abc.com.py/edicion-impres/politica/la-ue-no-negociara-con-mercosur-si-paraguay-no-integra-la-mesa-542123.html>

⁽²⁾ Ushuaia Protocol: <http://www.amersur.org.ar/Integ/ProtocoloUshuaia.htm>

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003435/13
an die Kommission
Jutta Steinruck (S&D)
(26. März 2013)

Betrifft: Dreiecksbesteuerung

Mir wurde berichtet, dass im Online-Handel beim sogenannten Dropshipping zwischen mehreren Mitgliedstaaten erheblicher Aufwand betrieben werden muss, um das Geschäft regelkonform zu versteuern. Im konkreten Fall geht es um die Lieferung eines Online-Händlers mit Firmensitz in Deutschland. Er beauftragt nach Bestellung einen Großhändler, die Ware nach Österreich auszuliefern. Nun muss er folgendes Prozedere bei der Rechnungsstellung einhalten: Er berechnet das Geschäft mit seiner österreichischen Umsatzsteuer-ID und versteuert es in Österreich. Der Kunde bekommt eine Rechnung mit österreichischer Mehrwertsteuer. Gleichzeitig muss nun der in Deutschland sitzende Großhändler eine Rechnung ohne Mehrwertsteuer ausstellen, da das Geschäft in Österreich stattgefunden hat.

1. Stimmt es, dass Unternehmen bei Geschäften wie dem oben genannten tatsächlich so ein Verfahren der Abwicklung einhalten müssen?
2. Steht das nicht dem Grundsatz des Binnenmarktes entgegen, wonach Geschäfte auch über die Grenzen der Mitgliedstaaten hinweg ohne Hürden ablaufen sollten?
3. Sieht die Kommission hier die Notwendigkeit einer Vereinfachung und wann ist diese geplant?

Antwort von Herrn Šemeta im Namen der Kommission
(8. Mai 2013)

Die Kommission kann bestätigen, dass die Vereinfachung der für Dreiecksgeschäfte eingeführten Maßnahmen ⁽¹⁾ nicht gilt, wenn ein in Deutschland und in Österreich für Mehrwertsteuerzwecke erfasster Online-Händler im Rahmen des Dropshipping über einen in Deutschland ansässigen Großhändler Waren an einen Kunden in Österreich liefert; in diesem Fall erfolgt die steuerliche Behandlung gemäß den derzeitigen Übergangsvorschriften für die Besteuerung von EU-internen Umsätzen in der von der Frau Abgeordneten dargestellten Weise.

Diese Vorschriften, mit denen eine Besteuerung am Bestimmungsort sichergestellt werden soll, werden angesichts ihrer Komplexität von vielen als eines der wichtigsten Hindernisse für einen effizienten EU-internen Handel angesehen. Das bedeutet allerdings nicht, dass sie den Grundsätzen des Binnenmarktes entgegenstehen.

Die Notwendigkeit einer Vereinfachung wird allgemein anerkannt. Als Antwort auf diese Notwendigkeit hat die Kommission einen Aktionsplan für ein einfacheres, robusteres und effizienteres MwSt.-System, das auf den Binnenmarkt zugeschnitten ist, angenommen. Einzelheiten zu den geplanten Maßnahmen sowie der voraussichtliche Zeitplan sind der Mitteilung der Kommission zur Zukunft der Mehrwertsteuer ⁽²⁾ zu entnehmen.

⁽¹⁾ Artikel 42 in Verbindung mit Artikel 141 der MwSt.-Richtlinie (Richtlinie 2006/112/EG des Rates vom 28. November 2006 über das gemeinsame Mehrwertsteuersystem.

⁽²⁾ Mitteilung der Kommission an das Europäische Parlament, den Rat und den Europäischen Wirtschafts- und Sozialausschuss zur Zukunft der Mehrwertsteuer (KOM(2011)851).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003435/13
to the Commission**

Jutta Steinruck (S&D)

(26 March 2013)

Subject: Triangular taxation

I have been informed that, in online trading in connection with drop shipping between several Member States, a considerable amount of effort has to be made to tax the business in accordance with the rules. This particular case relates to supply from an online trader with a registered office in Germany. After engaging the services of a wholesaler, he asks for the goods to be delivered to Austria. He must now adhere to the following procedure for invoicing: he draws up an invoice for the transaction using his Austrian VAT number and subjects it to tax in Austria. The customer receives an invoice that includes Austrian VAT. At the same time, the wholesaler based in Germany has to draw up an invoice without VAT, as the transaction took place in Austria.

1. Is it true that, in the case of transactions like the one described above, companies really have to follow this sort of procedure for settlement?
2. Does that not run counter to the principle of the internal market, according to which there should be no barriers to transactions taking place across the borders of the Member States?
3. Does the Commission see the need for simplification here and when is this planned?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission

(8 May 2013)

The Commission can confirm that, as the simplification measures put in place for triangular transactions ⁽¹⁾ are not applicable in the case where an online trader registered for VAT purposes in Germany as well as in Austria drop ships goods supplied to a customer in Austria via a wholesaler based in Germany, the tax treatment will, under the current transitional arrangements for taxing intra-EU transactions, be as described by the Honourable member.

Those arrangements designed to ensure taxation at destination are, due to their complexity, seen by many as one of the main obstacles to efficient intra-EU trade. That does not, however, signify that they run counter to the principles of the internal market.

The need for simplification is widely recognised. Responding to that need, the Commission has adopted an action plan for a simpler, more robust and efficient VAT system tailored to the single market. Details on the actions planned and the timing envisaged are set out in its communication on the future of VAT ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Article 42 read in conjunction with Article 141 of the VAT Directive (Council Directive 2006/112/EC of 28 November 2006 on the common system of value added tax.

⁽²⁾ Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council and the European Economic and Social Committee on the future of VAT (COM(2011) 851).

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003436/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(26 Μαρτίου 2013)

Θέμα: Κατασκευή πυρηνικού σταθμού στο Ακουγιού της Τουρκίας

Σε απάντηση προηγούμενης ερώτησής μου (P-002935/2011) σχετικά με τον κίνδυνο που συνεπάγεται για τους ευρωπαίους πολίτες η απόφαση των τουρκικών αρχών για την κατασκευή πυρηνικού σταθμού σε περιοχή γνωστής σεισμογένειας, στο Ακουγιού, η Επιτροπή είχε υπογραμμίσει την ανησυχία της για το γεγονός.

Επιπλέον, η Επιτροπή είχε δηλώσει ότι θα καλέσει την Τουρκία να υιοθετήσει νομοθεσία που να εξασφαλίζει υψηλό επίπεδο πυρηνικής ασφάλειας με βάση τα πρότυπα της ΕΕ, να προσχωρήσει στην κοινή σύμβαση για την ασφάλεια διαχείρισης αναλωμένου καυσίμου και την ασφάλεια διαχείρισης ραδιενεργών αποβλήτων και να ευθυγραμμίσει τη νομοθεσία της με το σύνολο του κοινοτικού κεκτημένου για την πυρηνική ασφάλεια, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της οδηγίας για την πυρηνική ασφάλεια. Επιπλέον, είχε επισημάνει ότι θα περίμενε η Τουρκία να προχωρήσει σε εκτίμηση περιβαλλοντικών επιπτώσεων (ΕΠΕ) του προγραμματισμένου πυρηνικού σταθμού και ότι «θα παρακολουθήσει το θέμα εκ του σύνεγγυς».

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

- η Τουρκία ακολούθησε τις παραπάνω παροτρύνσεις της και κατά πόσο έχει προχωρήσει σε εκτίμηση περιβαλλοντικών επιπτώσεων (ΕΠΕ);

Εάν ναι, είναι ενήμερη για τα συμπεράσματα της ΕΠΕ;

Τέλος, στο πλαίσιο της νέας οδηγίας για την υπεύθυνη και ασφαλή διαχείριση αναλωμένων καυσίμων και ραδιενεργών αποβλήτων, το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο υπογράμμισε τη ρητή ανησυχία του ειδικά για την κατασκευή πυρηνικού σταθμού στο Ακουγιού και κάλεσε την Επιτροπή να λάβει όλα τα απαραίτητα μέτρα για την αποτροπή απόδοσης ραδιενεργών αποβλήτων σε τέτοιες περιοχές υψηλής σεισμικότητας (<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//NONSGML+TA+P7-TA-2011-0295+0+DOC+PDF+V0//EN>).

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

- ποια μέτρα έχει λάβει σε συνέχεια της απόφασης αυτής;

Απάντηση του κ. Oettinger εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(23 Μαΐου 2013)

1. Σύμφωνα με την Αντιπροσωπεία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης στην Άγκυρα, η εκτίμηση των περιβαλλοντικών επιπτώσεων του προγραμματισμένου πυρηνικού σταθμού στο Ακουγιού υποβλήθηκε στο Υπουργείο Περιβάλλοντος και Χωροταξίας της Τουρκίας το 2011. Ωστόσο, η διαδικασία δεν έχει ακόμα ολοκληρωθεί.

2. Η Επιτροπή ανέκαθεν ενθάρρυνε την Τουρκία να προσχωρήσει στην κοινή σύμβαση για την ασφάλεια διαχείρισης αναλωμένου καυσίμου και την ασφάλεια διαχείρισης ραδιενεργών αποβλήτων⁽¹⁾. Επιπλέον, η Επιτροπή έχει επισημάνει ότι η Τουρκία, ως υποψήφια προς ένταξη χώρα, αναμένεται να ευθυγραμμίσει σταδιακά τη νομοθεσία της με το σύνολο του κοινοτικού κεκτημένου, το οποίο περιλαμβάνει την οδηγία για την υπεύθυνη και ασφαλή διαχείριση αναλωμένων καυσίμων και ραδιενεργών αποβλήτων⁽²⁾. Σύμφωνα με την οδηγία, το κράτος έχει την τελική ευθύνη για την εν λόγω διαχείριση και καλείται να θεσπίσει σε εθνικό επίπεδο πολιτική, πλαίσιο και πρόγραμμα για τη διαχείριση των αναλωμένων καυσίμων και των ραδιενεργών αποβλήτων, από την παραγωγή έως τη διάθεσή τους. Η οδηγία απαιτεί επίσης η ασφάλεια κάθε εγκατάστασης ή δραστηριότητας να αξιολογείται, να επαληθεύεται και να βελτιώνεται σε τακτά χρονικά διαστήματα με συστηματικό και ελεγχόμενο τρόπο, υπό την εποπτεία της αρμόδιας για την ασφάλεια αρχής⁽³⁾.

Η Επιτροπή θα ήθελε επίσης να παραπέμψει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου στις απαντήσεις της στις γραπτές ερωτήσεις P-002852/2011, P-008971/2012, E-005692/2012 και E-006346/2012.

⁽¹⁾ Η σύμβαση παρέχει πλαίσιο για την αντιμετώπιση ανάλογης διαχείρισης και ένα φόρουμ για την ανταλλαγή σχετικών εμπειριών με άλλα συμβαλλόμενα μέρη.

⁽²⁾ Οδηγία 2011/70/Ευρατόμ του Συμβουλίου, της 19ης Ιουλίου 2011, η οποία θεσπίζει κοινοτικό πλαίσιο για την υπεύθυνη και ασφαλή διαχείριση των αναλωμένων καυσίμων και των ραδιενεργών αποβλήτων, ΕΕ L 199 της 2.8.2011, σ. 48.

⁽³⁾ Επιπλέον, η διαδικασία χορήγησης της άδειας θα συμβάλει στην ασφάλεια της εγκατάστασης ή της δραστηριότητας υπό κανονικές συνθήκες λειτουργίας, κατά τη διάρκεια των αναμενόμενων επιχειρησιακών περιστατικών και σε περίπτωση ατυχημάτων λόγω σχεδιασμού. Τέλος, οι διεθνείς αξιολογήσεις από ομότιμους πρέπει να κληθούν να διασφαλίσουν την εφαρμογή των υψηλότερων δυνατών προτύπων ασφαλείας.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003436/13
to the Commission
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(26 March 2013)**

Subject: New nuclear power plant in Akkuyu (Turkey)

In its reply to my previous question (P-002935/2011), the Commission underlined its concerns about the risk to European citizens posed by the decision of the Turkish authorities to construct a nuclear power plant in the seismic area of Akkuyu.

Furthermore, the Commission stated that it would call on Turkey to pass legislation that guaranteed a high level of nuclear safety based on EU standards, accede to the Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management and bring its legislation into line with all EU *acquis* on nuclear safety, including the Nuclear Safety Directive. It also pointed out that it expected Turkey to carry out an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of the planned nuclear power plant and that 'it would monitor the matter closely'.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

- Has Turkey taken the action called for and has it carried out an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)?

If so, has it been advised of the outcome of the EIA?

Finally, the European Parliament underlined its specific concerns, especially regarding the construction of a nuclear power plant in Akkuyu, within the framework of the new Directive on responsible and safe spent fuel and nuclear waste management and called on the Commission to take all measures needed to prevent radioactive waste from being stored in areas at high seismic risk (<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//NONSGML+TA+P7-TA-2011-0295+0+DOC+PDF+V0//EN>).

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

- What measures has it taken in the wake of that decision?

**Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(23 May 2013)**

1. According to the Delegation of the European Union in Ankara, the Environmental Impact Assessment for the planned nuclear power plant in Akkuyu was submitted to the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization of Turkey in 2011. The process has however not been finalised yet.

2. The Commission has long been encouraging Turkey to accede to the Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management ⁽¹⁾. Moreover, the Commission has pointed out that Turkey, as a candidate country, is expected to progressively align its national legislation with the EU *acquis*, which includes the directive on the responsible and safe management of spent fuel and radioactive waste ⁽²⁾. According to the directive, the State has ultimate responsibility for this management and shall establish a relevant national policy, framework and programme for managing spent fuel and radioactive waste, from generation to disposal. The directive also requires that the safety of any facility or activity is regularly assessed, verified and improved in a systematic and verifiable manner, under the supervision of the competent safety authority ⁽³⁾.

The Commission would also like to cross refer the Honorable Member to its replies to written questions P-002852/2011, P-008971/2012, E-005692/2012 and E-006346/2012.

⁽¹⁾ The Convention provides a framework addressing such management and a forum to share relevant experience with other Contracting Parties.

⁽²⁾ Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom of 19 July 2011 establishing a Community framework for the responsible and safe management of spent fuel and radioactive waste, OJ L 199, 2.8.2011, p. 48.

⁽³⁾ In addition, the licensing process shall contribute to safety in the facility or activity during normal operating conditions, anticipated operational occurrences and design basis accidents. Finally, international peer reviews have to be invited to ensure the application of the highest safety standards.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003437/13
aan de Commissie
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(26 maart 2013)

Betreft: Kwaliteitsnormen van materialen gebruikt voor 3D-printen

3D-printen in de economie heeft op korte tijd sterk aan belang gewonnen. Het aantal toepassingen neemt snel toe en stilaan bereikt deze technologie ook de Europese huiskamers. Bedrijven kunnen al allerlei gebruiksvoorwerpen printen in verschillende materialen waaronder plastic, metaal en cement. Bij de gewone consument beperkt printen zich vandaag tot voorwerpen in kunststof. In principe kan elk denkbaar voorwerp dat printbaar is afgedrukt worden in eender welk materiaal. De vraag rijst echter of elk materiaal wel geschikt is voor eender welk voorwerp. De speelgoedindustrie bijvoorbeeld maakt steeds vaker gebruik van deze nieuwe techniek. De vraag kan gesteld worden of er geen nieuwe risico's betreffende de kwaliteit van geprinte voorwerpen ontstaan.

1. Bestaan er Europese of nationale kwaliteitsnormen betreffende de materialen gebruikt voor 3D-printen? En zo niet, heeft de Commissie plannen zulke Europese kwaliteitsnormen in te voeren?
2. Zijn er specifieke controlemechanismen om de kwaliteit van 3D-geprinte voorwerpen te kunnen garanderen?
3. In hoeverre gaan de bestaande Europese kwaliteitsnormen op voor materialen die gebruikt worden voor 3D-printen?
4. Is er een dialoog met de belangrijkste stakeholders over dergelijke kwaliteitsnormen? Zo nee, bereidt de Commissie zich voor om deze te initiëren?

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003438/13
aan de Commissie
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(26 maart 2013)

Betreft: Invoer van Amerikaanse 3D-printers op de Europese markt

De afgelopen jaren is het aanbod van commerciële 3D-printers voor thuisgebruik erg gestegen. Er is echter een grote variatie in toestellen. De meeste van deze toestellen of bouwpakketten voor 3D-printers worden vandaag ingevoerd vanuit de Verenigde Staten.

1. Bestaan er kwaliteitslabels of certificaten die minimumstandaarden garanderen aan de Europese consument bij de aanschaf van een commerciële 3D-printer voor thuisgebruik? En indien niet, welke plannen maakt de Commissie om zulke kwaliteitslabels of certificaten in te voeren?
2. Bestaan er Europese minimumstandaarden inzake commerciële 3D-printers voor thuisgebruik?
3. Welke plannen heeft de Commissie voor dergelijke Europese minimumstandaarden inzake commerciële 3D-printers voor thuisgebruik?
4. Is er een dialoog met de belangrijkste stakeholders betreffende minimumstandaarden met betrekking tot 3D-printers voor thuisgebruik?
5. In welke mate is er certificering van en controle op de invoer van 3D-printers vanuit bijvoorbeeld de Verenigde Staten naar de EU? Kan er gegarandeerd worden dat 3D-printers die een particulier bijvoorbeeld via een internetwinkel in de VS aankoopt, gecertificeerd zijn voor gebruik in de EU?

Antwoord van de heer Tajani namens de Commissie
(30 mei 2013)

De Commissie volgt de ontwikkeling van de voor 3D-printen gebruikte technologie op de voet en voert nauw overleg met de belanghebbenden over deze kwestie. Het onderwerp is ook behandeld in de openbare raadpleging over de herziening van de internemarktwetgeving voor industrieproducten, die op 17 april 2013 is afgesloten.

Met betrekking tot de voor 3D-printen gebruikte materialen en de door middel van 3D-printen vervaardigde producten dient elk product dat onder de harmonisatiewetgeving van de EU valt, te voldoen aan de Europese veiligheidsregelgeving. Daarnaast moet elk consumentenproduct dat onder de richtlijn inzake algemene productveiligheid ⁽¹⁾ valt, veilig zijn wanneer het op de markt wordt gebracht. De risico's die ontstaan bij chemische stoffen en mengsels worden behandeld in de REACH-verordening ⁽²⁾.

De veiligheid van 3D-printers is geregeld in de machinerichtlijn ⁽³⁾, waarin essentiële eisen zijn opgenomen en de conformiteit met die eisen kan worden verkregen door de toepassing van de Europese geharmoniseerde normen of andere technische normen, mits deze dezelfde mate van veiligheid bieden. De eisen zijn zowel op in de EU geproduceerde als op ingevoerde producten van toepassing. De richtlijn verplicht fabrikanten producten die voldoen aan de eisen, d.w.z. veilige producten, in de handel te brengen en de noodzakelijke aanwijzingen te verstrekken om een veilig gebruik van deze producten te waarborgen. Bovendien is de fabrikant, of deze nu in de EU of in een derde land is gevestigd, verplicht:

- de technische documentatie te leveren;
- de CE-markering aan te brengen;
- de verklaring van overeenstemming af te geven en te ondertekenen.

De markttoezichtautoriteiten van de lidstaten houden toezicht op de naleving van de EU-voorschriften voor een product, ongeacht de oorsprong van de producten.

De machinerichtlijn omvat veiligheidskwesties, maar bevat geen bepalingen omtrent kwaliteit; dit is een aspect dat beter kan worden gereguleerd door middel van vraag en aanbod van deze producten.

⁽¹⁾ 2001/95/EG.

⁽²⁾ EG/1907/2006.

⁽³⁾ 2006/42/EG.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003437/13
to the Commission
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(26 March 2013)**

Subject: Quality standards for materials used in 3D printing

3D printing for business purposes has gained greatly in importance over a short space of time. The number of applications is increasing rapidly and this technology will also gradually reach European homes. Companies are already able to print all kinds of objects in various materials, including plastic, metal and cement. For the ordinary consumer, printing is currently limited to objects in plastic. In principle, every conceivable object that is printable can be printed in any material. However, the question arises as to whether any material is suitable for any object. The toy industry, for example, is increasingly using this new technology. The question may, therefore, be asked whether any new risks might be associated with the quality of printed objects.

1. Are there any European or national quality standards for the materials used in 3D printing? If not, does the Commission plan to introduce such European quality standards?
2. Are there any specific control mechanisms by which the quality of 3D-printed objects can be guaranteed?
3. To what extent are the existing European quality standards sufficient for materials that are used in 3D printing?
4. Is there a dialogue with key stakeholders on such quality standards? If not, is the Commission preparing to introduce one?

**Question for written answer E-003438/13
to the Commission
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(26 March 2013)**

Subject: Importation of US 3D printers into the European market

In recent years, the availability of commercial 3D printers for home use has greatly increased. However, there is a great deal of variation between these devices. Most of these devices or assembly kits for 3D printers are currently imported from the United States.

1. Are there quality labels or certificates that guarantee minimum standards to European consumers purchasing a commercial 3D printer for home use? If not, what plans does the Commission have in terms of introducing such quality labels or certificates?
2. Are there minimum European standards on commercial 3D printers for home use?
3. What plans does the Commission have for such European minimum standards on commercial 3D printers for home use?
4. Is there a dialogue with key stakeholders on minimum standards relating to 3D printers for home use?
5. To what extent is there certification and monitoring of the importation of 3D printers from the United States, for example, into the EU? Can it be guaranteed that 3D printers which a private individual purchases, for example through an online shop in the US, will be certified for use in the EU?

**Joint answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2013)**

The Commission is closely following the development of 3D printing technology and is in close dialogue with stakeholders on the issue. The topic has also been addressed in the public consultation on the 'Review of the internal market legislation for industrial products' that closed on 17 April 2013.

Concerning the materials used for 3D printing and products manufactured by 3D printing, any product falling under EU harmonisation legislation, must comply with European safety rules. In addition, any consumer product falling under the General Product Safety Directive ⁽¹⁾ must be safe when placed on the market. The risks arising from chemical substances and mixtures are tackled by the REACH Regulation ⁽²⁾.

The safety of 3D printers is governed by the Machinery Directive ⁽³⁾ which sets essential requirements and conformity that can be established either by applying the European harmonised standards or another engineering standardisation practice provided that the latter guarantees the same level of safety. The requirements apply to products produced in the EU as well as to imports. This directive requires producers to place compliant, hence safe products on the market and provide necessary information to ensure the safe use of these products. Moreover, the manufacturer, whether established in the EU or a third country, is obliged to:

- provide the technical documentation;
- affix the CE marking (conformity label);
- issue and sign the declaration of conformity.

Product compliance with EU rules is monitored by Member States' market surveillance authorities, irrespective of the origin of the products.

The Machinery Directive covers safety issues but not quality, an aspect that is better managed by the offer and the demand of these products.

⁽¹⁾ 2001/95/EC.
⁽²⁾ EC/1907/2006.
⁽³⁾ 2006/42/EC.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003439/13
alla Commissione
Mario Borghesio (EFD)
(26 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: La Commissione intervenga sulla mancanza di sangue in Grecia

La Grecia è in debito con la Svizzera per 4 milioni di euro relativi a spese dovute all'organizzazione, al confezionamento e al trasporto di plasma (il plasma è gratuito poiché viene fornito da donatori). Il servizio svizzero per le trasfusioni dimezzerà la fornitura di plasma fra il 2015 e il 2020 per un nuovo contratto stipulato con Atene al fine di incentivare la raccolta direttamente in Grecia dove, si ricorda, circa 3000 persone soffrono di talassemia, ovvero di anemia mediterranea, e hanno bisogno di regolari trasfusioni.

Quali azioni di coordinamento per la sicurezza della raccolta di sangue intende intraprendere la Commissione?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(16 maggio 2013)

Norme di qualità e sicurezza del sangue umano e dei suoi componenti sono stabilite nella direttiva 2002/98/CE ⁽¹⁾ del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio e nella legislazione di attuazione di tale direttiva. Tali documenti specificano i requisiti minimi europei per la raccolta, il controllo, la lavorazione, la conservazione e la distribuzione del sangue umano e dei suoi componenti. Gli Stati membri inoltre possono applicare misure di protezione più rigorose in proposito.

Spetta alle autorità nazionali competenti, ivi compreso il Greek National Blood Centre, garantire che negli Stati membri si rispettino le norme di qualità e sicurezza di cui alla direttiva 2002/98/CE.

La Commissione intende garantire la qualità e la sicurezza del sangue e dei suoi componenti mediante la normativa UE sopra menzionata e i progetti finanziati nell'ambito del programma in materia di salute dell'Unione ⁽²⁾. Grazie a tali progetti sono migliorate le pratiche per la gestione dei donatori (DOMAINE ⁽³⁾) e le modalità di impiego dei componenti del sangue (EUOBUP ⁽⁴⁾) e le autorità hanno ricevuto assistenza per garantire la sicurezza e la qualità dei componenti del sangue (EuBIS e CATIE ⁽⁵⁾).

⁽¹⁾ Direttiva 2002/98/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 27 gennaio 2003, che stabilisce norme di qualità e di sicurezza per la raccolta, il controllo, la lavorazione, la conservazione e la distribuzione del sangue umano e dei suoi componenti e che modifica la direttiva 2001/83/CE.

⁽²⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/index.html>

⁽³⁾ <http://www.domaine-europe.eu/Home/tabid/36/Default.aspx>

⁽⁴⁾ <http://www.optimalblooduse.eu/>

⁽⁵⁾ <http://www.eubis-europe.eu/> e <http://www.catie-europe.eu/>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003439/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(26 March 2013)**

Subject: Request for the Commission to take action over the lack of blood in Greece

Greece owes Switzerland EUR 4 million for the costs of organising, packaging and transporting plasma (the plasma itself is free because it is supplied by donors). The Swiss transfusion service will halve its supply of plasma between 2015 and 2020 in accordance with a new contract concluded with Athens which encourages the direct collection of plasma in Greece where, it should be noted, some 3 000 people suffer from thalassaemia, or Mediterranean anaemia, and need regular transfusions.

What coordination measures does the Commission intend to take to ensure that blood is collected safely?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(16 May 2013)**

Standards of safety and quality of blood and blood components are laid down in Directive 2002/98/EC ⁽¹⁾ of the European Parliament and of the Council, and in its implementing legislation. Together these set out the European minimum requirements for the collection, testing, processing, storage and distribution of blood and blood components. In addition, Member States can apply more stringent protective measures.

National competent authorities for blood and blood components, such as the Greek National Blood Center, are responsible for ensuring that the quality and safety standards stipulated in Directive 2002/98/EC are upheld in the Member States.

In addition, the Commission seeks to ensure the quality and safety of blood and blood components through the implementation of the EU legislation in the field, and through projects funded under the Health Programme ⁽²⁾. These projects have worked to improve donor management practices (DOMAINE ⁽³⁾), improve how blood components are used (EUOBUP ⁽⁴⁾), and assist authorities in ensuring the safety and quality of blood components (EuBIS, CATIE ⁽⁵⁾).

⁽¹⁾ Directive 2002/98/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 January 2003 setting standards of quality and safety for the collection, testing, processing, storage and distribution of human blood and blood components and amending Directive 2001/83/EC.

⁽²⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/index.html>

⁽³⁾ <http://www.domaine-europe.eu/Home/tabid/36/Default.aspx>

⁽⁴⁾ <http://www.optimalblooduse.eu/>

⁽⁵⁾ <http://www.eubis-europe.eu/>, <http://www.catie-europe.eu/>

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003440/13
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(26 marzo 2013)**

Oggetto: La Commissione vigili sulla tossicità delle pellicce

In Italia, su segnalazione della Lega Anti Vivisezione, è stata aperta un'indagine su capi in pelliccia destinati al mercato infantile che sono risultati contenere sostanze tossiche. Sono infatti stati rinvenuti residui della lavorazione delle pellicce quali formaldeide, dal potere cancerogeno, e nonilfenolo etossilato, un disturbatore endocrino che rende la commercializzazione dei capi vietata per legge. I capi d'abbigliamento sono stati posti sotto sequestro e il Ministero della salute ha intrapreso una campagna di campionamenti per verificare la salubrità dei capi.

La Commissione sta vigilando sulla situazione in Italia?

Le risulta che in altri paesi UE si siano verificati episodi analoghi?

Effettua controlli sanitari sulle pellicce in ingresso da paesi extra UE per verificare la presenza di sostanze tossiche?

**Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(15 maggio 2013)**

L'indagine svolta dal Ministero italiano della salute sui capi di pelliccia confezionati con sostanze chimiche tossiche cui l'onorevole Parlamentare fa riferimento non è ancora stata segnalata alla Commissione. Qualora le autorità italiane dovessero adottare provvedimenti in merito ai suddetti capi di pelliccia tali provvedimenti, inclusi i dettagli relativi ai prodotti in questione, andranno notificati al RAPEX, sistema rapido di allerta dell'UE per i prodotti di consumo non alimentari pericolosi ⁽¹⁾. Il RAPEX procederà quindi a informare tutti gli Stati membri nonché Islanda, Liechtenstein e Norvegia (paesi SEE-EFTA) in merito a tali provvedimenti, così che possano verificare l'eventuale presenza sul loro territorio dei prodotti in esame e prendere i provvedimenti del caso.

La Commissione non è a conoscenza di episodi analoghi all'interno di altri Stati membri.

I controlli di frontiera e la vigilanza del mercato sono di competenza degli Stati membri. Le autorità nazionali hanno facoltà di prendere tutti i provvedimenti preventivi o restrittivi ritenuti opportuni. La Commissione, in particolare tramite il RAPEX, promuove la cooperazione tra autorità nazionali competenti per le questioni doganali e di vigilanza del mercato, cosicché i provvedimenti adottati contro prodotti pericolosi possano essere presi in modo sempre più diretto alle frontiere esterne dell'UE.

(1) http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/safety/rapex/index_en.htm

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003440/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(26 March 2013)**

Subject: Request for the Commission to monitor the toxicity of furs

In Italy, following a report by the Anti-Vivisection League, an investigation was launched into fur garments designed for children which were revealed to contain toxic substances. In fact, residues from the processing of fur have been found, including formaldehyde, a carcinogen, and nonoxynol, an endocrine disruptor which makes the sale of these garments prohibited by law. The items of clothing were seized and the Ministry of Health has launched a sampling campaign to check whether the garments are harmful to health.

Is the Commission monitoring the situation in Italy?

Have similar incidents been recorded in other EU countries?

Does it carry out health checks on furs coming from countries outside the EU to check for the presence of toxic substances?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(15 May 2013)**

The investigation of the Italian Health Ministry on fur garments with toxic chemicals referred to by the Honourable Member has not yet been reported to the Commission. Should the Italian authorities take measures on those fur garments, these measures, including details on the products concerned, will have to be notified to the EU's RAPEX rapid alert system for dangerous non-food consumer products ⁽¹⁾. RAPEX will then inform all Member States and the EEA-EFTA countries Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway, about those measures, so that they can check for the presence of those products on their territories and take the appropriate measures.

The Commission has no information on similar incidents in other Member States.

The competence for border controls and market surveillance is with the Member States. National authorities have the competence to take appropriate preventive or restrictive measures. The Commission is promoting, in particular through RAPEX, the cooperation between national customs and market surveillance authorities, so that measures against dangerous products can increasingly be taken already at the EU's external borders.

(1) http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/safety/rapex/index_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003441/13
alla Commissione
Mario Borghesio (EFD)
(26 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: L'UE intervenga in difesa dei consumatori

Uno studio realizzato in Germania e pubblicato dalla «Sueddeutsche Zeitung» rivela che molti apparecchi elettrici di uso domestico sarebbero programmati dai costruttori per rompersi una volta scaduto il periodo di garanzia.

L'usura pianificata è un fenomeno di massa che interessa principalmente varie stampanti a getto di inchiostro, nelle quali dopo la stampa di alcune migliaia di pagine appare l'indicazione della necessità di una riparazione, anche se l'apparecchio potrebbe continuare a stampare tranquillamente; la risuolatura delle scarpe, per le quali vengono invece usate spesso soles incollate che si consumano rapidamente, impossibile poi staccarle per sostituirle. E ancora, in molte chiusure lampo di giacconi, i denti sono costruiti a spirale; lavatrici nelle quali le barre di riscaldamento si arrugginiscono con troppa facilità, con il risultato che la loro sostituzione risulta carissima per l'utente dell'elettrodomestico.

Il fenomeno di usura precoce degli apparecchi viene definito nello studio «opalescenza pianificata», poiché i produttori inserirebbero appositamente punti deboli o utilizzerebbero materiali scadenti destinati ad usurarsi rapidamente.

La Commissione non ritiene necessarie una maggiore regolamentazione e chiare norme sulla riparabilità e la sostituzione dei pezzi di ricambio a tutela dei consumatori?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(22 maggio 2013)

Invito l'onorevole deputato a consultare la risposta della Commissione all'interrogazione E-004887/2012 dell'onorevole Rareș-Lucian Niculescu ⁽¹⁾.

La Commissione ritiene che l'obsolescenza pianificata possa avere un impatto negativo sugli interessi dei consumatori, sull'ambiente e sulla concorrenza leale. La legislazione europea prevede degli strumenti per lottare contro tali pratiche. La direttiva sulla progettazione ecocompatibile ⁽²⁾ contiene un quadro giuridico adeguato al fine di definire i requisiti potenziali in tema di riparabilità e di prolungamento della durata di vita di prodotti e apparecchi. È possibile imporre requisiti obbligatori in tema di progettazione ecocompatibile allorché l'impatto ambientale previsto risulta essere significativo ⁽³⁾. Requisiti in merito alla progettazione dei prodotti sono contenuti anche nella direttiva sui rifiuti di apparecchiature elettriche ed elettroniche (direttiva RAEE) ⁽⁴⁾, in particolare per facilitare il riutilizzo, lo smantellamento e il recupero dei RAEE, dei loro componenti e materiali. Il principio di responsabilità estesa del produttore contenuto nella direttiva RAEE o i periodi prolungati di garanzia sono altri strumenti con cui si dovrebbero incoraggiare i progettisti e i produttori ad agevolare la riparazione, l'eventuale aggiornamento e il riutilizzo delle apparecchiature. Inoltre, gli standard europei a carattere volontario possono contribuire maggiormente alla presa in conto delle esigenze ambientali nell'intero ciclo di vita dei prodotti, dei processi e dei servizi.

Per pervenire a una crescita sostenibile, accompagnata da consumi sostenibili, la Commissione esaminerà l'opportunità di adottare misure per rendere più durevoli i beni di consumo, compreso il sostegno ai servizi di riparazione e manutenzione ⁽⁵⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html>

⁽²⁾ Direttiva 2009/125/CE, GU L 285 del 31.10.2009.

⁽³⁾ La vita utile o durevolezza sono disciplinate, ad esempio, nel regolamento sulla progettazione ecocompatibile, regolamento (CE) n. 244/2009 della Commissione (durata delle lampadine pari a 6 000 h), e nel regolamento per la progettazione ecocompatibile degli aspirapolvere, in corso di adozione.

⁽⁴⁾ Direttiva 2012/19/UE sui rifiuti di apparecchiature elettriche ed elettroniche (RAEE) (rifusione), GU L 197 del 24.7.2012.

⁽⁵⁾ Come indicato nella comunicazione della Commissione «Un'agenda europea dei consumatori», COM(2012)225 def.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003441/13
to the Commission**

Mario Borghezio (EFD)

(26 March 2013)

Subject: Request for the EU to take action to defend consumers

According to a study carried out in Germany and published in the *Sueddeutsche Zeitung*, many electrical household appliances have been designed by their creators to break once their warranty period expires.

Planned wear and tear is a mass phenomenon which mainly affects a range of inkjet printers, which, after printing a few thousand pages, indicate that repairs are necessary, even if the machine could continue to print without any problem; the resoling of shoes, where glued soles are often used which wear away rapidly, are impossible to remove and so must be replaced. And also in many jacket zips, the teeth of the zip are coiled; or in washing machines, the heating rods rust too easily, meaning that the users of the appliances must replace them at great cost.

The study defines the phenomenon of early wear and tear in appliances as 'planned obsolescence', since the manufacturers appear to deliberately insert weak points or use poor-quality materials intended to wear rapidly.

Does the Commission not believe that greater regulation and clearer standards regarding the reparability and replacement of spare parts are necessary in order to protect consumers?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission

(22 May 2013)

The Honourable Member is invited to refer to the Commission's reply to E-004887/2012 by Rareș-Lucian Niculescu ⁽¹⁾.

The Commission considers that planned obsolescence can have negative impacts on consumers' interests, on the environment, and on fair competition. European legislation provides means to combat such practices. The Ecodesign Directive ⁽²⁾ contains an adequate legal framework to establish potential requirements for reparability and the lifetime extension of products and equipment. Mandatory ecodesign requirements can be set whenever the associated environmental impacts are found to be significant ⁽³⁾. Product design requirements are also included in the WEEE Directive ⁽⁴⁾, notably in view of facilitating re-use, dismantling and recovery of WEEE, its components and materials. The extended producer responsibility principle in the WEEE Directive, or extended warranty periods, are other means by which design and production should be encouraged to facilitate the repair, possible upgrading, and reuse of equipment. In addition, voluntary European standards have the potential to play a more important role to take environmental requirements into account for the whole life cycle of products, processes and services.

In order to achieve sustainable growth underpinned by sustainable consumption, the Commission will consider taking measures to make consumer goods more durable, including support for repair and maintenance services ⁽⁵⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html>

⁽²⁾ Directive 2009/125/EC, OJ L 285, 31.10.2009.

⁽³⁾ Lifetime or durability is regulated for example in Ecodesign Regulation 244/2009 (Lamp lifetime of 6 000 h), and in Ecodesign Regulation on vacuum cleaners being adopted.

⁽⁴⁾ Directive 2012/19/EU on waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE) (recast), OJ L 197, 24.7.2012.

⁽⁵⁾ Indicated in the communication of the Commission on a Consumer Agenda, COM(2012) 225 final.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003443/13
a la Comisión**

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)

(27 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Ley de montes en el Estado español

Según se desprende del borrador de la futura ley de montes ⁽¹⁾ presentado hace escasos días por el Ministro de Agricultura español, parece que se abre la posibilidad de recalificar montes arrasados por el fuego.

De hecho, en el año 2003, se aprobó una ley que prohibía taxativamente el cambio de uso de los espacios quemados en un plazo de 30 años e impedía realizar en dicho espacio cualquier actividad incompatible con la regeneración de la cubierta vegetal. En el Estado español se han producido casos de incendios muy graves en zonas de alto interés natural que luego se han recalificado. Véase el caso en donde se construyó Terra Mítica, en el País Valencià. Se pasó de tener un pulmón verde en la comarca de la Marina Baixa a tener más de 400 hectáreas quemadas, no se hizo ningún plan de reforestación posterior y luego se recalificó.

A la luz de lo anterior y teniendo en cuenta las prioridades de la Comisión para Horizonte 2020:

1. ¿Cree la Comisión que la Ley 43/2003, de 21 de noviembre, aprobada en el Congreso y actualmente en vigor va en consonancia con los objetivos de crecimiento inteligente y sostenible para Horizonte 2020?
2. ¿Cree la Comisión que ahora es necesario cambiar la legislación vigente en el Estado español en un tema tan sensible como es la conservación y protección de los espacios naturales?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión

(17 de mayo de 2013)

La política forestal, la gestión de los montes y la reforestación tras los incendios forestales son competencia de los Estados miembros. Las preguntas de Su Señoría conciernen, por lo tanto, a las autoridades nacionales.

En lo que atañe a las zonas dañadas por incendios forestales, el Reglamento de desarrollo rural puede aportar cofinanciación para medidas de prevención y reforestación previa petición del Estado miembro. En varios Estados miembros, la legislación que restringe las posibilidades de cambio de uso del suelo en los bosques dañados por incendios ha demostrado ser un instrumento eficaz para prevenir incendios intencionados.

(1) <http://www.elconfidencial.com/archivos/ec/2013032229leymontes4-1.pdf>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003443/13
to the Commission**

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)

(27 March 2013)

Subject: Forestry law in Spain

The Forestry Bill ⁽¹⁾ presented a few days ago by the Spanish Minister for Agriculture seems to provide for the reclassification of areas ravaged by fire.

In fact, in 2003 a law was passed strictly prohibiting change of use of ravaged areas for a period of 30 years and banning any activity incompatible with regeneration of the ground cover in those areas. There have been cases of very serious fires in areas of natural interest in Spain which have since been reclassified. One example is the construction of Terra Mítica in the Valencia region. The Marina Baixa area went from having a green lung to having over 400 hectares of scorched land. No reforestation plan was drawn up following the disaster and the land was later reclassified.

In view of the above, and bearing in mind the Commission's priorities for Horizon 2020:

1. Does the Commission believe that Law 43/2003 of 21 November, passed by Congress (the Lower House of the Spanish Parliament) and currently in force, is in line with the objectives of smart, sustainable growth for Horizon 2020?
2. Does the Commission believe that it is now necessary to change the legislation currently in force in Spain on such a sensitive issue as the conservation and protection of natural areas?

Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission

(17 May 2013)

Forest policy, forest management and forest fire restoration are within the competence of the Member States. The Honourable Member's questions are therefore a matter for the national authorities concerned.

As far as areas damaged by forest fires are concerned, the rural Development Regulation can provide co-funding for prevention and restoration measures at the request of the Member State. For several member states, legislation restricting the possibilities for land use changes in forests damaged by fires has proven to be an effective instrument to prevent intentional fires.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.elconfidencial.com/archivos/ec/2013032229leymontes4-1.pdf>

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-003444/13
a Bizottság számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. március 27.)

Tárgy: Az INI-jelentés 104. pontjának kérdésköre a látássérült személyek digitális kijelzővel ellátott termékek használatával kapcsolatos nehézségeiről

Mint ismeretes, a 2011 októberében elfogadott, a fogyatékossgal élő személyek mobilitásáról és befogadásáról, valamint a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékossgügyi stratégiáról szóló EP-jelentés (P7_TA(2011)0453) rögzíti, hogy a látássérült személyek számára kihívás a digitális kijelzővel ellátott elektromos és elektronikai eszközök használata (104. pont).

Mit kíván tenni az Európai Bizottság annak érdekében, hogy a látássérült személyek választhassanak olyan termékeket, amelyek számukra értelmezhető módon is használhatók?

Mikorra várható ezzel kapcsolatosan elemzés és jogalkotási javaslat?

Viviane Reding válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. május 30.)

A Bizottság jogi és más eszközöket – például szabványosítást – alkalmaz az épített környezethez, a közlekedéshez és az ikt-hez való hozzáférés optimalizálása érdekében.

Például az európai akadálymentesítési intézkedéscsomagot előkészítő lépések során a Bizottság a fogyatékossgal élő személyek számára fontos áruk és szolgáltatások széles skáláját vizsgálta meg. Az intézkedéscsomag célja, hogy elősegítse az akadálymentes áruk és szolgáltatások belső piacának helyes működését. A Bizottság 2013 második felében tervezi előterjeszteni javaslatát.

Emellett a közszektorbeli szervezetek webhelyeinek akadálymentesítéséről szóló irányelvre irányuló javaslat harmonizált követelményeket határoz meg közigazgatási szervek bizonyos csoportja által működtetett, a polgárok számára alapvető információkat és szolgáltatásokat nyújtó webhelyekre vonatkozóan. A javaslat eredményeként az érintett webhelyek elérhetőek lennének valamennyi felhasználó számára, beleértve a látássérült személyeket is, összhangban a Web Akadálymentesítési Útmutató 2.0 verziójában meghatározott, az AA megfeleléségi szinthez tartozó teljesítési feltételekkel és követelményekkel.

Továbbá a szabványosítás terén a Bizottság kezdeményezte és támogatja a „Mandate 376” projektet ⁽¹⁾, amely az ikt-re és ezen belül a webre vonatkozó akadálymentesítési kritériumok közbeszerzési eljárásokban alkalmazandó európai szabványának kidolgozására irányul. A 2011–2015-ös időszakra szóló európai elektronikus kormányzati cselekvési terv is kiterjed a felhasználói szükségletek szerint kialakított, inkluzivitást és akadálymentességet biztosító szolgáltatások kifejlesztésére.

Az akadálymentességgel kapcsolatos intézkedésekről – más kezdeményezésekkel együtt – áttekintést nyújt majd a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékossgügyi stratégia végrehajtásának első éveiről szóló átfogó jelentés, amelynek előkészítése folyamatban van, és közzététele idén várható.

⁽¹⁾ www.mandate376.eu

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003444/13
to the Commission
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: The subject matter of point 104 of the INI report in relation to the difficulties encountered by visually impaired people in using products with digital displays

As you know, the Parliament report adopted in October 2011 on the mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and on the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) states that visually impaired people find it a challenge using electrical and electronic devices with digital displays (point 104).

What action does the Commission intend to take to ensure that visually impaired people can choose products which they can use in a comprehensible manner?

By when will this matter be examined and a legislative proposal drafted on it?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2013)**

To optimise the accessibility of the built environment, transport and ICT, the Commission combines legislative and other instruments, such as standardisation.

For instance, in the course of preparatory actions for the European Accessibility Act, the Commission has examined a wide variety of goods and services relevant to persons with disabilities. The Act will aim at improving the proper functioning of the internal market for accessible goods and services. The Commission plans to present its proposal in the second half of 2013.

Moreover, the proposal for a directive on the accessibility of public sector bodies' websites sets harmonised accessibility requirements for a set of public sector bodies' websites offering essential information and services to citizens. As a result of such proposal the websites concerned would be accessible to all users, including visually impaired persons, in accordance with the Success Criteria and Compliance Requirements of the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.0 Level AA.

Furthermore, in the area of standardisation, the Commission has initiated and is supporting the work on Mandate 376 ⁽¹⁾ developing a European standard for accessibility requirements for ICT, including the web, to be used in public procurements. The eGovernment Action Plan 2011-2015 also covers the development of services designed around user needs and ensuring inclusiveness and accessibility.

Actions relevant to accessibility will be reviewed among other initiatives in the report on the first years of the implementation of the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 that is under preparation for publication later this year.

⁽¹⁾ www.mandate376.eu.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-003445/13
a Bizottság számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. március 27.)

Tárgy: Az INI-jelentés 98. pontjának kérdésköre a látássérülteket támogató navigációs alapú alkalmazásokról

Mint ismeretes, a 2011 októberében elfogadott, a fogyatékossgal élő személyek mobilitásáról és befogadásáról, valamint a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékossgügyi stratégiáról szóló EP-jelentés (P7_TA(2011)0453) rögzíti, hogy szükség van a navigációs alapú közlekedési alkalmazásokra az egyénileg is közlekedő látássérültek részére, összhangban a 98. pontban leírtakkal.

Milyen lépéseket tett és kíván tenni az Európai Bizottság annak érdekében, hogy a látássérültek részére a gyalogos közlekedést biztonságosan (testi épségüket nem veszélyeztető módon) is támogató alkalmazások is elérhetőek legyenek?

Viviane Reding válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. június 6.)

A Bizottság tisztában van a látássérülteknek készült navigációs eszközök és alkalmazások jelentőségével.

A látássérültek gyalogos közlekedését biztonságosan támogató alkalmazások kifejlesztése érdekében nemrégiben tett lépések tekintetében a Bizottság szeretné a tisztelt Képviselő Úr figyelmébe ajánlani az E-7856/2010. számú írásbeli kérdésre adott válaszát.

Ami az ilyen alkalmazások kifejlesztését célzó további intézkedéseket illeti, a Bizottság kutatási projekteket finanszíroz, amelyek a hozzáférhető és hatékony navigációs eszközök látássérült felhasználók számára való biztosítása érdekében olyan megoldások kifejlesztésére irányulnak, amelyek kihasználják az EGNOS⁽¹⁾-rendszerrel és a Galileo-programtól várható nagyobb pontosság előnyeit.

(¹) http://www.esa.int/Our_Activities/Navigation/The_present_-_EGNOS/What_is_EGNOS

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003445/13
to the Commission
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: The subject matter of point 98 of the INI report in relation to navigation-based applications supporting visually impaired people

As you know, the Parliament report adopted in October 2011 on the mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and on the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) states that navigation-based transport applications are required for visually impaired people also travelling alone, as described in point 98.

What steps has the Commission taken and does it intend to take to ensure that visually impaired people can also access applications which also help them get around safely on foot (without endangering their physical person)?

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

The Commission is aware of the importance of the availability of navigation devices and applications that for visually impaired persons.

Regarding recent actions aimed at developing applications that can help visually impaired people to get around safely on foot, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-7856/2010.

Regarding further actions aimed at developing such applications, the Commission funds research projects aiming at developing solutions to provide visually impaired users with accessible and efficient navigators that will take advantage of the higher levels of accuracy expected from the EGNOS⁽¹⁾ system and the Galileo programme.

⁽¹⁾ http://www.esa.int/Our_Activities/Navigation/The_present_-_EGNOS/What_is_EGNOS.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-003446/13
a Bizottság számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. március 27.)

Tárgy: Az INI-jelentés 73. pontjának kérdésköre a fogyatékkal élők képviselő szervezetek döntéshozatali részvételéről

Mint ismeretes, a 2011 októberében elfogadott, a fogyatékosokkal élő személyek mobilitásáról és befogadásáról, valamint a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékosügyi stratégiáról szóló EP-jelentés (P7_TA(2011)0453) rögzíti, hogy a fogyatékos emberek érdekeit védő uniós ernyőszervezeteknek megfelelő pénzügyi támogatásban kell részesülniük, hogy aktívan képviselhessék a fogyatékos embereket az uniós döntéshozatal során (73. pont).

Kifejtené-e az Európai Bizottság, hogy milyen módon támogatja az ilyen szervezetek működését, és hogyan kíván gondoskodni arról, hogy minél szélesebb körűen – és ne csak egy-egy ernyőszervezet által – legyen biztosítva a fogyatékosokkal élő személyek jogairól szóló ENSZ-egyezmény nyomán követése?

Viviane Reding válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. május 14.)

A 2007–2013 közötti időszakra szóló Progress program keretében a Bizottság tíz uniós szintű, a fogyatékos emberek érdekeit védő ernyőszervezet működési költségeit támogatja hároméves partnerségi megállapodásokon alapuló működési támogatás révén és a szervezetek éves munkaprogramjának értékelése függvényében.

Ez a támogatás az ilyen szervezetek érdekvédelmi képességének, valamint az EU politikai döntéshozatalában történő aktív részvételének támogatására, valamint irányítási szerkezetének és uniós hálózatának erősítésére is szolgál. Egyik konkrét cél a fogyatékos emberek érdekeit védő szervezetek kapacitásának bővítése annak érdekében, hogy aktívan részt vegyenek a fogyatékosokkal élő személyek jogairól szóló egyezmény (a továbbiakban: UNCRPD) végrehajtásában uniós és tagországi szinten, ezen belül az UNCRPD 33. cikkében szereplő, ellenőrzéssel kapcsolatos ügyekben.

Ehhez hasonló támogatási szintet helyez kilátásba a Bizottság által a 2014–2020-as időszakra javasolt Jogok és polgárság program elnevezésű új program is ⁽¹⁾.

Az egyezmény végrehajtását segítő, védő és ellenőrző uniós keretrendszer (lásd az UNCRPD 33. cikkének (2) bekezdését) fogyatékos emberek érdekeit védő, legnagyobb és legjelentősebb uniós szintű ernyőszervezetében, az Európai Fogyatékosügyi Fórumban elfoglalt tagság tovább egyszerűsíti a civil társadalom – különösen a fogyatékosokkal élő személyek és az őket képviselő szervezetek – szerepvállalását és teljes részvételét az egyezmény ellenőrzési folyamataiban, amelyet az UNCRPD 33. cikkének (3) bekezdése ír elő.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2011) 758 final: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0758:FIN:HU:PDF>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003446/13
to the Commission
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: The subject matter of point 73 of the INI report in relation to the participation of organisations representing people with disabilities in the decision-making process

As you know, the Parliament resolution adopted in October 2011 on the mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and on the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) states that EU umbrella organisations protecting the interests of people with disabilities need to be given adequate financial support to enable them to represent people with disabilities actively during the EU decision-making process (point 73).

Would the Commission explain how it supports the operation of these organisations and how it intends to ensure that the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities is monitored, not only by a single umbrella organisation but by the widest range of organisations possible?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(14 May 2013)**

Under the Progress Programme 2007-2013 the Commission supports the running costs of ten EU-level disability umbrella organisations by means of an operating grant based on triennial partnership agreements and subject to an assessment of the organisations' annual work programmes.

This funding also serves to support the advocacy capacity of these organisations and their active participation in EU policy-making, and to strengthen their governance structures and EU-wide network. One specific objective is to strengthen the capacity of DPOs to actively participate in the implementation of the UNCRPD at EU and national level including in matters related to the article 33 UNCRPD on monitoring.

A comparable level of funding is foreseen in the Commission's proposal for a new Rights and Citizenship Programme for 2014-2020 ⁽¹⁾.

The involvement and full participation of civil society, in particular persons with disabilities and their representative organisations, in the monitoring process of the UNCRPD, required by art. 33.3 UNCRPD, is further facilitated by the membership of the European Disability Forum, the largest and most representative EU-level disability umbrella organisation, of the EU Framework to promote, protect and monitor the Convention (art. 33.2 UNCRPD).

⁽¹⁾ COM(2011) 758 final <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0758:FIN:EN:PDF>.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-003447/13
a Bizottság számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. március 27.)

Tárgy: Az INI-jelentés 71. pontjának kérdésköre a fogyatékos gyermekeket nevelő szülők pótszabadságáról

Mint ismeretes, a 2011 októberében elfogadott, a fogyatékossgal élő személyek mobilitásáról és befogadásáról, valamint a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékossgügyi stratégiáról szóló EP-jelentés (P7_TA(2011)0453) rögzíti, hogy a fogyatékos gyermekeket nevelő szülők pótszabadságra érdemesek, amivel elismeri nehézségeiket (71. pont).

Milyen bevált gyakorlatok lelhetőek fel a tagállamokban ezen a téren, és hol ismerik el ezt az erőfeszítést az öregségi nyugdíjogosultság kapcsán?

Viviane Reding válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. május 30.)

Bár a szabadságról és a nyugdíjogosultságról szóló konkrét társadalombiztosítási rendelkezések elsősorban uniós tagállami hatáskörbe tartoznak, a Bizottság a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékossgügyi stratégia ⁽¹⁾ 2010–2015-re tervezett fellépéseinek felsorolásán belül ⁽²⁾ kötelezettséget vállalt arra, hogy a fogyatékossggal kapcsolatos szempontok figyelembevétele érdekében a nyugdíjakról szóló zöld könyvre épülő javaslatokat tesz.

Egyes tagállamok, így például a Cseh Köztársaság, Franciaország, Málta, Szlovákia, Spanyolország és az Egyesült Királyság, valamint Norvégia a nyugdíj kiszámításakor számításba veszik a fogyatékossggal élő gyermekek gondozásából eredő kötelezettségekkel kapcsolatos, járulékfizetés nélküli időszakot. E rendelkezésekről bővebb információ található a szociális védelemről/társadalombiztosításról szóló kölcsönös tájékoztatási rendszer összehasonlító táblázataiban ⁽³⁾: VI. táblázat – Öregségi nyugellátás, 4. pont – Elismert vagy számításba vett, járulékfizetés nélküli időszakok.

⁽¹⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0636:FIN:HU:HTML>

⁽²⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010SC1324:EN:NOT>

⁽³⁾ <http://www.missoc.org/MISSOC/INFORMATIONBASE/COMPARATIVETABLES/MISSOCDATABASE/comparativeTableSearch.jsp>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003447/13
to the Commission
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: The subject matter of point 71 of the INI report in relation to compassionate leave for parents of children with disabilities

As you know, the Parliament report adopted in October 2011 on the mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and on the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) states that parents of children with disabilities deserve to be granted compassionate leave in recognition of their difficult situation (point 71).

What best practice can be identified in this area in Member States, and where are these efforts recognised as part of the old-age pension entitlement?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2013)**

While specific social security provisions on leave and pension entitlements are primarily the competence of the EU Member States, the Commission has included in the list of actions for 2010-2015 ⁽¹⁾ of the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 ⁽²⁾ an undertaking to follow up on the Green Paper on pensions to take into account disability relevant aspects.

Some Member States, such as Czech Republic, France, Malta, Slovakia, Spain and the United Kingdom, as well as Norway, take into account the non-contributory periods, related to the caring obligations for disabled children, for the purposes of pension calculation. More detailed information on these regulations can be found in the Comparative Tables in the 'Mutual Information System on Social Protection / Social Security' ⁽³⁾: Table VI. Old-age Benefits, point 4. Non-contributory periods credited or taken into consideration.

⁽¹⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010SC1324:EN:NOT>.

⁽²⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636:en:NOT>.

⁽³⁾ <http://www.missoc.org/MISSOC/INFORMATIONBASE/COMPARATIVETABLES/MISSOCDATABASE/comparativeTableSearch.jsp>

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-003449/13
a Bizottság számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
 (2013. március 27.)

Tárgy: Az INI-jelentés 65. pontjának kérdésköre a fenntartható rehabilitációs rendszerekről

Mint ismeretes, a 2011 októberében elfogadott, a fogyatékossgal élő személyek mobilitásáról és befogadásáról, valamint a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékossgügyi stratégiáról szóló EP-jelentés (P7_TA(2011)0453) rögzíti, hogy hatékonyabb és egymásra épülő rehabilitációs rendszerekre van szükség Európában (65. pont).

Mit tett és mit kíván tenni a Bizottság, hogy támogassa a tagállamokat a hatékonyabb, jobb minőségű rehabilitációs rendszerek kiépítésében, amelyek egészségügyi, oktatási, képzési és foglalkoztatási dimenzióval is rendelkeznek, valamint költségvetésileg is fenntarthatóbbak?

Mely országok hajtották végre a legmegfelelőbb átalakításokat, amelyek a valóban rászorultakat támogatják, és amelyek hatékonyan, a legújabb nemzetközi sztenderdek (pl. a WHO által kiadott *A funkcióképesség, fogyatékossg és egészség nemzetközi osztályozása* (FNO)) is alkalmazó megoldásokkal működnek?

Viviane Reding válasza a Bizottság nevében
 (2013. május 30.)

A szociális és egészségügyi szolgáltatásokért, és ezen belül a fogyatékossgal élő személyek rehabilitációjáért a közvetlen felelősség a tagállamokat terheli. A Bizottság elsősorban az Európai Szociális Alapon keresztül nyújt támogatást a tagállamok számára a hatékonyabb, jobb minőségű rehabilitációs szolgáltatások kialakításához. Például a magyar rehabilitációs rendszer reformjához az Európai Szociális Alap Társadalmi Megújulás Operatív Programja nyújtott támogatást a rehabilitációs és munkaerő-piaci reintegrációs szolgáltatásokat támogató számos intézkedésen keresztül.

A Bizottság kutatásokat is támogat, pl. „A fogyatékossgal élők számára elérhető támogatott foglalkoztatás az EU-ban és az EFTA–EGT-ben” című felmérést⁽¹⁾ vagy az európai fogyatékossgügyi szakértők tudományos hálózatának⁽²⁾ munkáját. Emellett a Bizottság a területen működő egyes európai szervezetek⁽³⁾ működési költségeihez is támogatást nyújt, és ösztönzi a gyakorlatok és információk megosztását a fogyatékossgal foglalkozó magas szintű csoport keretében, amely a rehabilitációs szolgáltatásokat nyújtók szervezeteit⁽⁴⁾ is magába foglalja.

A Bizottság nem végzett szisztematikus összehasonlítást a tagállamok rehabilitációs szolgáltatásaival kapcsolatos fejleményekről, azonban a 2007–2013-as egészségügyi program keretében finanszírozást nyújtottunk olyan működési támogatáshoz⁽⁵⁾, projektekhez⁽⁶⁾, együttes fellépésekhez⁽⁷⁾ és konferenciákhoz⁽⁸⁾, amelyek célja az uniós tagállamokban és azokon kívül az egészségügyi ellátás és a rehabilitációs szolgáltatások fejlesztését szolgáló intézkedések kialakítása és ösztönzése volt⁽⁹⁾.

Végül a Bizottság nemrégiben statisztikai felméréseket alakított ki a fogyatékossgal élő személyek helyzetére vonatkozóan, nevezetesen a munkaerő-felmérés speciális *ad hoc* modulját, valamint az európai egészségügyről és társadalmi befogadásról szóló felmérést, és az ezekben szereplő kérdések meghatározásakor többek között a funkcióképesség, fogyatékossg és egészség nemzetközi osztályozásából (International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health – ICF) indult ki.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/cowi.final_study_report_may_2011_final_en.pdf

⁽²⁾ <http://www.disability-europe.net/content/pdf/ANED%20Task%206%20final%20report%20-%20final%20version%2017-04-09.pdf>

⁽³⁾ Pl. a Fogyatékos Emberek Számára Szolgáltatást Nyújtó Szervezetek Európai Szövetsége (EASPD) részére

⁽⁴⁾ Pl. az Európai Rehabilitációs Platform

⁽⁵⁾ Európai Sclerosis Multiplex Platform (EMSP_FY2012): <http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html?prjno=20113304>

⁽⁶⁾ Innovatív ellátás a több krónikus betegségben szenvedő betegek számára Európában (ICARE4EU):

<http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html?prjno=20121205>

⁽⁷⁾ EUCERD együttes fellépés: a ritka betegségekkel kapcsolatos munka (EJA): <http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html?prjno=20112201>

⁽⁸⁾ A 2008–2013 közötti időszakról szóló uniós egészségügyi program keretében rendezett 2012/4/30. sz. konferencia: „Munkahelyi egészségügyi intézkedések a krónikus betegségben szenvedő alkalmazottak számára” (PH konferencia):

<http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html?prjno=20124303>

⁽⁹⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003449/13
to the Commission
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: The subject matter of point 65 of the INI report in relation to sustainable rehabilitation services

As you know, the Parliament report adopted in October 2011 on the mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and on the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) states that more effective, overlapping rehabilitation services are required in Europe (point 65).

What action has the Commission taken and does it intend to take to support Member States in developing more effective, better-quality rehabilitation services which also include a healthcare, education, training and employment dimension, as well as being more sustainable in budgetary terms?

Which countries have made the most appropriate adjustments that support those who are really disadvantaged and interact effectively with solutions also applying the latest international standards (e.g. WHO's International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF))?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2013)**

The direct responsibility for managing social and health services, including rehabilitation services for persons with disabilities, lies with the Member States. The Commission supports Member States in developing more effective, better-quality rehabilitation services primarily through the European Social Fund. For example, the reform of the Hungarian rehabilitation system was supported by ESF's Social Renewal Operational Programme through several measures supporting rehabilitation and labour market reintegration services.

We also fund research, e.g. a study on 'Supported Employment for people with disabilities in the EU and EFTA-EEA' ⁽¹⁾ or the work of the Academic Network of European Disability Experts ⁽²⁾. Furthermore, the Commission also supports the operating costs of some European organisations active in the field ⁽³⁾ and promotes exchange of practices and information in the Disability High Level Group (DHLG) that includes organisations of rehabilitation service providers ⁽⁴⁾.

The Commission has not systematically compared the developments in rehabilitation services of the Member States but under the health programme 2007-2013 we have funded operating grants ⁽⁵⁾, projects ⁽⁶⁾, joint actions ⁽⁷⁾ and conferences ⁽⁸⁾ aiming to develop and promote measures to improve medical treatment and rehabilitation services in the EU member states and beyond ⁽⁹⁾.

Finally, the Commission developed recent statistical surveys on the situation of persons with disabilities, notably the special ad hoc module of Labour Force Survey and the European Health and Social Inclusion Survey, using the ICF classification as one of the bases for the development of the questions.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/cowi.final_study_report_may_2011_final_en.pdf

⁽²⁾ <http://www.disability-europe.net/content/pdf/ANED%20Task%206%20final%20report%20-%20final%20version%2017-04-09.pdf>

⁽³⁾ Such as European Association of Service Providers for Persons with Disabilities (EASPD).

⁽⁴⁾ Such as European Platform for Rehabilitation (EPR).

⁽⁵⁾ The European Multiple Sclerosis Platform (EMSP_FY2012) <http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html?prjno=20113304>

⁽⁶⁾ Innovating care for people with multiple chronic conditions in Europe (ICARE4EU):

<http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html?prjno=20121205>

⁽⁷⁾ EUCERD Joint Action: working for rare diseases (EJA), <http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html?prjno=20112201>

⁽⁸⁾ Conference No 20124303 under EU Health Programme 2008-2013 'Workplace health practices for employees with chronic illness'. (PH Work Conference), <http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html?prjno=20124303>

⁽⁹⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html>

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-003450/13
a Bizottság számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. március 27.)

Tárgy: Az INI-jelentés 64. pontjának kérdésköre az egész életen át tartó tanulási programok fogyatékkal élők számára való hozzáférhetőségéről

Mint ismeretes, a 2011 októberében elfogadott, a fogyatékossgal élő személyek mobilitásáról és befogadásáról, valamint a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékossgügyi stratégiáról szóló EP-jelentés (P7_TA(2011)0453) rögzíti, hogy az egész életen át tartó tanulás a fogyatékossggal élő emberek számára is fontos (64. pont).

Mit tett és mit kíván tenni az Európai Bizottság, hogy az egész életen át tartó tanulási programok a fogyatékossggal élő emberek számára is hozzáférhetőbbé váljanak, különösen azok számára, akik aktív korukban szereztek fogyatékossgukat?

Androulla Vassiliou válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. május 7.)

Az egész életen át tartó tanulás program jelenleg is sok lehetőséget nyújt a hátrányos helyzetű csoportoknak és megoldásokat kínál a fogyatékos személyek speciális tanulási szükségleteire. Az ilyen lehetőségek között szerepelnek többek között a fogyatékkal élő résztvevőkre háruló magasabb költségeket tükröző, magasabb összegű juttatások, illetve a jelbeszéd és Braille-írás elsajátítására és használatára nyújtott támogatás.

Az Európai Unió működéséről szóló szerződés ⁽¹⁾ és az Alapjogi Charta ⁽²⁾ rendelkezésein alapuló, az Unió oktatási, képzési, ifjúsági és sportprogramjára, az „Erasmus mindenkinek” programra vonatkozó javaslat a fenti megközelítést veszi át. A bizottsági javaslat 17. cikke értelmében a Bizottság és a tagállamok feladata, hogy a program végrehajtása során megkönnyítse a nehézségekkel küzdő – többek között fogyatékos személyek – részvételét. A javaslatban előirányzott megnövelt költségvetési keret a fogyatékos résztvevők számára kíván többletforrásokat biztosítani, illetve a teljes körű részvételükhöz szükséges segítséghez többlettámogatást nyújtani.

⁽¹⁾ Az Európai Unió működéséről szóló szerződés 8. és 10. cikke.

⁽²⁾ Lásd az Alapjogi Charta 21. és 23. cikkét.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003450/13
to the Commission
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: The subject matter of point 64 of the INI report in relation to the accessibility of lifelong learning programmes to people with disabilities

As you know, the Parliament report adopted in October 2011 on the mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and on the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) states that lifelong learning is also important for people with disabilities (point 64).

What action has the Commission taken and does it intend to take to make lifelong learning programmes also more accessible to people with disabilities, especially to those who have acquired their disability during their working life?

**Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(7 May 2013)**

The current Lifelong Learning programme (LLP) ensures wide access for beneficiaries from disadvantaged groups and addresses actively the special learning needs of those with disabilities. Particularly, this includes the use of higher grants to cover the additional costs of disabled participants, as well as the provision of support for the learning and use of sign languages and Braille.

Based on the provisions of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union ⁽¹⁾, as well as of the Charter of Fundamental Rights ⁽²⁾, the proposal for the future programme in Education, Training, Youth and Sport 'Erasmus for All' will continue this approach. Article 17 of the Commission's proposal foresees that the Commission and Member States, when implementing the programme, have to facilitate the participation of people with difficulties, including those with disability. The budget increase foreseen in the proposal should ensure higher grants for disabled participants and extra support for the assistance they need to participate fully.

⁽¹⁾ Articles 8 and 10 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

⁽²⁾ Articles 21 and 23 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-003451/13
a Bizottság számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. március 27.)

Tárgy: Az INI-jelentés 59. pontjának kérdésköre a fogyatékkal élők befogadó jellegű oktatását előmozdító cselekvésről

Mint ismeretes, a 2011 októberében elfogadott, a fogyatékosággal élő személyek mobilitásáról és befogadásáról, valamint a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékoságügyi stratégiáról szóló EP-jelentés (P7_TA(2011)0453) rögzíti, hogy a befogadó jellegű oktatást kell a középpontba állítani, különösen az európai oktatási és képzési keretstratégiában (59. pont).

Mit tett és kíván tenni a Bizottság, hogy ennek a célnak megfeleljen, és hogyan kívánja erősíteni a fogyatékos diákok esetében a személyre szabottabb segítségnyújtás fejlesztését, különösen az IT-eszközök alkalmazásával?

Androulla Vassiliou válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. május 23.)

A Bizottság teljes mértékben azonosul azzal a nézettel, hogy a fogyatékos személyeknek alapvetően fontos az egyéni igényekre szabott, befogadó jellegű oktatás és képzés, és egyetért azzal is, hogy az információs és kommunikációs technológiáknak fontos szerep jut e tekintetben.

A Bizottság „Gondoljuk újra az oktatást” című, tavaly novemberben megjelent közleménye határozott fellépést sürget a tanítás és a tanulás olyan új megközelítéseiinek támogatása érdekében, amelyek az új technológiák felhasználására és valamennyi tanuló, különösen a fogyatékos tanulók igényeinek jobb kiszolgálására is kiterjednek.

A Bizottság a közeljövőben indítja útjára „Az oktatás nyitottabbá tétele” elnevezésű kezdeményezését. Ennek célja az, hogy előmozdítsa a nyitott oktatási segédanyagok készítését és a fogyatékos személyek igényeinek megfelelő gyakorlatok kialakítását. Mindez kiegészül az online távoktatás akkreditációjának eszközeivel.

Az Európai Unió a jövőbeni európai strukturális és beruházási alapokon keresztül pénzügyi támogatást is nyújthat a fogyatékos személyek oktatásához és támogatásához.

Az egész életen át tartó tanulás programja, illetve a „Fiatalok lendületben” program más-más tanulmányi helyzetekben támogatja a tanulási mobilitást. Célzott támogatási formák állnak a fogyatékos személyek rendelkezésére ahhoz, hogy kihasználhassák a tanulási mobilitás nyújtotta lehetőségeket. A Bizottság javaslata szerint 2013 után ez a munka az „Erasmus mindenkinek” nevű, oktatással és képzéssel, valamint ifjúsági és sportüggyel foglalkozó jövőbeli program keretében fog folytatódni.

A Bizottság pénzügyi támogatást nyújt az EADSNE⁽¹⁾ számára, amely segíti a fogyatékos tanulók oktatásáról európai és nemzeti szinten rendelkezésre álló információk gyűjtését, feldolgozását és megosztását. Az EADSNE 2011-ben az Unesco-nak az információs technológiák oktatásban való alkalmazásával foglalkozó intézetével együttműködve közzétette „IKT a fogyatékos személyek oktatásában – áttekintés az innovatív gyakorlatokról” című értékelését.

(¹) European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education (Európai Ügynökség a Sajátos Nevelési Igényű Tanulók Oktatásának Fejlesztéséért)

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003451/13
to the Commission**

Ádám Kósa (PPE)

(27 March 2013)

Subject: The subject matter of point 59 of the INI report in relation to actively promoting inclusive education for people with disabilities

As you know, the Parliament report adopted in October 2011 on the mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and on the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) states that inclusive education should be the main focus, especially within the European framework strategy for education and training (point 59).

What action has the Commission taken and does it intend to take to achieve this aim, and how does it intend to develop further the provision of individually tailored assistance to pupils with disabilities, particularly through the use of IT resources?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission

(23 May 2013)

The Commission fully shares the view that inclusive education and training coupled with provision tailored to the individual's needs is key for people with disabilities. It also agrees that ICT has an important role to play in this respect.

The Commission Communication 'Rethinking Education', published last November, calls for strong action to support new approaches to teaching and learning, including in the use of new technologies and in order to better serve the needs of all learners, notably those with disabilities.

The forthcoming Commission initiative 'Opening up Education' will promote the creation of open educational resources and practices tailored to the needs of people with disabilities, combined with accreditation tools for online learning.

Through the future European Structural and Investment Funds, the European Union can offer financial support for the education and training of people with disabilities.

The Lifelong Learning and the Youth in Action programmes support learning mobility in different educational contexts. Specific supports are made available to people with disabilities to access such learning mobility opportunities. The Commission proposal Erasmus for All for a future programme in the field of education, training, youth and sport will continue this work after 2013.

The Commission financially supports EADSNE⁽¹⁾. EADSNE facilitates the collection, processing and transfer of European and national information on the education of pupils with disabilities. In 2011, in cooperation with Unesco's Institute for Information Technologies in Education, it published the review 'ICTs in Education for People with Disabilities -Review of innovative practice'.

⁽¹⁾ European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-003452/13
a Bizottság számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. március 27.)

Tárgy: Az INI-jelentés 56. pontjának kérdésköre a televíziós feliratozásról és jelnyelvi hozzáférésről

Mint ismeretes, a 2011 októberében elfogadott, a fogyatékosággal élő személyek mobilitásáról és befogadásáról, valamint a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékoságügyi stratégiáról szóló EP-jelentés (P7_TA(2011)0453) rögzíti, hogy az EU-ban csekély mértékben hozzáférhető a feliratozás és a jelnyelvi hozzáférés a televízióban (56. pont).

Milyen egyedi finanszírozási lehetőséget lát az Európai Bizottság ebben a kérdéskörben?

Milyen jó példákat látni Európában a feliratozás és a jelnyelvi tolmácsolás tekintetében a médiában?

Neelie Kroes válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. május 6.)

A Bizottság elismeri, hogy a feliratozás és a jelnyelv használatában nagy különbségek vannak a tagállamok között; egyes tagállamokban még mindig nagyon ritkák az ilyen szolgáltatások. A Bizottság továbbá elismeri, hogy az említett hozzáférhetőségi szolgáltatások gyenge elérhetőségének fő oka az, hogy a műsorszolgáltatóknak és az államoknak nem áll rendelkezésére elegendő forrás a szükséges infrastruktúra-beruházások és a személyzet képzésének fedezésére. A Bizottságnak van lehetősége a fogyatékkal élőket segítő szolgáltatásokra irányuló kutatási projektek támogatására, a feliratozási és jelnyelvi szolgáltatások tagállami nyújtásának támogatására rendelkezésre álló forrásai azonban korlátozottak.

A bizottsági szolgálatok értesülései szerint egyes tagállamok (Belgium, Szlovénia és Litvánia) államilag támogatják a hozzáférhetőségi szolgáltatások nyújtását.

A Bizottság ugyanakkor hangsúlyozni szeretné az e területen hatályban lévő uniós jogi eszközök, például az audiovizuális médiaszolgáltatásokról szóló irányelv (a 2010/13/EU irányelv) jelentőségét. Az irányelv 7. cikke komoly mértékben hozzájárult a tagállamokban kínált hozzáférhetőségi szolgáltatások számának növekedéséhez. Egyes tagállamokban, például az Egyesült Királyságban, Franciaországban és Hollandiában a főbb csatornák csaknem 100%-ban feliratozva sugározzák műsoraikat, ami kiemelkedő teljesítmény. A többi tagállam nem büszkélkedhet ilyen eredményekkel, azonban amint azt az audiovizuális médiaszolgáltatásokról szóló irányelv alkalmazására vonatkozó 2011. évi jelentés és az azt előkészítő nyomkövetési vizsgálat ⁽¹⁾, illetve a Nagyothallók Európai Szövetsége által készített felmérés ⁽²⁾ is megerősítette, az irányelv említett 7. cikke a szóban forgó tagállamokat is arra ösztökélte, hogy több intézkedést hozzanak a területen.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/avpolicy/docs/reg/tvwf/contact_comm/35_table_2.pdf

⁽²⁾ Az EFHOH jelentése: A feliratozási szolgáltatásokhoz való hozzáférés helyzete az EU-ban 2011-ben.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003452/13
to the Commission
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: The subject matter of point 56 of the INI report in relation to subtitling on television and the availability of sign language

As you know, the Parliament report adopted in October 2011 on the mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and on the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) states that the level of availability of subtitling and sign language on television in the EU is low (point 56).

What specific possibility of financing does the Commission see in this area?

What good examples are evident in Europe in terms of subtitling and sign-language interpreting in the media?

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

The Commission recognises that the state of subtitling and sign language varies a lot between Member States and in some of them is still very low. The Commission also acknowledges that the main factor contributing to the low quotas of these accessibility services is the lack of resources by the broadcasters and the state to support the investment in the necessary infrastructure and training of staff. However, while the Commission can fund research projects in the area of disability services, the possibilities it disposes of to fund the functioning of the subtitling and sign language services in the EU Member States are limited.

The Commission services are though aware that some Member States provide for state aid measures for the provision of accessibility services (Belgium, Slovenia, Lithuania).

At the same time, the Commission would like to emphasise the role played by EU instruments, such as the Audiovisual Media Services Directive (Directive 2010/13/EU). Article 7 of the AVMS has contributed substantially to the increase in the number of accessibility services offered by the Member States. Some of them, in particular the UK, France and the Netherlands are exemplary in the EU nearing 100% subtitling provision on their main channels. In other Member States the numbers are not so high but as confirmed by the monitoring exercise run by the Commission for the 2011 Application Report on AVMS Directive ⁽¹⁾, as well as the survey done by the European Federation of Hard of Hearing People ⁽²⁾, Article 7 AVMSD seemed an incentive for these Member States to do more in this area.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/avpolicy/docs/reg/tvwf/contact_comm/35_table_2.pdf

⁽²⁾ State of Subtitling access in the EU, 2011 Report by EFHOH.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-003453/13
a Bizottság számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. március 27.)

Tárgy: Az INI-jelentés 48. és 49. pontjainak kérdésköre a fogyatékkal élő emberek foglalkoztatásának rugalmasságáról és személyre szabottságáról

Mint ismeretes, a 2011 októberében elfogadott, a fogyatékossgal élő személyek mobilitásáról és befogadásáról, valamint a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékossgügyi stratégiáról szóló EP-jelentés (P7_TA(2011)0453) rögzíti, hogy szükség van a rugalmas foglalkoztatási formákra is a fogyatékossgal élő emberek foglalkoztatása terén (48-49. pontok).

Mit tett és mit kíván tenni az Európai Bizottság ezen a téren?

Továbbá hogyan kívánja az Európai Bizottság elérni, hogy a rugalmas foglalkoztatás ne járjon egyúttal a munkaerőpiacról és a közösségből való kiszorulással is?

Hogyan kívánja a Bizottság támogatni a személyre szabott foglalkoztatási formák változatosságát, azok elterjesztését?

Viviane Reding válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. június 4.)

A Bizottság megítélése szerint a rugalmas foglalkoztatási formák hozzájárulnak a fogyatékos személyek foglalkoztatásának növeléséhez. A Bizottság megbízásában készült egy tanulmány „Supported Employment for people with disabilities in the EU and EFTA-EEA” (A fogyatékos személyeknek szóló támogatott foglalkoztatás az EU és az EFTA–EGT országokban) címmel⁽¹⁾, és a Bizottság közreadta a tanulmány elkészítése során készült „Compendium of good practice” (Bevált gyakorlatok kézikönyve) című dokumentumot⁽²⁾ is. A 2010–2020 közötti időszakra szóló európai fogyatékossgügyi stratégiával összhangban a Bizottság azon dolgozik, hogy a megfelelő fellépésekben és politikákban érvényesítse a fogyatékossgal kapcsolatos kérdéseket. A Bizottság az Európa 2020 stratégia, valamint az európai szemeszter eljárásán keresztül – konkrétan az éves növekedési jelentés és a közös foglalkoztatási jelentés keretein belül – tesz lépéseket a fogyatékos személyek foglalkoztatásával kapcsolatban.

A nemrégiben elfogadott szociális beruházási csomagban⁽³⁾ a Bizottság a munkaerő-piaci részvételt akadályozó tényezőket felszámoló olyan szakpolitikák létrehozására és elfogadására szólít fel, amelyek kezelik az alulreprézantált munkavállalók speciális igényeit. Az aktív befogadásról szóló bizottsági ajánlás végrehajtására vonatkozó szolgálati munkadokumentum iránymutatással szolgál az olyan aktív munkaerő-piaci intézkedésekre vonatkozó holisztikus megközelítéssel kapcsolatban, amelyek segítenek csökkenteni a rugalmas foglalkoztatási formával élő munkavállalók munkaerő-piaci kirekesztésének kockázatát.

Az Európai Szociális Alap (ESZA) 2007–2013 közötti programozási időszakában⁽⁴⁾ összesen 2,4 milliárd EUR fordítható a foglalkoztatáshoz való egyenlő hozzáférés javítására. A 2014–2020 közötti időszakra szóló strukturális alapokra irányuló szabályozási csomag bizottsági tervezete a megkülönböztetés elleni küzdelmet és az egészségügyi és szociális szolgáltatások jobb elérhetőségét az ESZA társadalmi befogadásra vonatkozó tematikus célkitűzésének két beruházási prioritásként azonosítja. A Bizottság az ESZA források 20%-át e tematikus – a fogyatékos személyek foglalkoztatása szempontjából releváns – célkitűzés finanszírozására javasolta előíranyozni.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/cowi.final_study_report_may_2011_final_en.pdf

⁽²⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/supported_employment_study.compendium_good_practice_en.pdf

⁽³⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=hu&catId=1044&newsId=1807&furtherNews=yes>

⁽⁴⁾ Példa a tanulási nehézségekkel küzdő emberek munkavállalását megkönnyítő, egyénre szabott szolgáltatáshoz (Egyesült Királyság): <http://ec.europa.eu/esf/main.jsp?catId=46&langId=en&projectId=464>

Példa egyénre szabott, külföldi szakmai gyakorlathoz (Németország): <http://ec.europa.eu/esf/main.jsp?catId=46&langId=en&projectId=471>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003453/13
to the Commission
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: The subject matter of points 48 and 49 of the INI report in relation to providing flexible and individually tailored forms of employment for people with disabilities

As you know, the Parliament report adopted in October 2011 on the mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and on the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) states that flexible forms of employment are also needed when it comes to employing people with disabilities (points 48 and 49).

What action has the Commission taken and does it intend to take in this regard?

In addition, how does the Commission intend to prevent flexible employment from also going hand in hand with exclusion from the labour market and community?

How does the Commission intend to support the diversity and spread of individually tailored forms of employment?

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

The Commission considers flexible forms of employment helpful in increasing employment of persons with disabilities. It has financed a study on 'Supported Employment for people with disabilities in the EU and EFTA-EEA' ⁽¹⁾ and disseminated the Compendium of good practice ⁽²⁾ created during the study. In line with the EU Disability Strategy 2010-2020, the Commission is working to 'mainstream' disability into relevant actions and policies. In the framework of the EU 2020 strategy and European Semester process, notably in the Annual Growth Survey, and the Joint Employment Report we address employment of persons with disabilities.

In the recent Social Investment Package ⁽³⁾ the Commission calls for activation and enablement policies to overcome the barriers to labour market participation by addressing specific needs of underrepresented workers. The attached Staff Working Document on the implementation of our recommendation on active inclusion gives guidance on holistic approach to active labour market policies that will help to lessen the risk of exclusion from the labour market of those taking up flexible employment.

A total of 2.4 billion has been allocated to improve equal access to employment for the 2007-2013 programming period ⁽⁴⁾ of the European Social Fund (ESF). The Commission's proposal for the regulatory package on Structural Funds for 2014-2020 identifies combating discrimination and enhancing access to healthcare and social services as two investment priorities of ESF's social inclusion thematic objective. The Commission proposed allocating 20% of ESF funding to this thematic objective relevant to employment of persons with disabilities.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/cowi.final_study_report_may_2011_final_en.pdf

⁽²⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/supported_employment_study.compendium_good_practice_en.pdf

⁽³⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=1044&newsId=1807&furtherNews=yes>

⁽⁴⁾ Example of tailor-made service to get people with learning disabilities into work (United Kingdom):

<http://ec.europa.eu/esf/main.jsp?catId=46&langId=en&projectId=464>

Example of tailor-made abroad trainingship (Germany): <http://ec.europa.eu/esf/main.jsp?catId=46&langId=en&projectId=471>

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-003454/13
a Bizottság számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. március 27.)

Tárgy: Az INI-jelentés 39. pontjának kérdésköre a fogyatékkal élő emberek egészségügyi szolgáltatásokhoz való hozzáféréséről

Mint ismeretes, a 2011 októberében elfogadott, a fogyatékossgal élő személyek mobilitásáról és befogadásáról, valamint a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékossgügyi stratégiáról szóló EP jelentés (P7_TA(2011)0453) rögzíti, hogy az egészségügyi szolgáltatásokhoz való egyenlő hozzáférés hiányosságai alapvetőek (39. pont).

Mit tett és mit kíván tenni az Európai Bizottság, hogy felgyorsuljon azon ajánlások kidolgozása, amelyek támogatják az egészségügyi szolgáltatásokhoz, valamint az egészséget és az egészségügyi ellátást érintő információkhoz való egyenlő hozzáférést?

Tonio Borg válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. május 13.)

Az Európai Unió Alapjogi Chartájának ⁽¹⁾ 35. cikke előírja, hogy „a nemzeti jogszabályokban és gyakorlatban megállapított feltételek mellett mindenkinek joga van megelőző egészségügyi ellátás igénybevételéhez, továbbá orvosi kezeléshez”. Az egészségügyi ellátás ezen alapelvnek megfelelő megszervezése és nyújtása a tagállamok kizárólagos hatáskörébe tartozik, ezért ezen a területen az Európai Uniónak korlátozottan van joga a beavatkozásra.

A határokon átnyúló egészségügyi ellátás tekintetében uniós irányelv született a határon átnyúló egészségügyi ellátásra vonatkozó betegjogok érvényesítéséről ⁽²⁾, amelyet a tagállamoknak 2013. október 25-ig kell átültetniük, és amely előírja, hogy minden tagállamnak létre kell hoznia legalább egy nemzeti kapcsolattartó pontot. A nemzeti kapcsolattartó pontok feladata, hogy kérésre tájékoztassák a betegeket az egészségügyi ellátással kapcsolatos minőségi és biztonsági előírásokról és iránymutatásokról, a panasztételi eljárásokról és a jogorvoslati mechanizmusokról, valamint a vitarendezésre szolgáló lehetőségekről, beleértve a határon átnyúló egészségügyi ellátásból eredő károk esetét is.

⁽¹⁾ 2000/C 364/01

⁽²⁾ 2011/24/EU

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003454/13
to the Commission
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: The subject matter of point 39 of the INI report in relation to the access of people with disabilities to healthcare services

As you know, the Parliament report adopted in October 2011 on the mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and on the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) states that there is a basic lack of equal access to healthcare services (point 39).

What action has the Commission taken and does it intend to take to speed up its work on recommendations that will support equal access to healthcare services and to information on health and healthcare?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(13 May 2013)**

The Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union ⁽¹⁾ Article 35 stipulates that 'everyone has the right of access to preventive healthcare and the right to benefit from medical treatment', according to the conditions established by national laws and practices. The organisation and delivery of healthcare to apply such principle falls under the exclusive responsibility of the Member States and the European Union has limited legal base for intervention in this field.

As regards cross border healthcare, the EU Directive on the application of patients' rights in cross-border healthcare ⁽²⁾ due to be transposed by 25 October 2013, stipulates that each Member State shall designate at least one National Contact Point. The National Contact Point shall provide patients, on request, with information concerning standards and guidelines on quality and safety of healthcare, complaints procedures and mechanisms for seeking remedies, including options available to settle disputes in the event of harm arising from cross-border healthcare.

⁽¹⁾ 2000/C 364/01.
⁽²⁾ 2011/24/EU.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-003455/13
a Bizottság számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. március 27.)

Tárgy: Az INI-jelentés 35. pontjának kérdésköre a fogyatékkal élők európai mobilitási kártyájáról

Mint ismeretes, a 2011 októberében elfogadott, a fogyatékosággal élő személyek mobilitásáról és befogadásáról, valamint a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékoságügyi stratégiáról szóló EP-jelentés (P7_TA(2011)0453) rögzíti, hogy egy új, úgynevezett európai mobilitási kártyára lenne szükség, hogy a fogyatékos emberek könnyebben tanulhassanak, dolgozhassanak vagy vehessék igénybe a különböző ellátásokat, szolgáltatásokat (35. pont).

Mit tett és kíván tenni az Európai Bizottság ezen a téren?

Viviane Reding válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. május 27.)

A 2010–2020 közötti időszakra szóló európai fogyatékoságügyi stratégia ⁽¹⁾ 2010–2015 közötti intézkedéseinek ⁽²⁾ részeként a Bizottság vizsgálja a fogyatékosági igazolvány és az ahhoz kapcsolódó jogosultságok kölcsönös elismerésének lehetséges hatásait.

Az európai fogyatékoságügyi szakértők tudományos hálózata (ANED) által készített „*Disability Benefits and Entitlements in European Countries*” (Rokkantsági ellátások és jogosultságok az európai országokban) című tanulmány ⁽³⁾, valamint egy, az Európai Fogyatékosügyi Fórum (EDF) által készített tanulmány megállapításai nyomán a Bizottság információcserét szorgalmazott a tagállamok között valamint a fogyatékosággal foglalkozó magas szintű csoporton belül, legutóbb pl. 2013. április 24–25-én.

Az uniós tagállamok kellő érdeklődést tanúsítottak ahhoz, hogy a Bizottság projekt-munkacsoportot hozzon létre, amelyben az érdeklődő tagállamok és a civil társadalom képviselői egy többnemzetiségű igazolvány kibocsátásának és kezelésének gyakorlati kérdéseivel foglalkoznak majd.

A kölcsönösen elismert európai uniós fogyatékosági igazolvány létrehozása az uniós polgárságról szóló 2013. évi jelentésben ⁽⁴⁾ a Bizottság által előterjesztett kezdeményezések egyike.

A tervezett uniós fogyatékosági igazolványhoz kapcsolódó program a következő elveken alapulhatna: közös minta valamennyi részt vevő ország számára; viszonyosság; kölcsönös elismerés; a nemzeti kibocsátó szervezetek aktív részvétele és önfenntartás. Az igazolvány várhatóan a kultúra, szabadidős tevékenységek, sport, közlekedés és turizmus területén lesz érvényes, ahol felmutatásával kedvezmények lesznek igénybe vehetők.

⁽¹⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636:hu:NOT>

⁽²⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010SC1324:HU:NOT>

⁽³⁾ <http://www.disability-europe.net/content/aned/media/ANED%202010%20Task%207%20-%20Disability%20Benefits%20and%20Entitlements%20-%20Report%20-%20FINAL%20%282%29.pdf>

⁽⁴⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/justice/citizen/files/2013ecitizenshipreport_en.pdf

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003455/13
to the Commission
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: The subject matter of point 35 of the INI report in relation to the European Mobility Card for people with disabilities

As you know, the Parliament resolution adopted in October 2011 on the mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and on the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) states that a new 'European Mobility Card' would need to be adopted to make it easier for people with disabilities to study, work, or access the various benefits and services (point 35).

What action has the Commission taken and does it intend to take in this regard?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(27 May 2013)**

As part of the actions for 2010-2015 ⁽¹⁾ of the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 ⁽²⁾ the Commission is examining the implications of a mutual recognition of disability cards and related entitlements.

Based on the findings of a study on 'Disability Benefits and Entitlements in European Countries' ⁽³⁾ of the European Network of European Experts in Disability (ANED) and a study conducted by the European Disability Forum (EDF), the Commission has been promoting an exchange of information between Member States and within the High-Level Group on Disability, most recently on 24 and 25 April 2013.

The level of interest of the EU Member States has been sufficient for the Commission to initiate a project working group (PWG) where representatives of interested Member States and civil society will deal with practical details of issuing and managing a multinational card.

The development of a mutually recognised EU disability card is one of the actions put forward by the Commission in its EU Citizenship report 2013 ⁽⁴⁾.

The EU-model disability card scheme could be based on the following principles: a common model for all participating countries; reciprocity; mutual recognition; active engagement of the national issuing organisations and self-sustainability. The scope of the card is likely to be in the areas of culture, leisure, sport, transport and tourism, where benefits can be granted upon the presentation of the card.

⁽¹⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010SC1324:EN:NOT>

⁽²⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636:en:NOT>

⁽³⁾ <http://www.disability-europe.net/content/aned/media/ANED%202010%20Task%207%20-%20Disability%20Benefits%20and%20Entitlements%20-%20Report%20-%20FINAL%20%282%29.pdf>

⁽⁴⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/justice/citizen/files/2013ecitizenshipreport_en.pdf

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-003456/13
a Bizottság számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. március 27.)

Tárgy: Az INI-jelentés 34. pontjának kérdésköre a fogyatékkal élők gondozásában vállalt részvétel nyugdíjba való beszámíthatóságával kapcsolatban

Mint ismeretes, a 2011 októberében elfogadott, a fogyatékossggal élő személyek mobilitásáról és befogadásáról, valamint a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékossgügyi stratégiáról szóló EP-jelentés (P7_TA(2011)0453) kiemeli, hogy ösztönözni kell a tagállamokat, hogy társadalombiztosítási rendszerükben és nyugdíjazáskor ismerjék el a fogyatékossggal élő emberek gondozásában vállalt részvételt és ingyen végzett munkát (34. pont).

Mit tett és kíván tenni az Európai Bizottság ezen a téren?

Viviane Reding válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. június 21.)

A Bizottság a 2010–2020 közötti európai fogyatékossgügyi stratégia ⁽¹⁾ 2010–2015-re vonatkozó intézkedési tervében ⁽²⁾ vállalta, hogy a fogyatékossggal kapcsolatos szempontok figyelembevétele érdekében a nyugdíjakról szóló zöld könyvről épülő javaslatokat tesz. Az intézkedési terv emellett arra ösztönzi a tagállamokat, hogy a szociális védelem és társadalmi befogadás területén alkalmazott nyitott koordinációs módszer keretében foglalkozzanak a fogyatékossggal élő személyek helyzetével, és hozzanak intézkedéseket a fogyatékossg pénzügyi hatásainak ellentételezésére.

A Bizottság „A megfelelő, biztonságos és fenntartható európai nyugdíjak menetrendje” címmel 2012. februárjában közzétett fehér könyvben (COM(2012) 55 final) elismerte, hogy a férfiak és a nők nyugdíja közötti eltérés egyik oka az lehet, hogy a nők nagyobb mértékben vesznek részt gondozási tevékenységekben, és a nyugdíjkülönbség csökkentésének egyik módjaként ezért a gondozási jóváírást javasolta. Mindazonáltal a kérdés vizsgálata még tart, és nem korlátozódik a fogyatékossggal élő személyek gondozóira.

A fogyatékossggal élő idős személyek nem hivatalos gondozóinak támogatásával a szociális védelemmel foglalkozó bizottság is foglalkozhat, amelynek 2014 elejéig jelentést kell készítenie a tartós ápolás–gondozásról. E jelentésnek a Bizottság által februárban előterjesztett (COM(2013) 83 final) szociális beruházási megközelítéssel és a közleményt kísérő bizottsági szolgálati munkadokumentummal (ápolás–gondozás az idősödő társadalomban) ⁽³⁾ összhangban kiemelten kell foglalkoznia a tartós ápolás–gondozás iránti igény csökkentésének lehetőségeivel is. Az említett munkadokumentum kiemeli az ápolás–gondozás terén a koordináció javításában, a megelőzésben, a rehabilitációban és az új technológiák hasznosításában rejlő lehetőségeket. Az e lehetőségeket kiaknázó intézkedések jelentősen enyhíthetnék a hozzátartozók ápolás–gondozással kapcsolatos terheit, lehetővé tehetnék munkában maradásukat és csökkenthetnék a gondozók elégtelen szociális védelmének kockázatát.

⁽¹⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636:hu:NOT>

⁽²⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010SC1324:HU:NOT>

⁽³⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52013SC0041:HU:NOT>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003456/13
to the Commission**

Ádám Kósa (PPE)

(27 March 2013)

Subject: The subject matter of point 34 of the INI report in relation to the possibility of including involvement in caring for people with disabilities in the pension calculation

As you know, the Parliament report adopted in October 2011 on the mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and on the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) points out that Member States need to be encouraged to recognise, in their social security systems and when people retire, the involvement and unpaid work of carers of people with disabilities (point 34).

What action has the Commission taken and does it intend to take in this regard?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission

(21 June 2013)

The Commission has included in the list of actions for 2010-2015 ⁽¹⁾ of the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 ⁽²⁾ an undertaking to follow up on the Green Paper on pensions to take into account disability relevant aspects. The list of actions also includes encouraging Member States to address the situation of persons with disabilities in the Open Method of Coordination on Social Protection and Social Inclusion (SPSI) and to take measures to compensate the financial impact of disabilities.

The Commission's White Paper 'An Agenda for Adequate, Safe and Sustainable Pensions' of February 2012 (COM(2012) 55 final) acknowledged that one explanation of the gender gap in pensions is the greater involvement of women in caring activities and suggested looking at care credits as one way of reducing the gender pension gap. However, work on these issues is still in progress, and it is not limited to carers of people with disabilities.

Support for informal carers of elderly people with disabilities may also be addressed by the Social Protection Committee which is due to adopt a report on long-term care in early 2014. This report should also focus on possibilities for reducing the need for long-term care, in line with the social investment approach presented by the Commission in February (COM(2013) 83 final) and the Commission staff working paper on long-term care in ageing societies that accompanied the communication ⁽³⁾. This paper highlights the potential of better care coordination, prevention, rehabilitation and the use of new technologies in delivering care. Implementing such measures could significantly alleviate the care burden of relatives, allowing them to remain in employment and reduce the risk of inadequate social protection for care givers.

⁽¹⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010SC1324:EN:NOT>.

⁽²⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636:en:NOT>.

⁽³⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52013SC0041:EN:NOT>.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-003457/13
a Bizottság számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. március 27.)

Tárgy: Az INI-jelentés 18. pontjának kérdésköre a bentlakásos intézményben élő fogyatékos emberek kitagolásával kapcsolatos közösségi gondozásra való áttérés kapcsán

Mint ismeretes, a 2011 októberében elfogadott, a fogyatékosokkal élő személyek mobilitásáról és befogadásáról, valamint a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékosügyi stratégiáról szóló EP-jelentés (P7_TA(2011)0453) rögzíti, hogy a bentlakásos intézményben élő fogyatékos emberek kitagolásával kapcsolatosan a közösségi gondozásra kell egyre inkább áttérni (18. pont).

Az Európai Bizottság ezt hogyan és milyen formában tervezi elősegíteni, figyelemmel a tagállamok szűkös erőforrásaira és a bevált gyakorlatok alacsony szintjére?

Várható-e, hogy lesznek komplex és követhető fejlesztési példák (pl. turizmus, vidékfejlesztés, infrastruktúra, foglalkoztatás, képzési programok) a tagállamok számára a régi, nagy intézmények kiváltására?

Viviane Reding válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. május 27.)

A Bizottság először is szeretné a tisztelt Képviselő Úr figyelmébe ajánlani az E-002656/2013., az E-003264/2013. és az E-008559/2012. számú írásbeli kérdésre adott válaszait.

Nem léteznek olyan „fejlesztési példák”, melyeket kérdésében említ.

Ugyanakkor a fogyatékos személyek aktív befogadását és a szolgáltatások e személyek általi jobb elérhetőségét támogató politikák fontos szociális beruházások, amelyeket a szociális beruházási csomagról szóló bizottsági közlemény⁽¹⁾ is szorgalmaz. A Bizottság iránymutatással fog szolgálni a tagállamok számára az európai strukturális és beruházási alapok által támogatott szociális beruházások megvalósításával kapcsolatban. Emellett az intézményi ellátásról a közösségi ellátásra való áttéréssel foglalkozó európai szakértői csoport bevált módszereket is tartalmazó útmutatót és eszköztárat adott közre az európai alapoknak az intézményesítettség csökkentésére irányuló felhasználását illetően⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=hu&catId=1044&newsId=1807&furtherNews=yes>

⁽²⁾ <http://deinstitutionalisationguide.eu/>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003457/13
to the Commission
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: The subject matter of point 18 of the INI report in relation to the transition to community care as part of deinstitutionalising people with disabilities resident in institutions

As you know, the Parliament report adopted in October 2011 on the mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and on the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) states that the trend needs to continue towards the transition to community care as part of deinstitutionalising people with disabilities resident in institutions (point 18).

How and in what form does the Commission envisage promoting this trend, bearing in mind Member States' scarce resources and the low level of best practice?

Will there be ready-made development models (e.g. from tourism, rural development, infrastructure, employment, training programmes) which Member States can follow to challenge old, large institutions?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(27 May 2013)**

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-002656/2013, E-003264/2013 and E-008559/2012.

There are not 'development models' as referred to in the questions.

Nevertheless policies for active inclusion of and better access to services by disabled people are important social investments, also advocated by the Commission Communication's on the Social Investment Package⁽¹⁾. The Commission is going to provide Member States with guidance on how to carry out social investment by the European Structural and Investment Funds. Furthermore, the European Expert Group on the Transition from Institutional to Community-based Care has published its guidelines and a toolkit on the use of European funds for deinstitutionalisation, including best practices⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=1044&newsId=1807&furtherNews=yes>

⁽²⁾ <http://deinstitutionalisationguide.eu/>

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-003458/13
a Tanács számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. március 27.)

Tárgy: Az INI-jelentés 105. pontjának kérdésköre a jelynyelven való ügyintézés lehetőségéről

Mint ismeretes, a 2011 októberében elfogadott, a fogyatékosággal élő személyek mobilitásáról és befogadásáról, valamint a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékosággal élő személyek mobilitásáról és befogadásáról szóló EP jelentés (P7_TA(2011)0453) rögzíti, hogy a jelynyelv hivatalos elismertetése fontos lépés a siket és jelynyelvet használó személyek számára (105. pont). Számos tagállamban már hivatalosan is lehet ügyet intézni az államigazgatás és az igazságszolgáltatás területén jelynyelvvvel, míg több tagállamban nem.

Mikorra tervezik ennek felülvizsgálatát azon tagállamokban, amelyekben erre nincs lehetőség?

Készül-e egységes ajánlás a Tanácson belül ebben a kérdésben?

Válasz
(2013. május 28.)

A Tanács 2000/78/EK irányelve tiltja a valláson vagy meggyőződésen, *fogyatékoságon*, életkoron vagy szexuális irányultságon alapuló hátrányos megkülönböztetést a foglalkoztatás és a munkavégzés során ⁽¹⁾. A Bizottság 2008 júliusában elfogadott javaslata pedig olyan területekre terjeszti ki ezt a védelmet, amelyek még nem szerepelnek a 2000/78/EK irányelvben, azaz például az árukhoz és szolgáltatásokhoz való hozzáférés és azok nyújtása területére ⁽²⁾. Ez a javaslat nem tartalmaz a jelynyelvre történő kifejezett utalást. A javaslat tanácsi vizsgálata jelenleg folyamatban van ⁽³⁾.

A tisztelt képviselő minden bizonnyal emlékszik arra, hogy a Tanács 2009. november 26-án elfogadta a fogyatékosággal élő személyek jogairól szóló ENSZ-egyezménynek az Európai Közösség által történő megkötéséről szóló határozatot ⁽⁴⁾. Mára az EU és majdnem valamennyi tagállam részese a fogyatékosággal élő személyek jogairól szóló ENSZ-egyezménynek, amely úgy rendelkezik, hogy a részes államok „minden szükséges intézkedést megtesznek annak biztosítására, hogy a fogyatékosággal élő személyek másokkal azonos alapon, az általuk megválasztott kommunikációs formán keresztül gyakorolhassák a szólásszabadság és a véleménynyilvánítás szabadságának jogát, beleértve az információk és elgondolások keresésének, befogadásának és közlésének szabadságát, [...] beleértve a következőket: [...] legyen elfogadott és támogatott a jelynyelv [...]” ⁽⁵⁾.

A Tanács nem tett kifejezett lépéseket a jelynyelv elismerésének előmozdítása érdekében a tisztelt képviselő által hivatkozott európai parlamenti állásfoglalás szerint, mivel a jelynyelv hivatalos elismerése kizárólagosan tagállami hatáskörbe tartozó kérdés.

Egyelőre tehát a Tanács nem készít ezzel a területtel kapcsolatos ajánlást.

⁽¹⁾ A Tanács 2000/78/EK irányelve a foglalkoztatás és a munkavégzés során alkalmazott egyenlő bánásmód általános kereteinek létrehozásáról (HL L 303., 2000.12.2., 16. o., magyar nyelvű különkiadás, 5. fejezet, 4. kötet, 79. o.).

⁽²⁾ 11531/08 – javaslat – A Tanács irányelve a személyek közötti, vallásra vagy meggyőződésre, fogyatékoságra, életkorra vagy szexuális irányultságra való tekintet nélküli egyenlő bánásmód elvének alkalmazásáról.

⁽³⁾ Többek között a 16063/12 dokumentum.

⁽⁴⁾ A Tanács határozata a fogyatékosággal élő személyek jogairól szóló ENSZ-egyezménynek az Európai Közösség által történő megkötéséről (HL L 23., 2010.1.27., 35. o.).

⁽⁵⁾ 21. cikk, <http://www.un.org/disabilities/documents/natl/hungary.doc>

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003458/13
to the Council
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(27 March 2013)

Subject: The subject matter of point 105 of the INI report in relation to the possibility of using sign language in dealing with administrative matters

As you know, the Parliament report adopted in October 2011 on the mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and on the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) states that obtaining official recognition for sign language is an important step for deaf people and those who use sign language (point 105). It is already officially possible in many Member States to deal with administrative and judicial matters using sign language, while this is not the case in some Member States.

By when is this situation planned to be reviewed in those Member States which do not provide this option?

Is the Council preparing a common recommendation on this issue?

Reply
(28 May 2013)

Council Directive 2000/78/EC prohibits discrimination on the grounds of religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation as regards employment and occupation ⁽¹⁾. In July 2008, the Commission adopted a proposal that would extend the protection to cover areas not yet included in Directive 2000/78/EC, such as access to and supply of goods and services ⁽²⁾. This proposal does not contain any specific reference to sign language. The examination of this proposal is ongoing in the Council ⁽³⁾.

As the Honourable Member is certainly aware, on 26 November 2009 the Council adopted a decision concerning the conclusion, by the European Community, of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) ⁽⁴⁾. The EU and almost all the Member States are now parties to the UNCRPD, which provides that States Parties 'shall take all appropriate measures to ensure that persons with disabilities can exercise the right to freedom of expression and opinion, including the freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas on an equal basis with others and through all forms of communication of their choice, [...] including by accepting and facilitating the use of sign languages [...]' ⁽⁵⁾.

The Council has not taken specific action to promote the recognition of sign language as provided for in the European Parliament Resolution the Honourable Member refers to given that the official recognition of sign language is a matter that falls under the exclusive competence of the Member States.

For the time being, the Council is not preparing a recommendation in this area.

⁽¹⁾ Council Directive 2000/78/EC establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation, OJ L 303, 2.12.2000, p. 16.
⁽²⁾ 11531/08 — Proposal for a Council Directive on implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation.
⁽³⁾ 16063/12, *inter alia*.
⁽⁴⁾ Council Decision concerning the conclusion, by the European Community, of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, OJ L 23, 27.1.2010, p. 35.
⁽⁵⁾ Article 21, <http://www.un.org/disabilities/documents/convention/convoptprot-e.pdf>

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003461/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)**

Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Afeganistão — ponto da situação

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-6232/2009, o Conselho afirmou que «As Conclusões do Conselho e o Plano de Ação para o Afeganistão e o Paquistão, adotados em 27 de outubro de 2009, constituem o contexto para as atividades da UE na região e incluem uma avaliação geral da situação.» e que «A UE está pronta a colaborar de forma estreita com o Afeganistão, os Estados Unidos, os parceiros regionais e outros Parceiros da comunidade internacional na resolução dos desafios que o Afeganistão enfrenta.»

Assim, pergunto à Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante:

- Em que áreas principais tem a União Europeia colaborado mais estreitamente com o Afeganistão, os Estados Unidos, os parceiros regionais e outros Parceiros da comunidade internacional na resolução dos desafios que o Afeganistão enfrenta?
- Que avaliação faz desta colaboração?
- Como vê a presente situação no Afeganistão?
- Tem contacto com as autoridades afegãs?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(31 de maio de 2013)

O Afeganistão está a enfrentar um complexo e difícil período de transição. Embora tenham sido realizados progressos em muitos domínios, a situação continua a ser frágil e reversível, subsistindo grandes desafios. O êxito do apoio à transição e estabilização global irá provavelmente depender tanto dos elementos políticos, do processo de reconciliação e de paz e da consolidação do Estado a longo prazo, como das capacidades militares e paramilitares.

A cooperação com as autoridades afegãs e no seio da comunidade internacional é essencial para vencer estes desafios. A AR/VP subscreveu as prioridades estabelecidas no quadro de responsabilidade mútua de Tóquio (TMAF). Os principais domínios incluem eleições presidenciais abrangentes e transparentes com resultados legítimos; melhoria da gestão das finanças públicas; garantir que os progressos em matéria de direitos humanos, especialmente dos direitos das mulheres, são consolidados e prosseguidos; e prossecução da reforma do setor da justiça e o reforço do Estado de direito. A UE participa no grupo «5 + 3», a equipa principal que assegura a coordenação dos esforços da comunidade internacional para executar o TMAF.

A UE continuará a apoiar os esforços afegãos para reforçar o policiamento civil, e apoia um processo de reconciliação inclusivo e conduzido pelos afegãos conducente a uma resolução política coerente com as «linhas vermelhas» acordadas na Conferência de Bona. A UE continuará igualmente a apoiar a cooperação regional entre o Afeganistão e os seus vizinhos, tal como o processo de Istambul «Coração da Ásia», que prevê, nomeadamente, o reforço das capacidades regionais na gestão das fronteiras, na luta contra o tráfico de estupefacientes e na facilitação do comércio.

A AR/VP debate regularmente estas questões com o seu homólogo afegão e em reuniões bilaterais e multilaterais.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003461/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 March 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Afghanistan — state of play

In answer to my Question E-6232/2009, the Council stated that 'The Council conclusions and the action plan for Afghanistan and Pakistan, adopted on 27 October 2009, provide the context for EU activities in the region and include an overall assessment of the situation.' It added that 'The EU stands ready to work closely with Afghanistan, the United States and regional and other partners in the international community in addressing the challenges in Afghanistan.'

- In which key areas has the EU been working more closely with Afghanistan, the United States and regional and other partners in the international community in addressing the challenges in Afghanistan?
- What is the Vice-President/High Representative's assessment of this collaboration?
- How does she view the current situation in Afghanistan?
- Has she contacted the Afghan authorities?

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

Afghanistan faces a complex and difficult transition period. Although progress has been made in many areas, this remains fragile and reversible and major challenges persist. Success in supporting the overall transition and stabilisation will likely depend as much on the political elements, the reconciliation and peace process and longer term state-building, as on military and para-military capabilities.

Cooperation with the Afghan authorities and within the international community is essential for addressing these challenges. The HR/VP has endorsed the priorities set out in the Tokyo Mutual Accountability Framework (TMAF). Key areas include inclusive and transparent presidential elections with a legitimate outcome; improved public financial management; ensuring that human rights gains, especially women's rights, are consolidated and continued; and pursuing the reform of the justice sector and strengthening the rule of law. The EU participates in the '5+3' Group, the core team which coordinates the international community's efforts to implement the TMAF.

The EU will continue to support Afghan efforts to strengthen civilian policing, and supports an inclusive and Afghan-led reconciliation process leading to a political settlement consistent with the 'red lines' agreed at the Bonn Conference. The EU will also continue supporting the regional cooperation between Afghanistan and its neighbours, such as the Istanbul 'Heart of Asia' process which foresees inter alia the strengthening of regional capacities in border management, counter narcotics and trade facilitation.

The HR/VP raises these issues regularly with her Afghan counterpart and at bilateral and multilateral meetings.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003462/13

ao Conselho

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Afeganistão — ponto da situação

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-6232/2009, o Conselho afirmou que «As Conclusões do Conselho e o Plano de Ação para o Afeganistão e o Paquistão, adotados em 27 de outubro de 2009, constituem o contexto para as atividades da UE na região e incluem uma avaliação geral da situação.» e que «A UE está pronta a colaborar de forma estreita com o Afeganistão, os Estados Unidos, os parceiros regionais e outros Parceiros da comunidade internacional na resolução dos desafios que o Afeganistão enfrenta.»

Assim, pergunto ao Conselho:

- Em que áreas principais tem colaborado mais estreitamente com o Afeganistão, os Estados Unidos, os parceiros regionais e outros Parceiros da comunidade internacional na resolução dos desafios que o Afeganistão enfrenta?
- Que avaliação faz desta colaboração?
- Como vê a presente situação no Afeganistão?

Resposta

(9 de julho de 2013)

O Afeganistão atravessa atualmente um período de transição complexo e difícil. Embora tenham sido realizados progressos em numerosas áreas, estes permanecem frágeis e reversíveis, e persistem desafios de vulto. O êxito do apoio a uma transição e estabilização globais depende provavelmente tanto de aspetos políticos — o processo de paz e reconciliação e a construção do Estado a mais longo prazo — como de capacidades militares e paramilitares.

A cooperação com as autoridades afegãs e no âmbito da comunidade internacional é essencial para tentar responder a esses desafios. A Alta Representante e a Comissão subscreveram as prioridades definidas no Quadro de Responsabilidade Mútua de Tóquio. Entre as áreas essenciais contam-se: a realização de eleições presidenciais inclusivas e transparentes com resultados legítimos; uma melhor gestão financeira pública; a garantia de que os progressos em matéria de direitos humanos, nomeadamente em matéria de direitos das mulheres, serão consolidados e prosseguidos; e a prossecução da reforma do setor da justiça e o reforço do Estado de direito. A EU participa no Grupo «5+3», a equipa nuclear que coordena os esforços de implementação do Quadro de Responsabilidade Mútua de Tóquio pela comunidade internacional.

O Conselho continuará a apoiar os esforços do Afeganistão no sentido de reforçar o policiamento civil e apoia um processo de reconciliação inclusivo e liderado pelos afegãos conducente a uma resolução política consentânea com as «linhas vermelhas» acordadas na Conferência de Bona. O Conselho continuará igualmente a apoiar a cooperação regional entre o Afeganistão e os seus vizinhos, tal como o Processo de Istambul «Coração da Ásia», que prevê designadamente o reforço das capacidades regionais em matéria de gestão de fronteiras, de luta contra a droga e de facilitação do comércio.

A UE evoca periodicamente essas questões tanto com os seus homólogos afegãos como no âmbito de reuniões bilaterais e multilaterais.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003462/13
to the Council
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 March 2013)

Subject: Afghanistan — state of play

In answer to my Question E-6232/2009, the Council stated that 'The Council conclusions and the action plan for Afghanistan and Pakistan, adopted on 27 October 2009, provide the context for EU activities in the region and include an overall assessment of the situation.' It added that 'The EU stands ready to work closely with Afghanistan, the United States and regional and other partners in the international community in addressing the challenges in Afghanistan.'

- In which key areas has the EU been working more closely with Afghanistan, the United States and regional and other partners in the international community in addressing the challenges in Afghanistan?
- What is the Council's assessment of this collaboration?
- How does it view the current situation in Afghanistan?

Reply
(9 July 2013)

Afghanistan is facing a complex and difficult transition period. Although progress has been made in many areas, it remains fragile and reversible and major challenges persist. Success in supporting the overall transition and stabilisation are likely to depend as much on the political elements — the reconciliation and peace process and longer term state-building- as on military and para-military capabilities.

Cooperation with the Afghan authorities and within the international community is essential for addressing these challenges. The High Representative and the Commission have endorsed the priorities set out in the Tokyo Mutual Accountability Framework (TMAF). Key areas include: inclusive and transparent presidential elections with a legitimate outcome; improved public financial management; ensuring that human rights gains, especially women's rights, are consolidated and continued; and pursuing the reform of the justice sector and strengthening the rule of law. The EU participates in the '5+3' Group, the core team which coordinates the international community's efforts to implement the TMAF.

The Council will continue to support Afghan efforts to strengthen civilian policing and it supports an inclusive and Afghan-led reconciliation process leading to a political settlement consistent with the 'red lines' agreed at the Bonn Conference. The Council will also continue to support the regional cooperation between Afghanistan and its neighbours, such as the Istanbul 'Heart of Asia' process which foresees inter alia the strengthening of regional capacities in border management, counter narcotics and trade facilitation.

The EU raises these issues regularly both with its Afghan counterparts and at bilateral and multilateral meetings.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003463/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Fundos de capital de risco transfronteiras — Ponto da situação

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-0175/2010, o senhor Comissário Algirdas Šemeta declarou, em nome da Comissão, que «A UE necessita de um setor de capital de risco dinâmico, que seja capaz de fornecer capitais próprios para financiar a fase inicial da atividade das PME inovadoras e de crescimento rápido. Contudo, as potencialidades do mercado do capital de risco da UE continuam a ser subaproveitadas, devido, essencialmente, aos vários entraves aos investimentos de capital de risco transfronteiras. A Comissão criou um grupo de peritos, em maio de 2007, para identificar os obstáculos fiscais transfronteiras nesta área e as soluções possíveis. O relatório do grupo e as reações recebidas serão integrados no trabalho da Comissão tendo em vista realizar um verdadeiro mercado único de capitais de risco.»

1. Que medidas concretas adotou a Comissão destinadas a promover o maior aproveitamento das potencialidades do mercado do capital de risco da UE?
2. Nomeadamente, como pretende a Comissão reduzir os vários entraves aos investimentos de capital de risco transfronteiras?
3. Que entraves foram identificados e que soluções foram apresentadas pelo grupo de peritos? Quais destas últimas foram efetivamente postas em prática e com que resultados?

Resposta dada por Algirdas Šemeta em nome da Comissão
(27 de maio de 2013)

Resposta conjunta aos pontos 1 e 2. A Comissão contribuiu para um melhor quadro jurídico para os investimentos de capital de risco transfronteiras na UE, prestando simultaneamente apoio financeiro ao mercado. O Conselho e o Parlamento Europeu adotaram recentemente um Regulamento relativo aos fundos europeus de capital de risco ⁽¹⁾, com base numa proposta da Comissão. O regulamento prevê para todos os gestores de fundos de capitais de risco um passaporte europeu de comercialização, que permite o acesso a investidores aptos em toda a UE. Além disso, o FEI ⁽²⁾, através do Programa-Quadro para a Competitividade e a Inovação, investe em fundos de capital de risco, que investem em PME em fase de arranque e de crescimento. Vários desses fundos investem além-fronteiras. Os próximos programas «COSME» ⁽³⁾ e «Horizonte 2020», atualmente em fase de negociação com os legisladores, continuarão a disponibilizar apoio financeiro.

3. O relatório do grupo de peritos relativo à tributação dos fundos de capital de risco ⁽⁴⁾ identificou dois problemas fiscais principais e apresentou as soluções correspondentes, destinadas a evitar a dupla tributação. Propôs que um gestor de fundos de capital de risco não deva ser considerado como criando uma «presença tributável» no país em que é efetuado o investimento e que os Estados-Membros da UE cheguem a acordo quanto a um sistema de reconhecimento mútuo da classificação fiscal dos fundos de capital de risco. A Comissão apresentou o relatório às autoridades fiscais dos Estados-Membros que, de um modo geral, não consideram que exista uma necessidade urgente de se adotar uma iniciativa da UE. Por conseguinte, a Comissão lançou uma consulta pública ⁽⁵⁾ para obter elementos que comprovem que estes problemas fiscais surgem efetivamente na prática. Dado que a Comissão recebeu poucas respostas, está atualmente a estudar a melhor forma de abordar os eventuais obstáculos fiscais à atividade de capital de risco, sem facilitar a fraude e a evasão fiscais.

⁽¹⁾ Regulamento (UE) n.º 345/2013 do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 17 de abril de 2013, relativo aos fundos europeus de capital de risco.

⁽²⁾ Fundo Europeu de Investimento.

⁽³⁾ Programa para a Competitividade das Empresas e PME para o período de 2014-2020.

⁽⁴⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/taxation/company_tax/initiatives_small_business/venture_capital/tax_obstacles_venture_capital_en.pdf

⁽⁵⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/taxation/company_tax/initiatives_small_business/venture_capital/index_en.htm

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003463/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Cross-border venture capital funds — state of play

In answer to my Question E-0175/2010, Commissioner Šemeta stated on behalf of the Commission that 'the EU needs a dynamic venture capital industry that is capable of providing early-stage equity financing innovative high-growth SMEs. However, the EU Venture Capital market still works below its potential, mainly because of the various obstacles that exist to cross-border Venture Capital investments. The Commission set up the Expert group in May 2007 to identify the cross-border tax obstacles in this area and possible solutions. The report and the reactions it receives will feed into the Commission's work that is designed to achieve a true Single Market for Venture Capital'.

1. What concrete action has the Commission taken to help the EU venture capital market better fulfil its potential?
2. In particular, how does the Commission intend to reduce the various obstacles to cross-border venture capital investments?
3. What obstacles has the expert group identified and what solutions has it proposed? Which solutions have actually been implemented and with what results?

**Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(27 May 2013)**

1 and 2. The Commission has contributed to a better legal framework for cross border venture capital investment in the EU whilst also providing financial support to the market. The Council and European Parliament recently adopted a regulation on European Venture Capital Funds ⁽¹⁾, on the basis of a Commission proposal. This regulation provides all managers of qualifying venture capital funds with a European marketing passport allowing access to eligible investors across the EU. In addition, the EIF ⁽²⁾, through the Commission's Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme, invests in risk capital funds which invest in SMEs at the start-up and growth stage. Several of these funds invest across borders. The forthcoming COSME ⁽³⁾ and Horizon 2020 programmes, currently under negotiation with the co-legislators, will continue the financial support.

3. The Venture Capital Tax Expert Group's Report ⁽⁴⁾ identified two main tax problems and corresponding solutions aimed at preventing double taxation. It proposed that a venture capital fund manager should not be considered as creating a taxable presence in the country into which the investment is made and that EU Member States should agree on a mutual recognition of the tax classification of venture capital funds. The Commission presented the report to Member States' tax authorities which generally did not see an urgent need for EU action. The Commission therefore launched a public consultation ⁽⁵⁾ to obtain evidence that these tax problems actually arise in practice. As it received few replies it is currently exploring how best to address any tax obstacles to cross-border venture capital activity while not facilitating tax avoidance and evasion.

⁽¹⁾ Regulation (EU) No 345/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 April 2013 on European Venture Capital Funds.

⁽²⁾ European Investment Fund.

⁽³⁾ Commission's Programme for the Competitiveness of enterprises and SMEs, 2014-2020.

⁽⁴⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/taxation/company_tax/initiatives_small_business/venture_capital/tax_obstacles_venture_capital_en.pdf

⁽⁵⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/taxation/company_tax/initiatives_small_business/venture_capital/index_en.htm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003464/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: IVA — apoio às PME

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-0175/2010, o senhor Comissário Algirdas Šemeta declarou, em nome da Comissão, que, «em matéria de IVA, a Comissão apresentou várias propostas de apoio às PME. Entre as medidas adotadas, destacam-se as seguintes:

- conceder aos Estados-Membros o direito de fixarem um limiar até 100 000 euros, abaixo do qual as empresas possam estar isentas de IVA;
- autorizar os Estados-Membros a aplicarem um regime facultativo de contabilidade de caixa, no caso das empresas com um volume de negócios inferior a 2 milhões de euros, de modo a não serem obrigadas a liquidar o IVA às administrações fiscais enquanto o não receberem dos seus clientes;
- estabelecer um procedimento de reembolso eletrónico para o IVA devido num Estado-Membro diferente daquele onde a empresa está estabelecida (Diretiva 2008/9/CE do Conselho);
- permitir que os Estados-Membros apliquem, de forma permanente, taxas reduzidas a certos serviços locais de mão-de-obra intensiva, particularmente importantes para as PME, nomeadamente os serviços de hotelaria. Quanto a este último ponto, no seguimento do acordo político alcançado em 10 de março de 2009, o Conselho adotou a Diretiva 2009/47/CE.»

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

- Que avaliação faz da adoção das medidas por parte dos Estados-Membros?
- Que impacto concreto tiveram nas respetivas economias?
- Que problemas encontrou na sua aplicação? Que soluções apresenta para os mesmos?

Resposta dada por Algirdas Šemeta em nome da Comissão
(13 de maio de 2013)

A proposta da Comissão de conceder aos Estados-Membros o direito a fixarem um limiar até 100 000 euros, abaixo do qual as empresas podem estar isentas de IVA, data de 2004 ⁽¹⁾. Os Estados-Membros ainda não alcançaram qualquer acordo a este respeito.

O Comité do IVA recebeu comunicações de quatro Estados-Membros no que diz respeito à aplicação de um regime facultativo de contabilidade de caixa ⁽²⁾, sendo que dois deles aplicam o limiar até 2 milhões de euros ⁽³⁾ de volume anual de negócios e os outros dois o limiar até 500 000 euros.

Devido a alguns problemas levantados pelas empresas quanto à aplicação do procedimento eletrónico de reembolso do IVA ⁽⁴⁾ pelos Estados-Membros, a Comissão propôs uma alteração para introduzir medidas de implementação por forma a lidar com esses problemas ⁽⁵⁾. Contudo, os Estados-Membros não alcançaram um acordo nesta matéria. A Comissão criou um Grupo de Projeto Fiscalis que identificou e propôs soluções para todos os problemas pendentes. O trabalho do projeto foi aprovado pelo Comité Permanente de Cooperação Administrativa em outubro de 2012 e a Comissão entende que estes problemas estão resolvidos.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2004) 728.

⁽²⁾ Nos termos do artigo 167.º-A da Diretiva IVA.

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/taxation/vat/key_documents/vat_committee/2012_notifications.pdf

⁽⁴⁾ Nos termos da Diretiva 2008/9/CE do Conselho.

⁽⁵⁾ COM(2010) 381.

A Diretiva do IVA ⁽⁶⁾ fornece aos Estados-Membros a opção de aplicar taxas de IVA reduzidas aos produtos enumerados no Anexo III da dita Diretiva. Assim, cabe a cada Estado-Membro decidir, tendo em conta os seus objetivos orçamentais, sociais e outros objetivos estratégicos, se deve ou não aplicar taxas de IVA reduzidas a serviços locais ⁽⁷⁾ e avaliar depois se as estratégias foram alcançadas.

Os Estados-Membros em causa são quem melhor pode avaliar o impacto económico das medidas acima referidas.

⁽⁶⁾ Diretiva 2006/112/CE do Conselho, de 28 de novembro de 2006, relativa ao sistema comum do imposto sobre o valor acrescentado — JO L 347 de 11.12.2006, p. 1 — Pode igualmente obter informações gerais sobre o IVA no seguinte endereço:

http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/taxation/vat/how_vat_works/rates/index_en.htm

⁽⁷⁾ Diretiva 2009/47/CE do Conselho, de 5 de maio de 2009, que altera a Diretiva 2006/112/CE no que diz respeito às taxas reduzidas do imposto sobre o valor acrescentado, JO L 116 de 9.5.2009, p.18.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003464/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
 (27 March 2013)

Subject: VAT — support for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs)

In answer to my Question E-0175/2010, Commissioner Šemeta stated on behalf of the Commission that 'in the area of VAT the Commission has made various proposals to help SMEs. Amongst the measures taken, the most notable involve:

- allowing Member States the right to set a threshold of up to EUR 100 000 below which businesses can be exempt from VAT;
- allowing Member States to apply an optional cash accounting scheme for businesses with a turnover below EUR 2 000 000, so that those businesses do not have to pay VAT to the tax authorities before they have received VAT from their customers;
- setting up an electronic refund procedure for VAT incurred in Member States where the business is not established (Council Directive 2008/9/EC);
- allowing Member States to permanently apply reduced rates to certain labour intensive local services particularly important for SMEs, including restaurant and catering services. In this last respect, following its political agreement of 10 March 2009, the Council adopted Directive 2009/47/EC.'

How well does the Commission think the Member States have implemented these measures?

What concrete impact have the measures had on their respective economies?

What problems has the Commission encountered in the implementation of the measures? How does it propose to solve these problems?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
 (13 May 2013)

The Commission's proposal on giving Member States the right to set a threshold of up to EUR 100 000 below which businesses can be exempt from VAT dates from 2004 ⁽¹⁾. No agreement has yet been reached by Member States.

The VAT Committee has received notice from four Member States regarding the application of an optional cash accounting scheme ⁽²⁾, of which two apply the threshold of annual turnover up to EUR 2 000 000 ⁽³⁾ and two up to EUR 500 000.

Because some issues had been raised by businesses on the Member States' implementation of the electronic VAT refund procedure ⁽⁴⁾ the Commission proposed an amendment to introduce implementing measures to deal with these problems ⁽⁵⁾. However Member States could not agree to this proposal. The Commission set up a Fiscalis Project Group which listed and proposed solutions to all outstanding problems. The work of the project group was approved by the Standing Committee on Administrative Cooperation in October 2012, and the Commission understands that those problems have now been resolved.

The VAT Directive ⁽⁶⁾ provides Member States with the option to apply reduced VAT rates to the supplies listed in Annex III of that directive. It is therefore up to each Member State to decide, in view of its budgetary, social and other policy objectives, whether or not to apply reduced VAT rates on local services ⁽⁷⁾ and to assess afterwards whether the policy objectives have been achieved.

The respective Member States are best suited to evaluate the economic impact of the abovementioned measures.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2004) 728.

⁽²⁾ In accordance with Article 167a of the VAT Directive.

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/taxation/vat/key_documents/vat_committee/2012_notifications.pdf

⁽⁴⁾ In accordance with Council Directive 2008/9/EC.

⁽⁵⁾ COM(2010) 381.

⁽⁶⁾ Council Directive 2006/112/EC of 28 November 2006 on the common system of VAT — OJ L 347, 11.12.2006, p. 1 — General information about VAT can also be found at: http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/taxation/vat/how_vat_works/rates/index_en.htm

⁽⁷⁾ Council Directive 2009/47/EC of 5 May 2009 amending Directive 2006/112/EC as regards reduced rates of VAT — OJ L 116, 09.05.2009, p.18.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003465/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Tributação dos produtos energéticos — ponto da situação

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-0175/2010, o senhor Comissário Algirdas Šemeta declarou, em nome da Comissão, que «Para evitar o risco de estratégias fiscais divergentes e sub-otimizadas a nível nacional em matéria de CO₂, suscetíveis de criar distorções da concorrência entre empresas localizadas em diferentes Estados-Membros, a Comissão estudará a possibilidade de apresentar uma proposta de revisão da diretiva relativa à tributação dos produtos energéticos nos próximos meses.»

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

- Quais as conclusões do estudo que pretendia desenvolver acerca da possibilidade de apresentar uma proposta de revisão da diretiva relativa à tributação dos produtos energéticos?
- Quando pretende apresentar a referida proposta?
- Pode adiantar alguns dos seus pontos principais?

Resposta dada por Algirdas Šemeta em nome da Comissão

(15 de maio de 2013)

A Comissão apresentou a sua proposta de revisão da Diretiva da Tributação da Energia (Diretiva 2003/96/CE) em 13 de abril de 2011 [COM(2011) 169 final].

A revisão tem por objetivo reestruturar o modo de tributação da energia e garantir o bom funcionamento do mercado interno no contexto dos objetivos e compromissos assumidos em prol de uma economia com baixas emissões de carbono e eficiente em termos energéticos.

Os principais elementos da proposta incluem: a introdução de uma distinção explícita entre a tributação da energia especificamente relacionada com as emissões de CO₂ (tributação relacionada com o CO₂) e a tributação da energia com base no teor energético dos produtos (tributação geral do consumo de energia); assegurar um tratamento equitativo sustentável das fontes de energia renováveis e sustentáveis e eliminar a duplicação das normas e a carga fiscal suplementar incidentes sobre as empresas abrangidas pelo Regime de Comércio de Licenças de Emissão da UE.

A proposta está sujeita ao processo legislativo especial e está atualmente a ser debatida no Conselho.

O Comité Económico e Social Europeu emitiu o seu parecer formal em novembro de 2011. O Parlamento Europeu foi consultado e adotou um parecer em abril de 2012.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003465/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Energy taxation — state of play

In answer to my Question E-0175/2010, Commissioner Šemeta stated on behalf of the Commission that 'to avoid the risk of diverging and sub-optimal national CO₂ tax strategies that might create distortions in competition between firms located in different Member States, the Commission will consider a proposal to revise the Energy Taxation Directive in the coming months.'

- What were the conclusions of the study the Commission intended to conduct regarding a possible proposal to revise the Energy Taxation Directive?
- When will the Commission present the aforementioned proposal?
- Can it set out some of the main points of the proposal?

**Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(15 May 2013)**

The Commission presented its proposal for a revision of the Energy Taxation Directive (Directive 2003/96/EC) on 13 April 2011 (COM(2011) 169 final).

The revision aims to restructure the way in which energy is taxed and ensure the proper functioning of the internal market within the context of objectives and commitments to progress to a low-carbon and energy-efficient economy.

The main elements of the proposal include introducing an explicit distinction between energy taxation specifically linked to CO₂-emissions (CO₂-related taxation) and energy taxation based on the energy content of the products (general energy consumption taxation); ensuring fair treatment of sustainable renewable energy sources and removing double regulation and additional tax burden on companies falling under the EU Emission Trading System.

The proposal is subject to the special legislative procedure and is currently under discussion in the Council.

The European Economic and Social Committee gave its formal opinion in November 2011. The European Parliament has been consulted and adopted an opinion in April 2012.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003466/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Fórum Conjunto da UE em matéria de Preços de Transferência (JTPF)

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-0175/2010, o senhor Comissário Algirdas Šemeta declarou, em nome da Comissão, que «o Fórum Conjunto da UE em matéria de Preços de Transferência (JTPF) investiga atualmente os problemas específicos que se colocam às PME em matéria de cumprimento de formalidades ligadas aos preços de transferência.»

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

- Quais as principais conclusões resultantes da investigação?
- Quais os problemas específicos identificados pelo JTPF?
- Que soluções propõe para os mesmos?

Resposta dada por Algirdas Šemeta em nome da Comissão

(22 de maio de 2013)

Em 2011, o Fórum Conjunto da UE em matéria de Preços de Transferência (FCPT) adotou um Relatório sobre as pequenas e médias empresas e os preços de transferência que examina os desafios que as pequenas e médias empresas (PME) enfrentam na União Europeia em matéria de preços de transferência e apresenta recomendações concretas. Em 2012, o relatório foi publicado como parte de uma Comunicação da Comissão ⁽¹⁾ e mereceu um acolhimento favorável da parte do Conselho ⁽²⁾. Todos os documentos estão disponíveis no sítio Web do FCPT ⁽³⁾.

O relatório reconhece as necessidades específicas das PME em matéria de conformidade das regras relativas aos preços de transferência. As PME carecem muitas vezes de conhecimentos e experiência sobre o assunto e possuem recursos limitados. Isso pode dissuadir as PME de se lançarem em operações comerciais transfronteiriças intragrupo.

O relatório apresenta várias recomendações sobre como melhorar o ambiente no qual as PME operam relativamente a pré-auditorias, auditorias e resolução de litígios. Para a fase de pré-auditoria, o relatório recomenda facilitar o acesso das PME à informação relevante e a pareceres de peritos, assim como aos procedimentos que lhes permitam obter antecipadamente alguma segurança jurídica (acordos prévios sobre os preços de transferência). Para a fase de auditoria, o relatório recomenda o desenvolvimento de medidas de simplificação que permitam reduzir a carga que a conformidade representa para as PME. Caso as PME sejam auditadas, devem ser objeto de tratamento adequado. No domínio da resolução de litígios, o relatório recomenda, por um lado, incentivar a resolução célere de litígios de valor reduzido e não complexos das PME e, por outro, explorar e aplicar o contacto direto entre auditores no âmbito dos procedimentos de acordo mútuo e da Convenção de Arbitragem ⁽⁴⁾.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2012) 516 final de 19.9.2012.

⁽²⁾ Conclusões do Conselho relativas ao Fórum Conjunto da UE em matéria de Preços de Transferência, 3 205.^a reunião do Conselho «Assuntos Económicos e Financeiros» de 4.12.2012.

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/taxation/company_tax/transfer_pricing/forum/

⁽⁴⁾ Convenção relativa à eliminação da dupla tributação em caso de correção de lucros entre empresas associadas, JO L 225 de 20.8.1990, p. 10.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003466/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: EU Joint Transfer Pricing Forum (JTPF)

In answer to my Question E-0175/2010, Commissioner Šemeta, on behalf of the Commission, said that 'the EU Joint Transfer Pricing Forum (JTPF) is currently investigating whether SMEs are faced with particular problems in complying with transfer pricing formalities'.

- What were the main outcomes of this investigation?
- What particular problems did the JTPF identify?
- What solutions does it propose for these problems?

**Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(22 May 2013)**

In 2011 the EU Joint Transfer Pricing Forum (JTPF) adopted a Report on Small and Medium Enterprises and Transfer Pricing which examines the challenges Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) in the European Union are facing in transfer pricing and offers concrete recommendations. In 2012 the report was published as part of a Commission Communication ⁽¹⁾ and was welcomed by the Council ⁽²⁾. All documents are available on the webpage of the JTPF ⁽³⁾.

The report recognises the particular needs of SMEs as regards compliance with transfer pricing rules. SMEs often lack knowledge and experience on the subject and have limited resources. This may impede SMEs from engaging in intra-group cross-border trading.

The report gives various recommendations on how to improve the environment in which SMEs operate with respect to pre-audit, audit and dispute resolution. For the pre-audit stage the report recommends facilitating the access of SMEs to relevant information and expert advice, also as regards procedures for advance certainty (Advance Pricing Agreements). For the audit stage the report recommends developing simplification measures to reduce the compliance burden for SMEs. When SMEs are audited, they should receive proportionate treatment. In the area of dispute resolution the report recommends encouraging fast track dispute resolution for non-complex low value SME claims and exploring and implementing auditor-to-auditor contacts in the framework of Mutual Agreement Procedures and the Arbitration Convention ⁽⁴⁾.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2012) 516 final, 19.9.2012.

⁽²⁾ Council conclusions on the EU Joint Transfer Pricing Forum, 3205th Economic and Financial Affairs Council meeting, 4.12.2012.

⁽³⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/taxation/company_tax/transfer_pricing/forum/

⁽⁴⁾ Convention on the elimination of double taxation in connection with the adjustment of profits of associated enterprises, OJ L 225, 20.8.1990, p. 10.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003467/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Fortalecimento da cooperação com o Brasil em termos energéticos

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-000799/2013, o senhor Comissário Günther Oettinger declarou, em nome da Comissão, que «A cooperação com o Brasil no domínio da energia, discutida por ocasião do IV Diálogo UE-Brasil sobre Política Energética (22 de janeiro de 2013) abrange prioritariamente os seguintes temas: cooperação em matéria de sustentabilidade dos biocombustíveis e biomassa no âmbito de um grupo técnico para a elaboração de normas, atividades conjuntas de investigação e desenvolvimento no domínio das energias renováveis e da eficiência energética (particularmente no setor da construção, rotulagem e normas aplicáveis aos produtos consumidores de energia), intercâmbio de informações em reuniões de peritos sobre as questões relacionadas com os mercados da eletricidade, segurança da exploração de gás e petróleo offshore e gás não convencional.»

Não obstante, a minha pergunta versava não sobre o elenco dos temas abrangidos pela cooperação, mas antes sobre as formas e meios concretos de a fortalecer.

Assim, pergunto novamente à Comissão:

De que formas e através de que meios concretos tenciona fortalecer a cooperação com o Brasil em termos energéticos?

Resposta dada por Günther Oettinger em nome da Comissão

(16 de maio de 2013)

No Diálogo sobre Energia que teve lugar em 22 de janeiro de 2013, o Brasil e os representantes da UE acordaram:

- Prosseguir as consultas bilaterais relativas à legislação da UE e do Brasil no domínio da sustentabilidade dos biocombustíveis, nomeadamente no que diz respeito à abordagem das questões relacionadas com as alterações indiretas do uso dos solos (ILUC) e os prados com elevado nível de biodiversidade;
- Apoiar o trabalho da Parceria Global para a Bioenergia (GBEP)⁽¹⁾ sobre o desenvolvimento da energia produzida a partir da madeira de uma forma moderna e sustentável conforme proposto na última Reunião do Comité Diretor GBEP em novembro de 2012;
- Nomear dois pontos focais para proceder ao acompanhamento da cooperação trilateral com vista a futuras atividades de doação em prol de países terceiros como o Quênia;
- Convidar a indústria e representantes de organismos públicos do Brasil a participarem nas respetivas plataformas tecnológicas no âmbito do Programa-Quadro de Investigação da UE;
- Reforçar as atividades conjuntas em matéria de investigação e tecnologia entre o Brasil e a UE, em especial nos seguintes domínios: eficiência energética nos edifícios, energia solar fotovoltaica, energia solar concentrada, energia eólica e rotulagem energética dos produtos;
- Estabelecer relações de cooperação e organizar reuniões técnicas entre os respetivos reguladores de energia;
- Organizar uma videoconferência entre serviços da Comissão e do Ministério das Relações Externas do Brasil responsáveis pela exploração *offshore*, a fim de debater questões relativas à segurança das atividades *offshore* e
- Designar pontos focais para o intercâmbio de informações sobre a evolução e os quadros regulamentares no domínio do gás não convencional.

(¹) <http://www.globalbioenergy.org/>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003467/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Enhancing cooperation with Brazil in the field of energy

In answer to my Question E-000799/2013, Commissioner Oettinger stated on behalf of the Commission that 'The cooperation with Brazil in the field of energy as discussed at the Fourth EU-Brazil Energy Policy Dialogue (22 January 2013) covers the following topics as priorities: cooperation on the sustainability of biofuels and biomass through a joint technical group on standards, joint R&D activities in the field of renewable energy and energy efficiency (particularly in the building sector and labelling and standards for energy using products), exchange of information through expert meetings on the issues related to electricity markets, gas and oil offshore safety and non-conventional gas.'

However, my question did not concern the list of topics covered by cooperation, but rather the practical ways and means of enhancing it.

How in practical terms does the Commission plan to enhance cooperation with Brazil in the field of energy?

**Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(16 May 2013)**

At the Energy Dialogue on 22 January 2013 Brazil and the EU representatives agreed to:

- continue bilateral consultations on the EU and Brazilian legislation on biofuel sustainability, including on addressing the issues related to Indirect Land Use Change (ILUC) and High Biodiversity Grasslands (HBG);
- support the work of the Global Bioenergy Partnership ⁽¹⁾ (GBEP) on sustainable modern wood energy development proposed during the last GBEP Steering Committee Meeting in November 2012;
- appoint two focal points to follow up trilateral cooperation with a view to future donation activities for third countries such as Kenya;
- invite Brazilian industry and representatives of public bodies to get involved in the respective technology platforms within the EU Framework Programme for Research;
- reinforce joint activity in research and technology issues between Brazil and the EU, particularly in the following fields: energy efficiency in buildings, solar photo-voltaic power, concentrated solar power, wind energy and energy-labelling of products;
- establish cooperation links and organise technical meetings between the respective energy regulators;
- organise a videoconference between services in charge of offshore at the Commission and the Ministry of External Relations of Brazil to discuss off-shore safety issues; and
- appoint focal points to exchange information on developments and regulatory frameworks on non-conventional gas.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.globalbioenergy.org/>.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003468/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Matéria coletável comum consolidada do imposto sobre as sociedades (CCCTB) — ponto da situação

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-0175/2010, o senhor Comissário Algirdas Šemeta declarou, em nome da Comissão, que «A redução dos obstáculos fiscais que atualmente se colocam às empresas e o bom funcionamento do mercado interno estão no centro das prioridades da Comissão.» e que, «Neste contexto, a Comissão tenciona lançar um novo olhar sobre a questão da matéria coletável comum consolidada do imposto sobre as sociedades (CCCTB), pois acredita que o regime poderá ser eficaz no combate aos muitos obstáculos fiscais com que as empresas se deparam no mercado interno.»

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

- Em que medida se tem concretizado o «novo olhar» que a Comissão pretendia lançar sobre a questão?
- Qual o ponto da situação quanto à CCCTB?
- Quais as principais prioridades da mesma?

Resposta dada por Algirdas Šemeta em nome da Comissão

(15 de maio de 2013)

No que diz respeito à primeira pergunta, a Comissão adotou uma proposta de Diretiva do Conselho relativa à matéria coletável comum consolidada do imposto sobre as sociedades (Mcccis) em 16 de março de 2011.

No que diz respeito à segunda pergunta, desde 2011, os debates no grupo de trabalho do Conselho levaram a cabo uma análise, artigo por artigo, dos elementos técnicos desta proposta. No relatório Ecofin apresentado ao Conselho Europeu de 6 de dezembro de 2012, alguns Estados-Membros expressaram objeções substanciais à proposta relativa à Mcccis, enquanto outros Estados-Membros manifestaram reservas sobre aspetos específicos. Alguns Estados-Membros solicitaram um debate de orientação relativo a futuras medidas a tomar. A Presidência Irlandesa está a tratar deste assunto e reportará os progressos ao Conselho Ecofin em junho de 2013.

No que diz respeito à terceira pergunta, existe um consenso generalizado entre os Estados-Membros sobre a condução do trabalho técnico passo a passo, incidindo numa primeira fase, nas questões relativas ao cálculo da matéria coletável. Da reunião do Ecofin em junho deverá resultar um relatório geral a apresentar ao Conselho Europeu.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003468/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Common Consolidated Corporate Tax Base (CCCTB) — state of play

In answer to my Question E-0175/2010, Commissioner Šemeta stated on behalf of the Commission that '[t]he reduction of tax obstacles which companies currently suffer from and the proper functioning of the internal market lie at the very heart of the priorities which the Commission has set for itself' and that '[i]n the light of this, the Commission is planning to have a fresh look at the Common Consolidated Corporate Tax Base (CCCTB), as it believes that the scheme can effectively tackle many of the tax obstacles that companies suffer in the internal market.'

- How far has the Commission got with the 'fresh look' it was going to have at this issue?
- What is the state of play with the CCCTB?
- What are the major priorities for the CCCTB?

**Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(15 May 2013)**

As regards the first question, the Commission adopted a proposal for a Council directive on a Common Consolidated Corporate Tax Base (CCCTB) on 16 March 2011.

As regards the second question, since 2011 discussions in the Council working group have involved an article-by-article examination of the technical elements of this proposal. In the Ecofin report to the European Council of 6 December 2012, some Member States expressed substantial objections to the CCCTB proposal, while some Member States had specific reservations. A number of Member States asked for an orientation debate on the future steps to take. The Irish Presidency is addressing this issue and is expected to report back on progress to Ecofin in June 2013.

As regards the third question, there is a general consensus amongst Member States to conduct the technical work on a step-by-step basis, concentrating in the first instance on issues related to the calculation of the tax base. The June Ecofin meeting is expected to submit an overall report to the European Council.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003469/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Novo espírito empresarial europeu

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-0175/2010, o senhor Comissário Algirdas Šemeta declarou, em nome da Comissão, que «a Comissão trabalhará no sentido de desenvolver um novo espírito empresarial a nível europeu, apoiando o crescimento das PME e o seu potencial de internacionalização.»

Assim, pergunta-se à Comissão:

- Quais os principais elementos do novo espírito empresarial a nível europeu que pretende desenvolver?
- Que medidas tomou ou prevê tomar a este respeito?
- Que resultados está em condições de apresentar a este respeito?

Resposta dada por Antonio Tajani em nome da Comissão

(16 de maio de 2013)

Em janeiro de 2013, a Comissão adotou o Plano de Ação «Empreendedorismo 2020», que constitui um apelo à ação conjunta a todos os níveis — europeu, nacional, regional e até mesmo local, conforme apropriado — por forma a reativar a cultura empreendedora por toda a Europa. Os três pilares do plano de ação visam:

- incluir o ensino e a prática do empreendedorismo nos programas escolares,
- criar um ambiente no qual os empresários possam desenvolver-se e prosperar, incluindo a redução do tempo necessário para o arranque de uma empresa, obter as devidas licenças e autorizações e concluir os processos de falência, e
- introduzir programas de orientação, aconselhamento e apoio a mulheres, seniores, trabalhadores migrantes, desempregados e potenciais empresários, bem como criar modelos positivos de empresários.

O texto completo do plano de ação, incluindo uma lista detalhada das ações a serem tomadas pela Comissão e daquelas que os Estados-Membros são convidados a realizar, encontra-se no seguinte endereço eletrónico:

<http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/promoting-entrepreneurship/>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003469/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: New European enterprise culture

In answer to my Question E-0175/2010, Commissioner Šemeta stated on behalf of the Commission that 'the Commission will work to develop a new enterprise culture in Europe, supporting SMEs' growth and their internationalisation potential.'

- What are the main features of the new enterprise culture that the Commission intends to develop in Europe?
- What action has it taken or does it intend to take in this regard?
- What results can it mention in this regard?

**Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(16 May 2013)**

In January 2013, the Commission adopted the Entrepreneurship 2020 Action Plan, which is a call for joint action at all levels — European, national, regional and even local, as appropriate — to reignite entrepreneurship culture across Europe. The three action pillars of the action plan focus on:

- including entrepreneurship education and experience in school curricula,
- creating an environment where entrepreneurs can flourish and grow, including reducing the time it takes to start up a business, obtain the necessary licenses and permits and complete bankruptcy procedures, and
- outreach, mentoring, advice and support schemes for women, seniors, migrants, the unemployed and other potential entrepreneurs, as well as creating positive role models of entrepreneurs.

The complete text of the action plan, including a detailed listing of actions to be taken by the Commission and those which the Member States are invited to address, may be found at:

<http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/promoting-entrepreneurship/>

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003470/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Tributação dos rendimentos da poupança e Cooperação administrativa em matéria de tributação

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-0175/2010, o senhor Comissário Algirdas Šemeta declarou, em nome da Comissão, que «O funcionamento equilibrado e correto do mercado interno e a existência de condições mais equitativas poderão também ser facilitados através da oportuna adoção, pelo Conselho, das propostas apresentadas pela Comissão no sentido da alteração da diretiva relativa à tributação dos rendimentos da poupança e de uma nova diretiva relativa à cooperação administrativa em matéria de tributação bem como, no plano externo, do acordo antifraude com o Liechtenstein e da concessão, pelo Conselho, de um mandato para a Comissão negociar acordos de cooperação antifraude e no domínio fiscal com outros quatro países europeus não membros da UE.»

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

- Que acolhimento obtiveram as propostas apresentadas pela Comissão no sentido da alteração da diretiva relativa à tributação dos rendimentos da poupança e de uma nova diretiva relativa à cooperação administrativa em matéria de tributação?
- Qual o ponto de situação nesta matéria?

Resposta dada por Algirdas Šemeta em nome da Comissão

(21 de maio de 2013)

A Diretiva 2011/16/UE do Conselho, relativa à cooperação administrativa no domínio da fiscalidade ⁽¹⁾, foi formalmente adotada pelo Conselho Ecofin de 15 de fevereiro de 2011. Além disso, em 6 de dezembro de 2012, a Comissão adotou um regulamento que estabelece as normas de execução da diretiva ⁽²⁾. O regulamento estabelece formulários normalizados e meios de comunicação a utilizar pelos Estados-Membros para o intercâmbio de informações.

A diretiva e o regulamento entraram em vigor em 1 de janeiro de 2013, com exceção das disposições relativas ao intercâmbio automático de informações em cinco categorias de rendimento e capitais. Estas disposições são aplicáveis a partir de 1 de janeiro de 2015. A Comissão anunciou que apresentaria uma proposta no sentido de alargar o âmbito de aplicação do intercâmbio automático de informações, a fim de garantir que, de futuro, todos os rendimentos relevantes são incluídos.

Embora a proposta da Comissão de alteração da diretiva relativa à poupança goze de um apoio substancial a nível do Conselho desde 2009, a sua adoção foi bloqueada devido à posição de dois Estados-Membros. Atendendo ao inequívoco movimento de apoio ao intercâmbio automático de informações, a Comissão considera que existe hoje a dinâmica necessária para avançar, e insiste junto dos ministros das finanças da UE para que cheguem rapidamente a acordo quanto à alteração da diretiva relativa à poupança e ao mandato associado de reforçar, em conformidade, a cooperação existente com a Suíça, o Liechtenstein, Andorra, Mónaco e São Marinho.

⁽¹⁾ Diretiva 2011/16/UE do Conselho, de 15 de fevereiro de 2011, relativa à cooperação administrativa no domínio da fiscalidade e que revoga a Diretiva 77/799/CEE (JO L 64 de 11.3.2011, p.1).

⁽²⁾ Regulamento de Execução (UE) n.º 1156/2012 da Comissão, de 6 de dezembro de 2012, que fixa as normas de execução de certas disposições da Diretiva 2011/16/UE do Conselho relativa à cooperação administrativa no domínio da fiscalidade.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003470/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Savings Taxation Directive and administrative cooperation in the field of taxation

In answer to my Question E-0175/2010, Commissioner Šemeta stated on behalf of the Commission that '[a] smooth and fair functioning of the internal market and a better level playing field could also be facilitated through the timely adoption by the Council of the Commission proposals for amending the Savings Taxation Directive and for a new directive on administrative cooperation in the field of taxation and, externally, through the anti-fraud agreement with Liechtenstein and the adoption by the Council of a mandate to the Commission for negotiating anti-fraud and tax cooperation agreements with four other non-EU European countries.'

- How have the Commission proposals for amending the Savings Taxation Directive and for a new directive on administrative cooperation in the field of taxation been received?
- What is the state of play on this issue?

**Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(21 May 2013)**

Council Directive 2011/16/EU on administrative cooperation in the field of taxation ⁽¹⁾ was formally adopted by the Ecofin Council of 15 February 2011. Furthermore, on 6 December 2012 the Commission adopted a regulation laying down detailed rules implementing the directive ⁽²⁾. The regulation sets out standard forms and means of communication to be used by Member States when they exchange information.

The directive and the regulation became applicable on 1 January 2013, with the exception of the provisions relating to automatic exchange of information on five categories of income and capital. Those provisions will apply from 1 January 2015. The Commission has announced that it will make a proposal to further extend the scope of automatic exchange of information to ensure that all relevant income is covered in the future.

The Commission's proposal to amend the Savings Directive is substantially agreed at Council level since 2009, but its adoption has been blocked because of the position of two Member States. In view of the clear groundswell of support for automatic exchange of information, the Commission believes that the momentum for progress is there and urges the EU Finance Ministers to come quickly to an agreement on the amended savings directive and on the associated mandate to enhance accordingly the existing cooperation with Switzerland, Liechtenstein, Andorra, Monaco and San Marino.

⁽¹⁾ Council Directive 2011/16/EU of 15 February 2011 on administrative cooperation in the field of taxation and repealing Directive 77/799/EEC (OJ L64 of 11.03.2011, p. 1).

⁽²⁾ Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1156/2012 of 6 December 2012 laying down detailed rules for implementing certain provisions of Council Directive 2011/16/EU on administrative cooperation in the field of taxation.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003471/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Seca na Europa

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-6073/2009, a senhora Comissária Mariann Fischer Boel declarou, em nome da Comissão, que «A análise feita pela Comissão no contexto do Livro Branco sobre a adaptação às alterações climáticas e do documento de trabalho que o acompanha relativo à Agricultura (“Adaptação às alterações climáticas: um desafio para a agricultura e as zonas rurais europeias”) mostra que é provável que, nos próximos anos, o tipo de condições descritas pelo Senhor Deputado se tornem mais frequentes devido às alterações climáticas.

Por conseguinte, é importante que as autoridades nacionais e regionais tomem medidas para começarem a planear a adaptação à mudança de condições e aproveitem as oportunidades oferecidas pelo Regulamento do Desenvolvimento Rural para apoiar ações de adaptação ao nível agrícola.»

1. Para além das medidas que deverão ser tomadas a nível nacional e regional, atendendo à gravidade da situação, pretende a Comissão tomar medidas a nível europeu no mesmo sentido?
2. Tem havido adesão significativa às ações de adaptação ao nível agrícola no quadro do Regulamento do Desenvolvimento Rural?
3. Dispõe a Comissão de dados quanto ao número de pedidos recebidos e efetivamente concedidos neste âmbito?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloș em nome da Comissão

(14 de maio de 2013)

Nos termos do Exame de Saúde da PAC e do Plano de Relançamento da Economia Europeia de 2008, os Estados-Membros/regiões da UE planearam gastar pelo menos 700 milhões de euros na atenuação das alterações climáticas e na adaptação às mesmas. Este valor representa 14 % do financiamento adicional disponibilizado pelo Exame de Saúde da PAC e pelo Plano de Relançamento da Economia Europeia. No entanto, este facto não dá uma ideia precisa das despesas relacionadas com as alterações climáticas suportadas pelo orçamento do desenvolvimento rural no seu conjunto, que devem ser substancialmente superiores.

De acordo com as propostas da Comissão para uma política de desenvolvimento rural pós 2013 ⁽¹⁾, a atenuação das alterações climáticas e a adaptação às mesmas constituem «objetivos transversais», dos quais determinados aspetos estarão fortemente presentes nas «prioridades» mais pormenorizadas dessa política. Além disso, será criado um sistema de seguimento para estimar a proporção dos gastos da PAC em objetivos ligados às alterações climáticas.

A Comissão apresentou recentemente uma estratégia da UE para a adaptação às alterações climáticas e um livro verde sobre os seguros contra catástrofes naturais, a fim de assegurar a preparação para essas catástrofes. A Comissão continuará a apoiar os Estados-Membros e as regiões nos seus esforços para adotar e aplicar políticas de adaptação. Além disso, a Comissão está atualmente a melhorar os indicadores para monitorizar o impacto do financiamento da PAC.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2011) 627 final/2 de 19.10.2011.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003471/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Drought in Europe

In answer to my Question E-6073/2009, Commissioner Fischer Boel stated on behalf of the Commission that 'The Commission's analysis in the context of the White Paper on adapting to climate change and its accompanying Working Document on Agriculture ("Adapting to climate change: the challenge for European agriculture and rural areas"), shows that it is likely that during the coming years the type of conditions described in the Honourable Member's question will become more frequent because of climatic changes.

It is, therefore, important that national and regional authorities take measures to start planning for adaptation to the changing conditions, and make use of the opportunities offered by the Rural Development Regulation to support adaptation actions at farm level.'

1. In view of the seriousness of the situation, will the Commission take EU-level measures in addition to those that should be taken at national and regional level?
2. Has there been significant uptake of the farm-level adaptation actions under the Rural Development Regulation?
3. Does the Commission have any figures for the number of applications received and actually approved in this area?

**Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission
(14 May 2013)**

Under the terms of the CAP Health Check and the European Economic Recovery Plan (EERP) of 2008, EU Member States / regions planned to spend at least EUR 700 million on mitigating climate change and adapting to it. This figure represents 14% of the additional funding made available by the Health Check and the EERP. However, this fact does not provide an accurate view of spending on climate change from the rural development budget as a whole, which must be substantially higher.

According to the Commission's proposals for a post-2013 rural development policy ⁽¹⁾, mitigating and adapting to climate change will be 'cross-cutting objectives', and aspects of these objectives will be strongly present in the policy's more detailed 'priorities'. Furthermore, a tracking system will be set up for estimating the proportion of CAP spending devoted to climate change objectives.

The Commission has recently put forward an EU Strategy on adaptation and a green paper on promoting insurance in the context of natural disasters to enhance preparedness for these events. The Commission will continue supporting Member States and regions in their efforts to adopt and implement adaptation policies. Moreover, the Commission is currently improving the indicator base for monitoring the impact of CAP funding.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2011) 627 final/2 of 19.10.2011.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003472/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Procuradoria de Justiça Europeia — proposta

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-011263/2012, a senhora Comissária Viviane Reding declarou, em nome da Comissão, que, quanto à Procuradoria de Justiça Europeia, «O Presidente José Manuel Barroso confirmou no seu discurso no Parlamento Europeu sobre o estado da União 2012 que a Comissão apresentará uma proposta em 2013.

A Comissão está atualmente a realizar as necessárias consultas e trabalhos preparatórios tendo em vista a preparação de uma proposta. Os trabalhos preparatórios ainda não estão concluídos.»

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

Está em condições de informar sobre quais as consultas que já foram realizadas e quando pretende concluir os trabalhos preparatórios e apresentar a referida proposta?

Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão
(3 de junho de 2013)

Em 2012, foram publicados dois questionários sobre a proteção dos interesses financeiros da UE e a criação da Procuradoria de Justiça Europeia (EPPO), para distribuição, respetivamente, aos profissionais da justiça e ao público em geral. A Comissão recebeu um grande número de respostas pormenorizadas.

Por outro lado, em 2012 e no início de 2013 tiveram lugar uma série de debates e reuniões a nível europeu, como a reunião da rede dos representantes dos Ministérios Públicos ou instituições equivalentes junto dos Tribunais Supremos dos Estados-Membros ou a conferência «A Blueprint for the European Public Prosecutor's Office». Além disso, a Comissão organizou uma reunião de consulta com os procuradores-gerais e altos responsáveis do Ministério Público dos diferentes Estados-Membros. A Comissão discutiu ainda diversas questões relacionadas com uma eventual reforma do Eurojust e a criação de uma EPPO com a participação de representantes dos Estados-Membros. A 10.ª conferência dos procuradores encarregados da luta contra a fraude, organizada pelo OLAF (novembro de 2012), constituiu uma oportunidade para explorar as formas como os procuradores nacionais poderão vir a interagir com a EPPO, caso venha a ser criada. As consultas informais aos representantes dos advogados (CCBE e ECBA) incidiram nas garantias processuais de que beneficiam os suspeitos e delas resultaram recomendações úteis. A reunião do Grupo de Peritos da Comissão sobre a Política Penal Europeia ⁽¹⁾ permitiu a recolha de diversos pontos de vista sobre a criação da EPPO.

Além disso, durante o segundo semestre de 2012, realizaram-se ainda diversas reuniões bilaterais de concertação com as autoridades dos Estados-Membros.

Tendo em conta os resultados de todas essas consultas, a Comissão tenciona apresentar uma proposta em 2013.

⁽¹⁾ O grupo de peritos foi criado em 2011, no seguimento da Comunicação da Comissão «Rumo a uma política da UE em matéria penal: assegurar o recurso ao direito penal para uma aplicação efetiva das políticas da UE» [COM(2011) 573]. A missão do grupo consiste na análise das questões jurídicas associadas ao direito penal substantivo.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003472/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: European Public Prosecutor's Office — proposal

In answer to my Question on the European Public Prosecutor's Office, E-011263/2012, Commissioner Reding stated on behalf of the Commission that 'President Barroso has confirmed in his 2012 state of the Union speech before the European Parliament that the Commission will present a proposal in 2013.

The Commission is currently conducting the necessary consultations and preparatory works in view of preparing a proposal. The preparatory works are not yet finalised.'

Can the Commission say what consultations have already been conducted and when it expects to finalise the preparatory works and present the aforementioned proposal?

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

In 2012 two questionnaires on the protection of the EU's financial interest and the establishment of the European Public Prosecutor's Office (EPPO) were published and distributed respectively to justice professionals and the general public. A large number of detailed replies were sent to the Commission.

In addition, throughout 2012 and early 2013, a number of discussions and meetings took place at European level, such as the meeting of the network of Public Prosecutors or equivalent institutions at the Supreme Judicial Courts of the Member States and the Conference 'A Blueprint for the European Public Prosecutor's Office'. Moreover, the Commission organised a consultation meeting with Prosecutors General and Directors of Public Prosecution from Member States. The Commission also discussed issues relating to a possible reform of Eurojust and to the setting up of an EPPO with representatives of Member States. The 10th OLAF Conference of Fraud Prosecutors (November 2012) was an opportunity to explore the ways in which national prosecutors would interact with the EPPO, if set up. The informal consultation held with defence lawyers (CCBE and ECBA) looked at procedural safeguards for suspects and made useful recommendations. The meeting of the Commission Expert Group on European Criminal Policy ⁽¹⁾ allowed the collection on different views on the establishment of the EPPO.

Also, numerous bilateral consultation meetings with Member States' authorities took place in the second half of 2012.

Taking into account the results of all those consultations, the Commission intends to present a proposal in 2013.

⁽¹⁾ The expert group has been set up in 2011 and follows up to the Commission Communication 'Towards an EU Criminal Policy — Ensuring the effective implementation of EU policies through criminal law' (COM(2011) 573). The task of the group is to focus on legal issues of substantive criminal law.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003473/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Impacto de produtos farmacêuticos no ambiente

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-010860/2012, o senhor Comissário Janez Potočnik declarou, em nome da Comissão, que «a Comissão está atualmente a examinar o significado dos vários problemas associados à presença de produtos farmacêuticos no ambiente e tenciona apresentar um relatório sobre a matéria em 2013. Está em curso um estudo para fundamentar o relatório.»

1. Que problemas conseguiu a Comissão já identificar associados à presença de produtos farmacêuticos no ambiente?
2. Que entidade desenvolve o estudo referido?

Resposta dada por Janez Potočnik em nome da Comissão

(21 de maio de 2013)

O estudo ainda não está concluído. Por conseguinte, é prematuro tecer comentários sobre as suas conclusões. A Comissão tenciona publicar o relatório assim que estiver finalizado.

O estudo está ser realizado por um consultor externo, a BIO Intelligence Services.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003473/13
to the Commission**

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(27 March 2013)

Subject: Environmental impact of pharmaceuticals

In answer to my Question E-010860/2012, Commissioner Potočnik stated on behalf of the Commission that 'the Commission is currently examining the significance of various problems related to the presence of pharmaceuticals in the environment and intends to report on the matter in 2013. A study to underpin the report is underway.'

1. What problems has the Commission managed to find so far as regards the presence of pharmaceuticals in the environment?
2. Which body is conducting the aforementioned study?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission

(21 May 2013)

The study has not yet been finalised. It is therefore premature to report on the findings. The Commission intends to publish the report as soon as it is ready.

The study is being performed by an external consultant, BIO Intelligence Services.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003474/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Açores — Recursos cinegéticos para fins turísticos

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-000596/2013, o senhor Comissário Johannes Hahn declarou, em nome da Comissão, que «Medidas e projetos relacionados com os recursos cinegéticos deverão igualmente respeitar a legislação prevista pela UE».

A que legislação se refere a Comissão?

Resposta dada por Janez Potočnik em nome da Comissão

(22 de maio de 2013)

A incidência e a elegibilidade das despesas dos Fundos Estruturais são determinadas pelo Regulamento Disposições Comuns e pelos regulamentos relativos a cada um dos fundos para o período de 2014-2020, isto é, o Fundo Europeu de Desenvolvimento Regional, o Fundo Social Europeu, o Fundo de Coesão, o Fundo Europeu Agrícola de Desenvolvimento Rural e o Fundo Europeu dos Assuntos Marítimos e da Pesca, que ainda estão neste momento em negociação ⁽¹⁾; a legislação temática da UE que pode ser aplicável neste domínio é a Diretiva Aves ⁽²⁾ e a Diretiva Habitats ⁽³⁾.

⁽¹⁾ As propostas de regulamentos podem ser descarregadas em:
http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/what/future/proposals_2014_2020_en.cfm#1

⁽²⁾ Diretiva 2009/147/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 30 de novembro de 2009, relativa à conservação das aves selvagens (versão codificada).

⁽³⁾ Diretiva 92/43/CEE do Conselho, de 21 de maio de 1992, relativa à preservação dos habitats naturais e da fauna e da flora selvagens, JO L 206 de 22.7.1992.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003474/13
to the Commission**

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(27 March 2013)

Subject: The Azores — game resources for tourism purposes

In answer to my Question E-000596/2013, Commissioner Hahn stated on behalf of the Commission that ‘measures and projects related to game resources will also need to abide by the relevant provisions of EU legislation.’

To what legislation is the Commission referring?

Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission

(22 May 2013)

While the focus and eligibility of Structural Funds’ expenditure is determined by the Common Provisions Regulation and the relevant Fund-specific regulations for 2014-2020, i.e. European Regional Development Fund, European Social Fund, Cohesion Fund, European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund, which are currently still under negotiation ⁽¹⁾, thematic EU legislation that could be relevant in this field is the Birds Directive ⁽²⁾ and the Habitats Directive ⁽³⁾.

⁽¹⁾ The proposals for regulations can be downloaded at: http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/what/future/proposals_2014_2020_en.cfm#1

⁽²⁾ Council Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds (codified version).

⁽³⁾ 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.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003475/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Assistência às PME no Mercosul

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-00795/2013, o senhor Comissário Karel De Gucht declarou, em nome da Comissão, que «No que respeita ao apoio às pequenas e médias empresas (PME), a Comissão está a estudar a possibilidade de instituir um serviço de assistência às PME no domínio dos direitos de propriedade intelectual na região do Mercosul, e procede atualmente à identificação de dois projetos para a América Latina, ao abrigo do Instrumento dos Países Industrializados (IPI+). Um projeto visa apoiar a criação de um centro de conhecimento e o outro a prestação de serviços de apoio às empresas, designadamente, às PME.»

1. Quando pretende a Comissão apresentar as conclusões do estudo que presentemente desenvolve?
2. Como se processa a identificação dos projetos referidos? Quando tenciona a Comissão concluí-la?

Resposta dada por Karel De Gucht em nome da Comissão

(24 de maio de 2013)

1. A Comissão está a preparar na América Latina, um «Centro de Informação do Conhecimento» e uma «Rede de Serviços de Apoio a empresas europeias» financiados pelo Instrumento dos Países Industrializados (IPI +), com um orçamento previsto de 4 milhões de euros para cada projeto. Foi recentemente realizada uma missão de identificação de projetos para as duas possíveis ações e as conclusões serão incluídas na apresentação dos projetos numa reunião do Comité IPI + no segundo semestre de 2013. Ambos os projetos começarão em 2014.

2. A Comissão está a preparar, na região do Mercosul, um *Helpdesk* para as PME sobre Direitos de Propriedade Intelectual (DPI) financiado no âmbito do Programa de Competitividade e Inovação (PCI), com um orçamento previsto de 0,6 milhões de euros. O projeto foi aprovado pelo Comité do Programa de Empreendedorismo e Inovação em 15 março de 2012. Foi lançado um convite à apresentação de propostas em 26 de fevereiro de 2013, e devendo ter início em 1 de julho de 2013, por um período de 18 meses. O projeto irá abranger o Brasil e, opcionalmente, outros países do Mercosul (e Chile). Irá fornecer os seus serviços através de um sítio Web completo, conselhos específicos e ações de sensibilização apropriadas.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003475/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Assistance for Mercosur SMEs

In answer to my Question E-00795/2013, Commissioner De Gucht stated on behalf of the Commission that 'As regards support to small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), the Commission is exploring the possibility of setting up a Helpdesk for SMEs on Intellectual Property Rights in the Mercosur region, and is in the process of identifying two projects for Latin America under the Industrialised Countries Instrument (ICI+). One project would support the creation of a Knowledge Centre and the other would provide business support services, particularly to SMEs.'

1. When does the Commission intend to present the conclusions of the study it is currently conducting?
2. How is it identifying the aforementioned projects? When does the Commission intend to have identified them?

**Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(24 May 2013)**

1. The Commission is preparing a 'Knowledge Information Centre' and a 'European Business Support Services Network' in Latin America funded by the Industrialised Countries Instrument (ICI+) with a foreseen budget of EUR 4 million for each project. A project identification mission for both possible actions has recently been performed and the conclusions will be included in the presentation of both projects at an ICI+ Committee meeting in the second semester 2013. Both projects would start in 2014.

2. The Commission is preparing a Helpdesk for SMEs on Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) in the Mercosur region funded under the Competitiveness and Innovation Programme (CIP) with a foreseen budget of EUR 0.6 million. The project was approved by the Entrepreneurship and Innovation Programme Committee on 15 March 2012. A call for proposals has been launched on 26 February 2013 and should start on 1 July 2013 for 18 months. The project will cover Brazil and optionally other Mercosur countries (and Chile). It will provide its services through a comprehensive website, specific advice and appropriate awareness actions.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003476/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Memória Ativa Europeia — Totalitarismos

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-000812/2013, a senhora Comissária Viviane Reding declarou, em nome da Comissão, que «A Comissão está empenhada em sensibilizar as pessoas para o passado da Europa e os crimes perpetrados por regimes totalitários. Para o efeito utiliza o programa “A Europa para os Cidadãos” (2007-2013) e mais especificamente a ação “Memória europeia ativa”. Esta ação tem por objetivo a comemoração das vítimas do nazismo e do estalinismo, como meio de superar o passado, mas transmitir às novas gerações de europeus a memória do que aconteceu.»

1. Não considera a Comissão que a designação encontrada para identificar os totalitarismos é desequilibrada, porquanto num caso se atribuem os crimes de guerra e contra a Humanidade a um regime e a um partido — o nacional-socialista — e, noutro, apenas os imputam a um período e a uma liderança (estalinista) de um regime e de um partido — o comunista soviético — sem que este seja expressamente referido?
2. Não considera a Comissão que esta designação demasiado restritiva contende com o objeto do programa Europa para os cidadãos, que é também preservar a memória histórica dos europeus?
3. Não crê a Comissão que a União Europeia deveria condenar expressamente não apenas o estalinismo, mas todos os crimes cometidos pelos regimes comunistas totalitários?
4. Estaria a Comissão disponível para promover esta alteração de designação nas futuras ações que desenvolva a este respeito e junto das demais instituições europeias?

Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão

(27 de maio de 2013)

A Comissão não avança uma interpretação institucional específica da história, mas proporciona um fórum europeu que permite a reflexão crítica e independente do passado recente da Europa por historiadores, outros peritos relevantes e a sociedade civil.

No entanto, na sequência do desejo explícito dos Estados-Membros, e a fim de proporcionar uma oportunidade de superar o passado à história do continente europeu, a proposta de regulamento que estabelece o novo programa «Europa para os cidadãos» (2014-2020) inclui explicitamente os regimes totalitários comunistas.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003476/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Active European Remembrance — totalitarianism

In answer to my Question E-000812/2013, Commissioner Reding stated on behalf of the Commission that 'The Commission is committed to raising people's awareness of Europe's past and the crimes perpetrated by totalitarian regimes. It does so through the Europe for Citizens Programme (2007-2013) and more specifically through Action 4 "Active European Remembrance". This Action is concerned with commemorating the victims of Nazism and Stalinism, as a means of moving beyond the past and passing the memory of what happened on to the young generation of Europeans.'

1. On the one hand, the Commission ascribes war crimes and crimes against humanity to a regime and a party — the National Socialist Party — but, on the other, it only ascribes them to a particular period and leadership (Stalinist) of a regime and a party — the Communist Party of the Soviet Union — without explicitly mentioning that party. In view of this, does the Commission agree that the definition it has used to identify totalitarianism is unbalanced?
2. Does the Commission not take the view that this overly restrictive definition runs counter to the purpose of the Europe for Citizens Programme, which is also intended to preserve Europeans' historical memory?
3. Does the Commission not believe that the EU should explicitly condemn not just Stalinism, but all crimes committed by totalitarian communist regimes?
4. Would the Commission be prepared to promote this change of definition in any future actions in this area that it organises and co-organises with the other European institutions?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(27 May 2013)**

The Commission does not advance a particular institutional interpretation of history but provides a European forum allowing for independent and critical reflection of Europe's recent past by historians, other relevant experts and civil society.

However, following the explicit wish of the Member States and in order to provide an opportunity to come to terms with history of the European continent, the proposal for a draft regulation establishing the new Europe for Citizens programme (2014-2020) explicitly includes totalitarian communist regimes.

(Deutsche Fassung)

**Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-003477/13
an die Kommission
Matthias Groote (S&D)
(27. März 2013)**

Betrifft: „Real-Life Tests“ des Kältemittels 1234yf in Fahrzeugen, MAC-Richtlinie 2006/40

Wie der Vizepräsident der Europäischen Kommission, Antonio Tajani, am 20. März 2013 im Umweltausschuss des Europäischen Parlaments auf Nachfrage des Fragestellers mitteilte, sind Tests unter Realbedingungen (Real-Life Tests) des Kältemittels 1234yf durchgeführt worden. Auf Basis dieser Tests wurde festgestellt, dass bei diesem Kältemittel angeblich keine höheren Risiken bestehen als bei anderen.

Bei denen von Daimler berichteten Testresultaten, nachdem das Kältemittel als gefährlich einzustufen sei, handele es sich um eine Ausnahme.

Um diese Einschätzung besser nachvollziehen zu können, sind detaillierte Informationen über die der Kommission vorliegenden Tests unter Realbedingungen erforderlich.

Welche Tests wurden unter welchen Bedingungen durchgeführt?

Inwiefern unterscheiden sich diese Tests von den von Daimler durchgeführten?

Auf Grundlage welcher Parameter kommt die Kommission zu einem anderen Ergebnis, nach welchem das Kältemittel als nicht gefährlich eingestuft wird?

**Antwort von Herrn Tajani im Namen der Kommission
(26. April 2013)**

Die Richtlinie 2006/40/EG über mobile Klimaanlage wurde vor mehr als sechs Jahren nach einem langen Verhandlungsprozess angenommen. Teil der Richtlinie war eine lange Anlaufzeit zur Anpassung; sie war ferner technologieneutral.

2009 entschieden die Automobilhersteller einvernehmlich, die Richtlinie unter Verwendung von HFO 1234yf umzusetzen, nachdem die Alternativen dazu und die Risiken seines Einsatzes in mobilen Klimaanlage geprüft worden waren. Die zahlreichen Einrichtungen, die die Prüfungen in dieser Phase durchgeführt haben, wurden z. B. in einer Pressemitteilung des VDA vom 20.5.2010 ⁽¹⁾ genannt. Im Einzelnen wurde die Wahrscheinlichkeit einer Entzündung des Gases durch eine Motorraumleckage aufgrund einer undichten Stelle oder eines Aufpralls untersucht. Berichte deuten nicht darauf hin, dass das Risiko größer ist als das bei derzeit verwendeten anderen entzündlichen Flüssigkeiten. Darüber hinaus unterliegen mobile Klimaanlage der Druckgeräte-Richtlinie 97/23/EG, und die Strenge der Konformitätsbewertungsverfahren ist vom Entflammbarkeitsgrad des jeweiligen Kältemittels abhängig. Es gelten die einschlägigen Normen (ISO).

Die allgemeine Schlussfolgerung war, wie vom VDA angegeben und in seinem Jahresbericht 2012 ⁽²⁾ bestätigt, dass HFO-1234yf „vergleichbar sicher wie das bisherige Mittel“ ist und daher bedenkenlos in mobilen Klimaanlage eingesetzt werden kann.

Schließlich haben nach der Ankündigung Daimlers sowohl der SAE ⁽³⁾ als auch mehrere Hersteller eingehendere Versuche und Bewertungen zu den genannten Punkten durchgeführt. Das KBA prüft ebenfalls diese Frage. Die bisher bekannt gegebenen Schlussfolgerungen deuten nicht darauf hin, dass das Kältemittel generell ein Problem für die Sicherheit darstellen würde oder ein schwerwiegenderes Risiko als das 2009 ermittelte mit sich brächte. Sie lassen auch nicht erkennen, dass es keine technischen Maßnahmen gäbe, mit denen das Risiko gemindert und beherrscht werden könnte.

⁽¹⁾ Die Risikobewertung schloss folgende Elemente ein: Risikoanalyse auf globaler Ebene in Zusammenarbeit mit Fahrzeugherstellern, der Zuliefererindustrie und der chemischen Industrie, unter Koordination des SAE; die größtmögliche Fachkompetenz und Akzeptanz durch weltweit durchgeführte Untersuchungen (TNO/NL, WIL Research Lab./USA; Huntingdon Life Sciences/USA; Hammer Institute/USA, BAM/D; INERIS/F; Hughes Ass. Inc./USA, Honeywell/USA and DuPont/USA); umfassende Laborversuche zur Ermittlung der chemischen und physikalischen Wirkungsmechanismen; Versuche mit Fahrzeugen unter realistischen Grenzbedingungen zur Bestimmung der praktischen Relevanz verschiedener Gefahrenszenarien; toxikologische Bewertungen zur Beurteilung der Ergebnisse und Festlegung von Grenzwerten; Fehlerbaumanalysen zur Quantifizierung der Wahrscheinlichkeit ungewollter Vorkommnisse, durchgeführt durch Sachverständige der Carmeq GmbH/D und der Gradient Cooperation/USA; Bewertung im Vergleich zu anderen Vorkommnissen bei der Nutzung des Fahrzeugs; TÜV-Prüfung der Fehlerbaumanalyse.

⁽²⁾ http://www.vda.de/de/publikationen/publikationen_downloads/detail.php?id=1092, S. 127

⁽³⁾ http://www.sae.org/servlets/pressRoom?OBJECT_TYPE=PressReleases&PAGE=showRelease&RELEASE_ID=1984

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-003477/13
to the Commission**

Matthias Groote (S&D)

(27 March 2013)

Subject: Real-life tests of 1234yf coolant in vehicles, MAC Directive 2006/40

As Antonio Tajani, Vice-President of the Commission, stated in response to a question from the author on 20 March 2013 in Parliament's Committee on the Environment, real-life tests of 1234yf coolant have been carried out. On the basis of these tests it was found, he said, that this coolant posed no greater risk than any other.

The test results reported by Daimler which showed that the coolant should be classified as hazardous represented an exception.

In order better to understand this assessment, detailed information about the real-life tests reported by the Commission is needed:

What tests were conducted, and under what conditions?

In what way were these tests different from those carried out by Daimler?

On the basis of what parameters does the Commission arrive at a different result, according to which the coolant is classified as not hazardous?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission

(26 April 2013)

Directive 2006/40/EC on mobile air-conditioning (MAC) was adopted more than six years ago following a long negotiation. It included a long lead-time for adaptation and was technologically neutral.

In 2009 the automotive manufacturers decided, consensually, that they would use HFO 1234yf to implement the directive. This decision followed an analysis of the alternatives, as well as of the risks associated to its use in MAC systems. The numerous organisations that conducted the tests in this phase were listed, e.g., in a press briefing of VDA on 20/05/2010 ⁽¹⁾. More specifically, the probabilities of an engine compartment leakage from a leak or crash resulting in ignition from the gas have been studied with reports not pointing to a greater risk than the one associated with the current use of other flammable fluids. Also, MAC systems are subject to the Pressure Equipment Directive 97/23/EC, and the flammability levels of the refrigerant determine the stringency of the conformity assessment procedures applied. Relevant standards (ISO) apply.

The general conclusion was, as stated by VDA, 'that HFO-1234yf is as safe to use as today's refrigerant and can therefore be used in (MAC) systems without cause for concern'. This conclusion was confirmed in the VDA Annual Report of 2012 ⁽²⁾.

Finally, following the announcement by Daimler, both the SAE ⁽³⁾ and several manufacturers have conducted more specific tests and evaluations, covering the elements raised. KBA is also evaluating the issue. Until now, the conclusions made available provide no evidence that the refrigerant poses a general safety problem or a more serious risk than the risk determined in 2009, and that there are no technical mitigation measures available to deal with this risk.

⁽¹⁾ The risk assessment included the following points: risk analysis in global cooperation with vehicle manufacturers, the supply industry and chemical industry, coordinated by SAE; the greatest possible expertise and acceptance due to worldwide investigations (TNO/NL, WIL Research Lab./USA; Huntingdon Life Sciences/USA; Hammer Institute/USA, BAM/D; INERIS/F; Hughes Ass. Inc./USA, Honeywell/USA and DuPont/USA); extensive laboratory testing to identify the chemical and physical mechanisms of action; vehicle trials under realistic boundary conditions to determine the practical relevance of various hazard scenarios; toxicological appraisals to assess the results and determine limit values; fault tree analysis to quantify the probabilities of undesirable events by specialists from Carmeq GmbH/D and Gradient Cooperation/USA; assessment in comparison to other events in vehicle use; TÜV certification of the fault tree analysis'.

⁽²⁾ http://www.vda.de/en/publikationen/publikationen_downloads/detail.php?id=1092, page 127

⁽³⁾ http://www.sae.org/servlets/pressRoom?OBJECT_TYPE=PressReleases&PAGE=showRelease&RELEASE_ID=1984

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-003478/13
do Komisji**

Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D)

(27 marca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Tworzenie miejsc pracy poprzez inwestowanie w infrastrukturę kolejową

Sektor kolejowy jest ważnym pracodawcą w Europie. Sektor ten zatrudnia bezpośrednio 700 000 osób, chociaż dane różnią się w zależności od źródeł. Interesują mnie jednak dane pokazujące, ile miejsc pracy mogłoby powstać dzięki zainwestowaniu 1 mln EUR z funduszy UE w infrastrukturę kolejową. W związku z tym mam następujące pytania:

1. Czy Komisja posiada dane lub wyniki badań, które pokazują, ile miejsc pracy można byłoby utworzyć inwestując 1 mln EUR w infrastrukturę kolejową?
2. Czy Komisja posiada dane lub wyniki badań, które pokazują, ile miejsc pracy można byłoby utworzyć inwestując 1 mln EUR w infrastrukturę drogową?
3. Jeżeli takie dane lub wyniki badań nie są dostępne, czy Komisja mogłaby zrealizować takie badania?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Siima Kallasa w imieniu Komisji

(24 kwietnia 2013 r.)

Komisja nie posiada danych ani wyników badań pokazujących, ile miejsc pracy można byłoby utworzyć inwestując 1 mln EUR w infrastrukturę drogową lub kolejową oraz zwraca uwagę na znaczne różnice występujące w tym względzie między różnymi regionami Europy. Konieczne jest rozróżnienie między fazą wdrażania infrastruktury i fazą jej eksploatacji.

W fazie wdrażania infrastruktury zainwestowanie 1 mln EUR może spowodować utworzenie 15-20 miejsc pracy rocznie, w zależności od sytuacji gospodarczej danego państwa członkowskiego: projekty drogowe wiążą się z powstaniem większej ilości miejsc pracy w przemyśle budowlanym, podczas gdy projekty kolejowe przyczyniają się również do powstania miejsc pracy w branży hutniczej, elektrycznej i w innych sektorach. Według jednego z badań przeprowadzonych w USA ⁽¹⁾ dzięki zainwestowaniu 1 mln USD w autostrady można utworzyć nawet 30 miejsc pracy, z czego jednak 50 % jest tylko pośrednio związanych z inwestycją (co nie jest wyszczególnione w wymienionych danych liczbowych). Według innego badania przeprowadzonego w USA ⁽²⁾, jeśli chodzi o tworzenie nowych miejsc pracy, inwestycje w transport publiczny są o około 70 % skuteczniejsze niż inwestycje w transport drogowy.

Najważniejsze są trwałe skutki pojawiające się po fazie wdrożenia, w szczególności ze względu na poprawę dostępności infrastruktury. Lepszy dostęp do rynku przyczynia się do zwiększenia konkurencyjności regionalnej gospodarki, co z kolei prowadzi do wyższych zysków i zrównoważonego wzrostu liczby miejsc pracy. Efekt ten zależy również od innych czynników lokalnych, takich jak miejscowa infrastruktura i poziom edukacji, ale przede wszystkim zależy od stopnia ulepszenia sieci transportowej: tworzenie nowych możliwości transportowych poprzez wypełnienie brakujących połączeń jest bardziej skuteczne niż tylko skracanie czasu podróży na istniejących już połączeniach. Obliczenia wykonane w ramach inicjatywy „Main Line for Europe” pokazują, że na każdy zainwestowany milion euro przypada 1,5-2 stałych miejsc pracy.

Wdrażając nowe wytyczne TEN-T ⁽³⁾, Komisja zwróci należyłą uwagę na kwestie zatrudnienia związane z rozwojem infrastruktury transportowej.

⁽¹⁾ „The Role of Public Works Infrastructure in Economic Recovery” („Znaczenie robót publicznych przy rozbudowie infrastruktury w kontekście ożywienia gospodarczego”), Służby Badawcze Kongresu USA.

⁽²⁾ „Transportation Funding and Job Creation” („Finansowanie transportu a tworzenie nowych miejsc pracy”) Smart Growth America.

⁽³⁾ COM(2011) 650 final.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-003478/13
to the Commission**

Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D)

(27 March 2013)

Subject: Creating jobs by investing in rail infrastructure

The railway sector is a major employer in Europe. It employs 700 000 people directly, although figures differ according to different sources. Nevertheless, I am interested in figures showing how many jobs would be created by investing EUR 1 million in EU funds in rail infrastructure. Accordingly, I have the following questions:

1. Does the Commission have any figures or studies showing how many jobs would be created by investing EUR 1 million in rail infrastructure?
2. Does the Commission have any figures or studies showing how many jobs would be created by investing EUR 1 million in road infrastructure?
3. If no such studies or figures are available, is it possible that the Commission would undertake such a study?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission

(24 April 2013)

The Commission has no specific figures or studies on job creation for the EU per EUR 1 million invested in road or rail infrastructure and points to the great differences between the different European regions. It is necessary to distinguish between the phase of infrastructure implementation and infrastructure operation.

During the implementation phase, investing EUR 1 million may create some 15-20 jobs for one year, depending on the economic situation of the corresponding Member State: road projects have a higher concentration of jobs in the construction industry, while rail project also include jobs in steel, electro and other industries. A US study ⁽¹⁾ 'indicates even 30 jobs per USD 1 million invested in motorways, of which however 50% are indirect effects' (which are not included in above figures). According to another US study ⁽²⁾, investment in public transport is some 70% more job-effective than in road.

Most important are the enduring effects which emerge after implementation, in particular due to improved accessibility. A better access to the market improves the competitiveness of the regional economy, leading to higher profits and a sustainable increase of jobs. This effect depends on the mixture with other factors of location quality, such as local infrastructure and education, but in particular also on the extent of the improvement: creating new accessibilities by filling missing links is more effective than mere reduced travelling times along existing connections. Calculations carried out by the 'Main Line for Europe' initiative show an order of 1.5 to 2 permanent jobs per each EUR million invested.

In the implementation of the new TEN-T guidelines ⁽³⁾, the Commission will pay due attention to the employment aspects of transport infrastructure.

⁽¹⁾ 'The Role of Public Works Infrastructure in Economic Recovery' by US Congressional Research Service.

⁽²⁾ 'Transportation Funding and Job Creation' by Smart Growth America.

⁽³⁾ COM(2011) 650 final.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-003479/13
à la Commission
Frédéric Daerden (S&D)
(27 mars 2013)

Objet: Dumping social entre États membres au préjudice des travailleurs

Fin janvier 2013, des milliers de travailleurs européens ont dénoncé à Bruxelles l'exploitation et le dumping social de la main-d'œuvre détachée pour «réclamer une meilleure protection des travailleurs envoyés dans un autre État membre que ceux dans lesquels ils travaillent habituellement pour une période limitée et dans le cadre d'une prestation de services définie».

De récentes déclarations officielles des autorités belges ont souligné l'ampleur de ce phénomène de dumping social, d'exploitation des travailleurs détachés dans des conditions de travail et de rémunération inqualifiables et, par conséquent, de non-respect des conditions de concurrence.

1. La Commission considère-t-elle que cette situation — notamment l'existence de sociétés «boîtes aux lettres», des sous-traitants fictifs destinés à contourner les réglementations — de salaires de misère et de conditions de travail déplorables ne doit pas faire l'objet, sinon de sanctions, au moins de contrôles de sa part dans la mesure où elle viole de nombreuses législations en vigueur, aussi bien dans le domaine de la concurrence qu'en matière de conditions de travail?
2. La Commission considère-t-elle que la compétitivité d'un État membre peut se faire par un dumping social au détriment d'autres États membres, avec des conséquences désastreuses pour l'emploi?
3. La Commission estime-t-elle que la proposition législative, présentée en 2012, clarifiant la directive de 1996 (96/71/CE) concernant le détachement des travailleurs sera suffisante pour mettre un terme à cette situation, en instituant des règles plus claires, des contrôles et des sanctions afin que l'ouverture des frontières ne soit pas un prétexte pour introduire et développer dans certains États de l'Union des conditions de travail déplorables et illégales au détriment des États membres disposant de législations respectant les droits élémentaires et la dignité des travailleurs?

Réponse donnée par M. Andor au nom de la Commission
(29 avril 2013)

1. La proposition de la Commission de directive ⁽¹⁾ relative à l'exécution de la directive 96/71/CE ⁽²⁾ établit une liste indicative non exhaustive des critères qualitatifs et des éléments constitutifs caractérisant la notion de «détachement». Cette proposition, qui contribuera à la lutte contre l'utilisation du détachement temporaire par des sociétés «boîtes aux lettres», institue des règles plus claires, notamment pour la coopération entre les autorités nationales et, singulièrement, pour l'utilisation du système d'information sur le marché intérieur, qui permet aux États membres d'échanger des informations. Elle dispose également que des inspections doivent être menées par les organismes de l'État membre responsables en la matière, prévoit des sanctions en cas de non-respect de cette obligation et introduit un système limité de responsabilité solidaire pour protéger les droits des travailleurs détachés et empêcher leur exploitation dans le cadre de la sous-traitance.

2 et 3. Pour fonctionner correctement, le marché unique doit être fondé sur une concurrence loyale et des conditions de concurrence égales. C'est pourquoi la proposition de la Commission vise à améliorer les droits des travailleurs détachés, veille à ce qu'ils soient respectés et appliqués plus efficacement, comme le prévoit la directive sur le détachement de travailleurs, et vise à faciliter la prestation transfrontalière de services grâce à un cadre juridique plus transparent et plus fiable. Elle garantit que les travailleurs détachés sont rémunérés à hauteur du travail fourni, dans le respect des règles applicables, empêche le contournement ou l'utilisation abusive de ces règles et met un terme à la concurrence déloyale des salaires. En outre, des projets d'amélioration de la coopération transnationale dans le domaine du détachement des travailleurs pourraient être cofinancés par le programme Progress, que gère la Commission.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2012) 131 final du 21 mars 2012.

⁽²⁾ Directive 96/71/CE du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 16 décembre 1996 concernant le détachement de travailleurs effectué dans le cadre d'une prestation de services, JO L 18 du 21.1.1997.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-003479/13
to the Commission
Frédéric Daerden (S&D)
(27 March 2013)

Subject: Social dumping between Member States at the expense of workers

At the end of January 2013, thousands of European workers protested in Brussels against the social dumping of posted workers, demanding better protection for workers posted for a limited period to a Member State, other than that in which they normally work, to perform a specific service.

Recent official statements by the Belgian authorities have stressed the scale of this phenomenon of social dumping, which represents the exploitation of posted workers for intolerable pay and conditions, and thus a failure to comply with the conditions of competition.

1. Does the Commission not consider that this situation — in particular the existence of ‘letter box’ companies, fictitious sub-contractors set up for the purpose of evading the rules, starvation wages and deplorable working conditions — should be subject if not to penalties, then at least to checks by the Commission, given that it violates a large number of existing laws both on competition and on working conditions?
2. Does the Commission consider that the competitiveness of a Member State may be achieved by social dumping at the expense of other Member States, with disastrous consequences for employment?
3. Does the Commission consider that the legislative proposal it submitted in 2012, seeking to clarify Directive 96/71/EC concerning the posting of workers, will be sufficient to put an end to this situation by enacting clearer rules, as well as instituting checks and penalties, to prevent the opening of borders becoming an excuse for the introduction and spread of deplorable and illegal working conditions in some Member States at the expense of Member States which have legislation respecting the elementary rights and dignity of workers?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(29 April 2013)

1. The Commission proposal for a directive ⁽¹⁾ on the enforcement of Directive 96/71/EC ⁽²⁾ sets out an indicative, non-exhaustive list of qualitative criteria/constituent elements characterising the concept of posting, which will help in combating the use of temporary posting by letter-box companies. It establishes clearer rules *inter alia* on cooperation between national authorities, including the use of the internal market Information System for exchanging information, provides for inspections by the Member State bodies responsible and penalties in the event of non-compliance, and introduces a limited system of joint and several liability to protect the rights of posted workers and prevent their exploitation in the subcontracting process.

2 and 3. To function properly, the Single Market must be based on fair competition and a level playing field. The proposal therefore aims to improve posted workers’ rights and ensure they are respected and enforced more effectively, as guaranteed by the Posting of Workers Directive, and to facilitate the cross-border provision of services by companies thanks to a more transparent and reliable legal framework. It should ensure that posted workers are paid for the work they do, in accordance with the rules applicable, prevent the circumvention or abuse of such rules, and stop unfair wage competition. In addition, projects relating to improving transnational cooperation in the area of posting of workers could be co-financed under the Progress programme, which is managed by the Commission.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2012) 131 final of 21 March 2012.

⁽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.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-003480/13
alla Commissione
Francesco De Angelis (S&D)
(27 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Ritardi nei pagamenti e situazione italiana

Le autorità nazionali italiane hanno deciso che le nuove regole relative alla trasposizione della direttiva contro i ritardi nei pagamenti si applicheranno esclusivamente ai contratti conclusi a partire dal 1° gennaio 2013.

Il debito pregresso maturato in Italia dalle pubbliche amministrazioni nei confronti dei fornitori di beni e servizi ammonta a molte decine di miliardi di euro, con drammatiche ripercussioni sulla competitività delle imprese.

Nella dichiarazione dei Vicepresidenti Rehn e Tajani, del 18 marzo, facendo esplicito riferimento al caso italiano si precisa che «il Patto di Stabilità e Crescita permette di prendere in considerazione fattori significativi in sede di valutazione della conformità del bilancio di uno Stato membro con i criteri di deficit e di debito del Patto stesso», e che «in tale ambito, la liquidazione dei debiti commerciali potrebbe rientrare tra i fattori attenuanti».

Secondo indiscrezioni trapelate il 25 marzo, la Commissione avrebbe parzialmente smentito questa interpretazione, precisando che il pagamento di 40 miliardi di debiti arretrati della pubblica amministrazione «renderebbe per l'Italia più difficile la chiusura della procedura per deficit eccessivo aperta a Bruxelles», e che la maggiore flessibilità sul deficit e sul debito in relazione allo smaltimento dei debiti arretrati delle pubbliche amministrazioni «riguarda i paesi che non sono in procedura di deficit eccessivo, e questo non è il caso dell'Italia».

In considerazione di quanto precede, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. Può precisare una volta per tutte se, come annunciato dai Vicepresidenti Rehn e Tajani, la flessibilità prevista dal Patto di Stabilità si applicherebbe anche all'Italia, o piuttosto se, come trapelato da indiscrezioni giornalistiche, l'Italia ne è esclusa in quanto già soggetta a procedura di deficit eccessivo?
2. Quali iniziative sta adottando al fine di verificare il corretto adempimento da parte del governo italiano non solo della trasposizione della direttiva contro i ritardi nei pagamenti, ma anche dell'istituzione di un piano per la liquidazione dei debiti pregressi delle PA nei confronti delle aziende?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-003651/13
alla Commissione
Patrizia Toia (S&D)
(28 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Debiti della pubblica amministrazione

Le autorità nazionali italiane hanno deciso che le nuove regole relative al recepimento della direttiva contro i ritardi nei pagamenti si applicheranno esclusivamente ai contratti conclusi a partire dal 1° gennaio 2013. Il debito pregresso maturato in Italia dalle pubbliche amministrazioni nei confronti dei fornitori di beni e servizi ammonta a molte decine di miliardi di euro, con drammatiche ripercussioni sulla competitività delle imprese.

La dichiarazione dei vicepresidenti Rehn e Tajani del 18 marzo, facendo esplicito riferimento al caso italiano, precisa che «il Patto di stabilità e crescita permette di prendere in considerazione fattori significativi in sede di valutazione della conformità del bilancio di uno Stato membro con i criteri di deficit e di debito del Patto stesso», e che «in tale ambito, la liquidazione dei debiti commerciali potrebbe rientrare tra i fattori attenuanti».

Secondo indiscrezioni trapelate il 25 marzo, la Commissione avrebbe parzialmente smentito questa interpretazione, precisando che il pagamento di 40 miliardi di debiti arretrati della pubblica amministrazione «renderebbe per l'Italia più difficile la chiusura della procedura per deficit eccessivo aperta a Bruxelles», e che la maggiore flessibilità sul deficit e sul debito in relazione allo smaltimento dei debiti arretrati delle pubbliche amministrazioni «riguarda i paesi che non sono in procedura di deficit eccessivo, e questo non è il caso dell'Italia».

Ciò premesso, può la Commissione precisare una volta per tutte se, come annunciato dai vicepresidenti Rehn e Tajani, la flessibilità prevista dal Patto di stabilità si applica anche all'Italia, o piuttosto se, come trapelato da indiscrezioni giornalistiche, l'Italia ne è esclusa in quanto già soggetta a procedura di deficit eccessivo?

Quali iniziative sta adottando la Commissione al fine di verificare il corretto adempimento, da parte del governo italiano, non solo della trasposizione della direttiva contro i ritardi nei pagamenti, ma anche dell'istituzione di un piano per la liquidazione dei debiti pregressi delle pubbliche amministrazioni nei confronti delle aziende?

Risposta congiunta di Olli Rehn a nome della Commissione

(7 maggio 2013)

1. L'Italia è attualmente oggetto di una procedura per i disavanzi eccessivi, con scadenza nel 2012. In seguito alla convalida, da parte di Eurostat, del deficit dell'esercizio 2012 e in base alle previsioni economiche della primavera 2013 dei servizi della Commissione, quest'ultima valuterà se l'Italia soddisfa i criteri per l'abrogazione della suddetta procedura, ossia se il disavanzo è stato allineato nel 2012 al valore di riferimento previsto dal trattato (3 % del PIL) e se, in base alle previsioni della Commissione, manterrà tale livello nel 2013 e nel 2014.

I fattori significativi citati nella dichiarazione del membro della Commissione europea responsabile degli Affari economici e monetari e del membro della Commissione europea responsabile dell'Industria e delle imprese sono i fattori presi in considerazione quando si valuta l'ipotesi di avvio di una procedura per i disavanzi eccessivi, e non quando si valutano le condizioni per l'abrogazione della stessa.

Infine, come qualsiasi altro Stato membro con un rapporto debito/PIL superiore al 60 %, l'Italia dovrà conformarsi alla norma sul debito. Poiché l'Italia era oggetto di una procedura per i disavanzi eccessivi al momento dell'entrata in vigore della norma sul debito, beneficerà di un periodo di transizione di tre anni durante il quale è tenuta a garantire progressi sufficienti nel rispetto di tale norma. In caso contrario, la Commissione preparerà una relazione in base all'articolo 126, paragrafo 3, del trattato, che terrà conto dei fattori significativi nel valutare il rispetto della norma sul debito da parte dell'Italia. Come dichiarato dai vicepresidenti, la liquidazione accelerata dei debiti commerciali pregressi potrebbe essere considerata un fattore attenuante in tal contesto.

2. In un comunicato stampa ⁽¹⁾, la Commissione ha ribadito il suo sostegno al piano del governo italiano del 6 aprile 2013 volto ad accelerare la liquidazione dei debiti commerciali pregressi, alleviando in tal modo i problemi di liquidità delle aziende e sostenendo la ripresa economica.

⁽¹⁾ http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-317_en.htm

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-003480/13
to the Commission
Francesco De Angelis (S&D)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Late payment and the Italian situation

The Italian national authorities have decided that the new rules transposing the directive on combating late payment will apply only to contracts concluded after 1 January 2013.

In Italy, public authorities have run up a combined debt to suppliers of goods and services amounting to billions of euros, and this is having correspondingly crippling effects on business competitiveness.

According to the statement issued on 18 March by Vice-Presidents Rehn and Tajani, which refers explicitly to the Italian case, 'the Stability and Growth Pact allows taking into account relevant factors in the assessment of compliance with the deficit and debt criteria. In this context, the liquidation of overdue commercial debt would represent a mitigating factor'.

However, the information which leaked out on 25 March suggests that the Commission has to some extent reversed the above interpretation, as it now apparently takes the view that the payment of the EUR 40 billion in debt arrears accumulated by public authorities would make it more difficult for Italy to close the excessive deficit procedure opened in Brussels and that the greater flexibility in terms of deficit and debt for the purpose of paying off public authority debt arrears applies to countries not going through an excessive deficit procedure, which is not the case with Italy.

In the light of the foregoing:

1. Can the Commission make it clear once and for all whether, as was stated by Vice-Presidents Rehn and Tajani, the flexibility afforded by the Stability Pact extends to Italy or whether, as has been revealed through journalistic indiscretions, Italy is excluded because it is the subject of an ongoing excessive deficit procedure?
2. What is the Commission doing to ascertain that the Italian Government is taking the steps required not just to transpose the directive on combating late payment, but also to draw up a plan for settling the debt arrears which public authorities owe to companies?

**Question for written answer P-003651/13
to the Commission
Patrizia Toia (S&D)
(28 March 2013)**

Subject: Debts of public authorities

The Italian national authorities have decided that the new rules transposing the directive on combating late payment will apply only to contracts concluded after 1 January 2013. In Italy, public authorities have run up a combined debt to suppliers of goods and services amounting to many tens of billions of euros, and this is having correspondingly crippling effects on business competitiveness.

According to the statement issued on 18 March by Vice-Presidents Rehn and Tajani, which refers explicitly to the Italian case, 'the Stability and Growth Pact allows taking into account relevant factors in the assessment of compliance with the deficit and debt criteria. In this context, the liquidation of overdue commercial debt would represent a mitigating factor'.

However, according to information which leaked out on 25 March, the Commission has to some extent reversed the above interpretation, as it now apparently takes the view that the payment of the EUR 40 billion in debt arrears accumulated by public authorities would make it more difficult for Italy to close the excessive deficit procedure opened in Brussels and that the greater flexibility in terms of deficit and debt for the purpose of paying off public authority debt arrears applies to countries not going through an excessive deficit procedure, which is not the case with Italy.

Can the Commission make it clear once and for all whether, as was stated by Vice-Presidents Rehn and Tajani, the flexibility afforded by the Stability Pact extends to Italy or whether, as has been revealed through journalistic indiscretions, Italy is excluded because it is the subject of an ongoing excessive deficit procedure?

What is the Commission doing to ascertain that the Italian Government is taking the steps required not just to transpose the directive on combating late payment, but also to draw up a plan for settling the debt arrears which public authorities owe to companies?

Joint answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission

(7 May 2013)

1. Italy is currently subject to an Excessive Deficit Procedure (EDP), with a deadline in 2012. After validation by Eurostat of the deficit outturn for 2012 and based on the Commission's spring 2013 forecast, the Commission will assess whether Italy fulfils the criteria for abrogating the EDP, i.e. whether the deficit has been brought in line with the Treaty reference value of 3% of GDP in 2012 and it is forecast by the Commission to remain so in 2013 and 2014.

The relevant factors mentioned in the statement by the Member of the Commission responsible for Economic and Monetary Affairs and the Member of the Commission responsible for Industry and Entrepreneurship refer to factors being taken into account when considering opening an EDP and not when assessing the conditions for abrogating it.

Finally, as any other Member State with a debt-to-GDP ratio above 60%, Italy will have to comply with the debt rule. Given that Italy was in EDP at the time of entry into force of the rule, it will benefit from a three-year transition period during which it should ensure sufficient progress towards meeting the rule. If it doesn't, the Commission will write a report based on Article 126(3) of the Treaty in which the relevant factors will be considered in the assessment of Italy's compliance with the debt rule. As stated by the Vice-Presidents, the accelerated liquidation of trade debt arrears could be considered a mitigating factor in this context.

2. In a press statement ⁽¹⁾, the Commission reaffirmed its support to the Italian government's plan of 6 April 2013 to accelerate the liquidation of the stock of trade debt, thus easing firms' liquidity constraints and supporting economic recovery.

⁽¹⁾ http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-13-317_en.htm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita P-003481/13

à Comissão

Nuno Melo (PPE)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Comissão confirma hipótese de estender o denominado «imposto sobre depósitos» a outros Estados-Membros

Considerando que:

1. Um porta-voz do comissário responsável pela regulação financeira, Michel Barnier, confirmou a hipótese de estender o denominado «imposto sobre depósitos» — consistindo na cativação de parte dos mesmos depósitos para efeitos de capitalização dos bancos — a outros Estados-Membros.
2. A supervisão dos bancos, destinada a evitar práticas insolventes do setor financeiro, compete aos Bancos Centrais dos Estados e ao BCE. Não seria normal imputar aos depositantes as responsabilidades pelas falhas de supervisão dos Estados e do BCE.
3. A denominação «imposto sobre depósitos», não sendo semântica, não faz da iniciativa um imposto.
4. Uma coisa é um imposto, outra bem diferente é um confisco, ou uma apropriação. E aqui, na possibilidade anunciada, em causa estará verdadeiramente a legitimação do confisco, ou de apropriação de coisa alheia.
5. Uma coisa é estabelecer um imposto sobre a rentabilidade de um depósito, por exemplo sobre os respetivos juros, outra coisa bem diferente é a apropriação de parte do próprio depósito em si mesmo.
6. Uma coisa é submeter a atividade bancária a um esforço fiscal que é legítimo nos Estados de direito democráticos, outra coisa é o Estado de direito fazer seu o que não lhe pertence, «expropriando» sem contrapartida a liquidez, isto é, o dinheiro de que os depositantes são legítimos titulares.
7. O direito à propriedade privada — abrangendo necessariamente no conceito o produto líquido disponível dos cidadãos e das empresas — e a estabilidade dos depósitos são princípios fundamentais genéticos dos Estados de direito e das democracias ocidentais.

Concorda que a apropriação sem contrapartida de parte dos depósitos aos respetivos titulares, para compensar falhas de supervisão dos Estados e do BCE, não traduz um «imposto», antes um confisco, ou apropriação de coisa alheia, incompatível com o princípio da estabilidade dos depósitos, mas mais do que isso, violador das mais elementares regras inerentes ao funcionamento dos Estados de direito democrático?

Resposta dada por Michel Barnier em nome da Comissão

(6 de maio de 2013)

Na pendência da adoção da proposta de legislação da UE no domínio da resolução bancária, os Estados-Membros dispõem de uma ampla margem de discricção no que se refere às modalidades de resolução bancária, desde que respeitem as regras do Tratado e o direito derivado da UE em vigor.

Os depósitos inferiores a 100 000 euros estão atualmente garantidos na União Europeia e continuarão a ser plenamente protegidos em qualquer futuro regime.

Neste contexto, a Comissão considera que é necessário adotar urgentemente a proposta de enquadramento para a resolução bancária, que virá clarificar as regras e procedimentos aplicáveis no futuro à resolução dos bancos em dificuldades. Conseguir-se-á assim uma segurança jurídica para todas as partes interessadas. Quando a diretiva estiver em vigor, todos os Estados-Membros disporão dos instrumentos necessários para intervir de forma decisiva numa crise bancária. Para minimizar o impacto sobre os contribuintes, o instrumento de resgate interno («*bail-in*») previsto nesse enquadramento permitirá a um banco ser recapitalizado através da anulação ou diluição das participações acionistas e da redução ou conversão em ações dos créditos dos credores. Os depósitos inferiores a 100 000 euros continuarão a ser plenamente garantidos e são explicitamente excluídos deste instrumento.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-003481/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(27 March 2013)

Subject: Commission confirms that 'tax on deposits' could cover several Member States

A spokesperson for the Commissioner responsible for financial regulation, Michel Barnier, has confirmed that the so-called 'tax on deposits' — whereby deposits are to be docked in order to capitalise banks — might be levied in more than one Member State.

Banking supervision, intended to avert insolvency in the financial sector, is a task for Member States' central banks and the ECB. It would be wrong to make depositors bear the blame for inadequate supervision by national authorities and the ECB.

The fact of calling it by the name (or, more accurately, misnomer) of 'tax on deposits' does not turn this move into a tax.

A tax is one thing, but confiscation, or appropriation, is a different matter altogether. What has been raised in this case as a possibility will reality legalise confiscation or appropriation of another person's property.

It is one thing to tax the profit — interest, for example — accruing from a deposit, but quite another to appropriate a portion of the deposit itself.

It is one thing to levy taxes on banking — banks can legitimately be called upon to contribute to tax revenue in a democratic state under the rule of law — but quite another for that state to take what does not belong to it and, without offering anything in return, 'expropriate' liquid assets, that is to say, money lawfully held by depositors.

The right to own private property — which must of necessity encompass the ready money available to citizens and businesses — and the stability of deposits are fundamental principles intrinsic to the rule of law and Western democracies.

Does the Commission agree that when deposits are partially appropriated with no quid pro quo for the holders, but, on the contrary, purely in order to make good the shortcomings of supervision by national authorities and the ECB, this amounts not to a 'tax', but to appropriation of what belongs to others and hence is incompatible with the principle of stability of deposits and, more seriously, violates the most basic operating rules that serve to define democratic states under the rule of law?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(6 May 2013)

Pending the adoption of proposed EU legislation in the field of bank resolution, Member States enjoy a wide margin of appreciation as to the modalities of bank resolution as long as they respect treaty rules and existing EU secondary legislation.

Deposits under EUR 100,000 are currently guaranteed in the European Union and will continue to be fully protected under any future regime.

Against this background, the Commission considers it necessary to urgently adopt the proposal for a bank resolution framework which will clarify the rules and procedures applicable to the resolution of ailing banks in the future. This will provide legal certainty to all stakeholders. Once the directive is in place, all Member States will have the necessary tools to intervene decisively in a banking crisis. To minimise taxpayer involvement, the bail-in tool enshrined in that framework will allow a bank to be recapitalised by wiping out or diluting shareholders and by reducing or converting the claims of creditors into shares. Deposits below EUR 100,000 will continue to be fully guaranteed and are explicitly excluded from this tool.

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003482/13
a la Comisión**

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)

(27 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Legislación de la UE

El pasado 19 de febrero, la Comisión publicó el cuadro de indicadores del mercado interior sobre la legislación europea por parte de los Estados miembros ⁽¹⁾. La correcta transposición en tiempo y forma de la legislación es la condición necesaria para conseguir los objetivos establecidos en las Directivas.

¿Podría la Comisión informar acerca de qué directivas y reglamentos aún no han sido transpuestos por los legisladores del Reino de España? ¿Cuáles de ellos están fuera de plazo?

El Reino de España es, juntamente con Italia y Grecia, uno de los países con más procedimientos de infracción sobre legislación comunitaria incoados por la Comisión. De todos estos procedimientos, ¿podría aclarar la Comisión cuáles cree que deberían ser una prioridad estratégica para su correcta transposición por parte del Reino de España?

El Reino de España tarda casi dos años de media en cumplir las sentencias del Tribunal Europeo por infracción de la legislación de la UE. La Comisión parece proponer que, en los sectores clave, el cumplimiento de las sentencias sea de doce meses. ¿Puede indicar la Comisión cuáles cree que son los sectores clave?

¿Puede indicar la Comisión cuántas sentencias del Tribunal Europeo está incumpliendo el Reino de España actualmente?

Respuesta del Sr. Barnier en nombre de la Comisión

(8 de mayo de 2013)

De conformidad con el artículo 288 del TFUE, los reglamentos serán obligatorios en todos sus elementos y directamente aplicables en cada Estado miembro, por lo que no es necesario que los Estados miembros adopten medidas para transponer los reglamentos a su Derecho interno. Las directivas, sin embargo, solo son vinculantes en cuanto a los resultados que deban conseguirse, de ahí que los Estados miembros deban adoptar medidas de transposición.

En el anexo se incluye un listado de las directivas que el Reino de España aún no ha transpuesto a su Derecho interno (situación a 1 de abril de 2013).

A 1 de abril de 2013, son once los procedimientos de infracción incoados contra el Reino de España por no haber comunicado las medidas de transposición de varias directivas. Uno de estos procedimientos se refiere a una directiva (la Directiva 2010/31/UE) que en la Comunicación «Mejorar la gobernanza del mercado único» ⁽²⁾, de 8 de junio de 2012, figura entre los «actos legislativos esenciales que requieren especial atención», y «en los que ha de realizarse un esfuerzo especial para garantizar su oportuna transposición».

En esta Comunicación sobre la gobernanza, los sectores considerados clave para el periodo 2012-2013 son: el sector servicios, los servicios financieros (de intermediación), el transporte, el mercado único digital y la energía.

En cuanto a los procedimientos de infracción incoados tras los dictámenes del Tribunal de Justicia de las Comunidades Europeas, a fecha de 1 de abril de 2013 son ocho las sentencias de dicho Tribunal pendientes de ejecución por parte del Reino de España, de las cuales solamente una se refiere a uno de los sectores clave citados (el transporte).

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/score/docs/score25_en.pdf

⁽²⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/strategy/docs/governance/com_2012_259_en.pdf

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003482/13
to the Commission**

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)

(27 March 2013)

Subject: EU legislation

On 19 February, the Commission published the internal market Scoreboard on the transposition of European legislation by Member States. ⁽¹⁾ It is essential for legislation to be transposed in a timely and correct manner if the objectives set out in the directives are to be achieved.

Can the Commission report which directives and regulations have not yet been transposed by Spanish legislators? Which of these are overdue?

Together with Italy and Greece, Spain is one of the countries against which the Commission has opened most infringement proceedings concerning Community legislation. Of all these proceedings, can the Commission clarify which legislation it believes Spain should transpose as a matter of strategic priority?

On average, it takes Spain almost two years to enforce European Court judgments concerning infringement of EU legislation. The Commission seems to be proposing that, in key sectors, judgments should be enforced within 12 months. Can the Commission indicate which these key sectors are?

Can the Commission indicate how many European Court judgments Spain is currently failing to enforce?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission

(8 May 2013)

Following Article 288 TFEU, a regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States. Thus, Member States do not need to take any measures to transpose regulations into domestic law. In contrast, directives are only binding as to the result to be achieved and Member States have to adopt transposition measures.

In the annex a list of directives not yet transposed by the Kingdom of Spain into domestic law (as of 1 April 2013) can be found.

As of 1 April 2013, there are eleven infringement cases open against the Kingdom of Spain for non-communication of transposition measures of directives. Of all these cases, one concerns one directive listed in the communication of 8 June 2012 on Better Governance for the Single Market ⁽²⁾ as 'legislative act requiring special attention' (Directive 2010/31/EU). For this piece of legislation, 'particular effort should be undertaken to secure timely transposition'.

As key areas for 2012-2013, the Governance Communication has identified the following sectors: services, financial (intermediation) services, transport, digital single market and energy.

As regards infringement cases open after the European Court of Justice has ruled, as of 1 April 2013, there are still eight cases for which the Kingdom of Spain needs to comply with the judgment of the European Court of Justice. Only one of these cases falls within one of the mentioned key areas (transport).

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/score/docs/score25_en.pdf

⁽²⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/strategy/docs/governance/com_2012_259_en.pdf

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003483/13
a la Comisión**

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(27 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Transposición de directivas en el Reino de España

En referencia a la respuesta E-005249/2012, de 9 de julio de 2012, el Sr. Barnier, en nombre de la Comisión, contestó: «España aún no ha realizado la transposición de seis directivas relativas al mercado interior. Se trata de las Directivas 2012/004/CE, 2009/128/CE, 2010/078/CE, 2010/044/CE, 2010/043/CE y 2009/065/CE. Entre ellas, la Comisión considera una prioridad para el mercado interior la Directiva OICVM (2009/65/CE) y la Directiva general (“Omnibus Directive” 2010/78/CE) a la luz de la difícil situación del sector financiero».

¿Podría indicar la Comisión cuáles de estas directivas, especialmente las consideradas prioritarias, ha transpuesto el Reino de España desde el pasado mes de julio?

En caso afirmativo, ¿está satisfecha la Comisión de esta transposición?

Respuesta del Sr. Barnier en nombre de la Comisión

(13 de mayo de 2013)

En lo que respecta a las seis Directivas relativas al mercado interior mencionadas en la pregunta de Su Señoría (2012/4/CE, 2009/128/CE, 2010/78/CE, 2010/44/CE, 2010/43/CE y 2009/65/CE), el Reino de España ha notificado sus medidas de transposición para todas ellas:

- Las medidas de transposición de la Directiva 2012/4 fueron notificadas el 4 de enero de 2012; todavía están siendo examinadas.
- Las medidas de transposición de la Directiva 2009/128 fueron notificadas plenamente el 17 de septiembre de 2012.
- Las medidas de transposición de la Directiva 2010/78 fueron notificadas plenamente el 8 de octubre de 2012.
- Las medidas de transposición de la Directiva 2010/44, para las cuales se fijaron dos plazos de transposición diferentes, fueron notificadas plenamente para la primera fecha límite de 23 de julio de 2012, y notificadas para la segunda (las medidas de transposición de esta última aún se están examinando con el fin de considerar que se ha transpuesto plenamente, no habiendo expirado aún la fecha límite de transposición).
- Las medidas de transposición de la Directiva 2010/43 fueron notificadas plenamente el 23 de julio de 2012.
- Las medidas de transposición de la Directiva 2009/65 fueron notificadas plenamente el 23 de julio de 2012.

La Comisión Europea ha dado por concluidas todas las infracciones pendientes por no comunicación de las medidas nacionales de ejecución contra España en el ámbito del mercado interior; por otra parte, no hay procedimientos de infracción abiertos contra España por falta de conformidad de las medidas de transposición con la legislación europea en este ámbito.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003483/13
to the Commission**

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)

(27 March 2013)

Subject: Transposition of directives in the Kingdom of Spain

I refer to the answer to question E-005249/2012 provided by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission on 9 July 2012: 'There are six Directives concerning the internal market which have not yet been transposed by Spain. These are: 2012/004/EC, 2009/128/EC, 2010/078/EC, 2010/044/EC, 2010/043/EC and 2009/065/EC. Of these, the Commission considers the UCITS Directive (2009/65/EC) to be a priority for the internal market along with the Omnibus Directive (2010/78/EC) in the light of the difficult situation concerning the financial sector.'

Can the Commission state which of these Directives, particularly those considered priorities, Spain has transposed since last July?

If so, is the Commission satisfied with this transposition?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission

(13 May 2013)

Regarding the six Directives concerning the internal market mentioned in the question of the Honourable Member (2012/4/EC, 2009/128/EC, 2010/78/EC, 2010/44/EC, 2010/43/EC and 2009/65/EC), the Kingdom of Spain has notified its transposition measures for all of them:

- The transposition measures for Directive 2012/4 were notified on 4 January 2012; they are still under examination;
- the transposition measures for Directive 2009/128 were fully notified on 17 September 2012;
- the transposition measures for Directive 2010/78 were fully notified on 8 October 2012;
- the transposition measures for Directive 2010/44, for which two different transposition deadlines were set, were fully notified for its first deadline on 23 July 2012, and notified for the second one (the transposition measures for the latter are still under examination in order to consider it fully transposed and the transposition deadline has not yet expired);
- the transposition measures for Directive 2010/43 were fully notified on 23 July 2012;
- the transposition measures for Directive 2009/65 were fully notified on 23 July 2012.

The European Commission has closed all pending infringements for non-communication of the national measures of execution against Spain in the field of the internal market; moreover, there are no infringement proceedings open against Spain for non-conformity of the transposition measures with the European law in this area.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-003484/13
до Комисията
Ivailo Kalfin (S&D)
(27 март 2013 г.)

Относно: Разследване на ЕК за такса за достъп до енергийната мрежа в България

На мое запитване до Европейската комисия относно въвеждането на такса за достъп до енергийната мрежа в България от 15 октомври 2012 г., Комисията отговори (E-009368/2012), че е започнала разследване по системата EU Pilot. Съгласно условията на системата това разследване вече би трябвало да е приключило.

Във връзка с това бих искал Европейската комисия да ми отговори на следните въпроси:

- Какви са основните резултати от разследването на сигналите за въвеждането такси за достъп до енергопреносната мрежа в България, проведено от Европейската комисия;
- Какви са изводите на Европейската комисия, направени в резултат на разследването;
- Какви мерки ще предприеме Комисията, за да приложи на практика изводите и резултатите, направени в своето разследване в България.

Отговор, даден от г-н Йотингер от името на Комисията
(21 май 2013 г.)

Комисията получи отговора на българските власти и го проучи задълбочено. В резултат им бе поискана допълнителна информация за въздействието на решението на Върховния административен съд относно правната сила на Решение № 33 на регулаторите от 14 септември 2012 г. Отговорът се очаква в скоро време.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003484/13
to the Commission
Ivailo Kalfin (S&D)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: EU investigation into an energy grid access charge in Bulgaria

In its answer (E-009368/2012) to my question submitted on 15 October 2012 regarding the introduction of an energy grid access charge in Bulgaria, the Commission replied that it had initiated an investigation under the EU Pilot system. Under the terms of the system, this investigation should already have been completed.

In this regard, I would like the Commission to answer the following questions:

- What is the main outcome of the investigation into the alleged introduction of an energy grid access charge in Bulgaria conducted by the Commission?
- What conclusions has the Commission drawn as a result of the investigation?
- What measures will the Commission take to implement the conclusions and results reached in its investigation in Bulgaria?

**Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(21 May 2013)**

The Commission has received the reply of the Bulgarian authorities and has thoroughly assessed it. As the result of the assessment, additional information has been requested from the Bulgarian authorities with regard to the effect of the ruling of the Supreme Administrative Court on the legal validity of the regulators' decision no 33 of 14 September 2012. The reply is expected shortly.

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-003485/13

Komisi

Hynek Fajmon (ECR)

(27. března 2013)

Předmět: Využití fondů Evropské unie pro revitalizaci nádražních objektů ve Středočeském kraji v České republice

Zástupci osmi středočeských měst mne informovali o záměru provést s pomocí evropských fondů rekonstrukce nádražních budov, které jsou ve vlastnictví společnosti České dráhy, a.s. Evropská komise údajně má s realizací tohoto projektu problémy s odkazem na pravidla hospodářské soutěže. Definitivní stanovisko však ze strany Evropské komise dosud nebylo sděleno. Obracím se proto na Evropskou komisi s následujícími dotazy:

1. Je dle Komise možné financovat z evropských fondů rekonstrukce nádražních budov ve Středočeském kraji ve vlastnictví společnosti České dráhy, a.s.?
2. Jak by měla města a České dráhy, a.s. postupovat, aby to bylo možné?

Odpověď komisaře Hahna jménem Komise

(23. května 2013)

Obecně platí, že ze strukturálních fondů lze spolufinancovat dopravní infrastrukturu včetně terminálů umožňujících přestup z jednoho druhu dopravního prostředku do jiného. Financování železničních stanic, které vlastní jeden z železničních podniků působících v České republice, v tomto případě České dráhy, představuje státní podporu. České orgány oznámily tuto státní podporu Komisi. Toto oznámení je v současné době předmětem šetření a ohledně slučitelnosti případné podpory dosud nebylo dosaženo konečného stanoviska.

Tento oznamovací postup je správním postupem mezi vnitrostátními orgány České republiky a Komisí. Orgány, na které se mohou České dráhy a dotčená města obrátit, jsou tedy příslušné vnitrostátní orgány České republiky. Vnitrostátním koordinátorem pro otázky státní podpory je český Úřad pro ochranu hospodářské soutěže (ÚOHS).

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003485/13
to the Commission
Hynek Fajmon (ECR)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Using EU funds to revitalise railway buildings in Central Bohemia, Czech Republic

Representatives of eight towns in Central Bohemia have notified me of their intention to use EU funds to reconstruct railway buildings owned by the České Dráhy a.s. company. The Commission reportedly has problems with this project being implemented in view of the rules on economic competition. However, the Commission has not yet given its definitive view.

1. In the Commission's view, is it possible to finance the reconstruction of railway buildings in Central Bohemia that are in the ownership of the České Dráhy from EU funds?
2. How should the towns and České Dráhy proceed in order to facilitate this?

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

In general, the Structural Funds can co-finance transport infrastructure, including terminals allowing interchange between different modes of transport. Financing of railway stations, which are owned by one of the railway transport undertakings operating in the Czech Republic, in this case Czech Railways, constitutes state aid. The Czech authorities notified this state aid to the Commission. This notification is currently under investigation; no final position has yet been reached regarding the compatibility of possible aid.

This notification procedure is an administrative procedure between the Czech national authorities and the Commission. The points of contact for Czech Railways and the towns concerned are the respective Czech national authorities. The national coordinator for state aid issues is the Czech Competition Authority — ÚOHS.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003486/13
an die Kommission
Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE) und Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D)
(27. März 2013)

Betrifft: Schließung von Linien auf dem polnischen Eisenbahnnetz

Nach verschiedenen Presseberichten plant der Betreiber der polnischen Eisenbahninfrastruktur, PKP Polskie Linie Kolejowe S.A., zahlreiche Linien auf dem polnischen Netz zu schließen. Darunter sollen sich auch Linien befinden, die aus EU-Mitteln ko-finanziert wurden.

1. Sind der Kommission derartige Pläne bekannt? Wenn ja, wie wurde sie informiert? Wenn nein, was wird sie unternehmen, um Erkundigungen einzuholen?
2. Sollten von den geplanten Schließungen auch Linien betroffen sein, die aus EU-Mitteln ko-finanziert wurden, welche Auswirkungen hätte dies auf die bisherige und künftige Ko-Finanzierung durch die EU?

Antwort von Herrn Hahn im Namen der Kommission
(22. Mai 2013)

1. Die Kommission wurde von Polen nicht offiziell über solche Pläne informiert, sondern erfuhr davon in Medienberichten. Daraufhin sprach die Kommission das Thema in bilateralen Treffen mit den polnischen Behörden (Verkehrsministerium, Verwalter für die Infrastruktur) an und brachte ihre Besorgnis zum Ausdruck. Die polnischen Behörden rechtfertigten die Schließungen hauptsächlich durch Budgetüberlegungen (Einsparungen, da nur Abschnitte mit äußerst geringem oder gar keinem Verkehrsaufkommen betroffen sind). Die Frage ist noch nicht entschieden und der Verwalter der Infrastruktur ist bereit, die Pläne angesichts der Entwicklungen neu zu bewerten.
2. Gemäß den kohäsionspolitischen Regelungen sollten an Projekten, in die auch EU-Mittel geflossen sind, nach ihrem Abschluss fünf Jahre lang keine erheblichen Veränderungen vorgenommen werden. Daher könnte es einen Verstoß gegen die Regelungen darstellen, wenn Linien, deren Modernisierung oder erneute Nutzung mit EU-Mitteln kofinanziert wurde, innerhalb eines solchen Zeitraums geschlossen werden. Allerdings haben die polnischen Behörden angegeben, dass der Plan für die Schließungen der Linien keine Projekte betrifft, die eine EU-Kofinanzierung erhalten oder erhalten haben.

Die Kommission betont, wie wichtig ein fundierter strategischer Ansatz gegenüber den aus den EU-Fonds unterstützten Investitionen ist, und möchte im neuen Finanzrahmen die für Eisenbahnprojekte vorgesehenen Finanzmittel anheben. Darüber hinaus ist die Kommission auch bereit, — zusätzlich zu größeren Investitionen in das TEN-V-Schienennetz — in Form von Revitalisierungsprojekten dem Bedarf für Investitionen in wichtige regionale Zubringerlinien Rechnung zu tragen. Manche der in Rede stehenden Linien könnten daher für eine Kofinanzierung der EU infrage kommen.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-003486/13
do Komisji
Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE) oraz Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D)
(27 marca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Likwidacja linii polskiej sieci kolejowej

Według różnych doniesień prasowych firma zarządzająca polską infrastrukturą kolejową, PKP Polskie Linie Kolejowe S.A., zamierza zlikwidować wiele linii kolejowych w Polsce. Wśród nich mają też być linie kolejowe współfinansowane ze środków UE.

1. Czy Komisja wie o takich planach? Jeżeli tak – w jaki sposób została poinformowana? Jeżeli nie – jakie działania podejmie, aby uzyskać informacje?
2. Gdyby planowana likwidacja dotyczyła także linii kolejowych, które były współfinansowane ze środków UE, jaki wpływ miałyby to na dotychczasowe i przyszłe współfinansowanie przez UE?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Johannesah Hahna w imieniu Komisji
(22 maja 2013 r.)

1. Komisja nie została oficjalnie zawiadomiona przez Polskę o przedmiotowych planach i dowiedziała się o nich z doniesień medialnych. Komisja podniosła wówczas tę kwestię podczas dwustronnych spotkań z władzami polskimi (Ministerstwem Transportu, zarządcą infrastruktury) oraz wyraziła swe obawy. Władze polskie uzasadniły wyłączenie z eksploatacji przedmiotowych linii kolejowych głównie przyczynami budżetowymi (oszczędności wynikające z braku ruchu lub minimalnego ruchu na tych odcinkach). Kwestia ta wciąż ewoluuje, a zarządcą infrastruktury jest gotowy dokonać ponownej oceny swoich planów, uwzględniając rozwój sytuacji.
2. Zasady polityki spójności przewidują, że projekty otrzymujące europejskie fundusze nie mogą być poddawane zasadniczej modyfikacji w terminie pięciu lat od ich zakończenia. Tym samym wyłączenie z eksploatacji linii, które otrzymały współfinansowanie UE na modernizację lub renowację w wyżej wymienionym terminie może oznaczać naruszenie tych zasad. Niemniej jednak polskie władze zaznaczyły, że planowane wyłączenie z eksploatacji linii kolejowych nie obejmuje projektów, które otrzymują lub otrzymywały współfinansowanie z UE.

Komisja podkreśla znaczenie rozsądnego podejścia strategicznego do inwestycji wspieranych z funduszy UE i dąży do zwiększenia środków przeznaczonych na projekty kolejowe w nowej perspektywie budżetowej. Ponadto, poza głównymi inwestycjami przeznaczonymi na sieć kolejową TEN-T, Komisja przygotowana jest do wyjścia naprzeciw potrzebom inwestycyjnym dotyczącym ważnych regionalnych linii dowozowych w ramach projektów rewitalizacyjnych. Niektóre z tych linii mogą więc otrzymać dofinansowanie z UE.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003486/13
to the Commission
Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE) and Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Closure of lines on the Polish rail network

According to various press reports, the operator of the Polish railway infrastructure, PKP Polskie Linie Kolejowe S.A., is planning to close numerous lines on the Polish network. These are said to also include lines that were co-financed from EU funds.

1. Is the Commission aware of any plans of this kind? If so, how was it informed? If not, what will it do to find out about this?
2. If the planned closures also affect lines that were co-financed from EU funds, what impact would this have on present and future co-financing by the EU?

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

1. The Commission was not officially notified by Poland about such plans and learnt of them through media reports. The Commission then raised the issue in bilateral meetings with the Polish authorities (Ministry of Transport, the infrastructure manager) and expressed its concerns. The Polish authorities justified the closures principally on budgetary grounds (savings due to no/minimal traffic on the sections concerned). The issue is still evolving and the infrastructure manager is ready to reassess its plans in view of developments.
2. Cohesion policy rules require that projects benefitting from European funding should not undergo a substantial modification within five years of their completion. Therefore, closure of lines which have received EU co-financing for modernisation or revitalisation within such timeframe could signify a breach of the rules. However, the Polish authorities have indicated that the plan for line closures does not include projects which are receiving or have received EU co-financing.

The Commission underlines the importance of a sound strategic approach towards the investments supported by the EU funds and aims at increased funding earmarked for rail projects in the new financial perspective. Furthermore, the Commission is also prepared to address — in addition to major investments in the TEN-T rail network — the need for investments in important regional feeder lines in the form of revitalisation projects. Some of the lines in question might therefore be able to receive co-funding by the EU.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003487/13
an die Kommission
Ismail Ertug (S&D)
(27. März 2013)

Betrifft: Folgenabschätzung: 4. Eisenbahnpaket

Artikel 63 der Richtlinie 2012/34/EU verpflichtet die Kommission, bis zum 31.12.2012 einen Bericht zur Marktentwicklung, dem Stand der Vorbereitungen für die weitere Marktöffnung sowie eine Analyse verschiedener Modelle für die Organisation des Schienenmarktes vorzulegen, wobei die Unterschiede zwischen den Mitgliedstaaten (Netzdichte, Passagierzahlen, durchschnittliche Reiseentfernung) berücksichtigt werden sollten.

Am 30.1.2013 legte die Kommission das „4. Eisenbahnpaket“ und zeitgleich eine Folgenabschätzung zu den Auswirkungen weiterer Trennungsmaßnahmen vor. Diese Folgenabschätzung enthält schwerwiegende methodische Mängel hinsichtlich der Nachweisbarkeit und Vollständigkeit. Insbesondere fehlt die empirische Grundlage für die dort gezogenen Schlussfolgerungen. Stattdessen basiert die Beweisführung im Kern auf unausgewogener und unzutreffender „anekdotischer“ Evidenz.

1. Weshalb hat die Kommission ihre Verpflichtungen aus der Richtlinie 2012/34/EU nicht erfüllt und das EP nicht rechtzeitig vor Vorlage weiterer Gesetzgebungsvorschläge („4. Eisenbahnpaket“) ausreichend über die Auswirkungen verschiedener Modelle für die Organisation des Schienenmarktes informiert?
2. Ist die Kommission mit Blick auf die ersichtlichen qualitativen und methodischen Mängel der nunmehr vorgelegten Folgenabschätzung zur weiteren Trennung von Infrastruktur und Betrieb der Auffassung, eine ausreichende Grundlage für ihre sehr weitreichenden Gesetzgebungsvorschläge geschaffen zu haben?
3. Was unternimmt die Kommission, um die Qualitätsmängel ihrer Folgenabschätzung zur Frage der Bahnstruktur im weiteren Verfahren zu beheben?

Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(6. Mai 2013)

Der Herr Abgeordnete weist zu Recht darauf hin, dass die Gesetzgebungsorgane die Kommission im Rahmen der Verhandlungen zur Richtlinie 2012/34/EU selbst dazu aufgefordert haben, Legislativmaßnahmen zur Öffnung des inländischen Schienenpersonenverkehrsmarkts in Erwägung zu ziehen und einen diskriminierungsfreien Zugang zur Infrastruktur sicherzustellen; dabei sollte sie auf den bestehenden Vorschriften zur Trennung von Infrastrukturverwaltung und Verkehrsbetrieb aufbauen.

Die Kommission hat drei detaillierte Folgenabschätzungen zur Öffnung des inländischen Schienenverkehrsmarkts, zur Verwaltung der Eisenbahninfrastruktur und zu einem gemeinsamen Konzept für die Sicherheits- und Interoperabilitätsbestimmungen vorgenommen⁽¹⁾. Diese Folgenabschätzungen beruhen jeweils auf einer gründlichen Analyse verschiedener politischer Optionen. Zu ihrer Unterstützung wurden externe Studien, eine Eurobarometer-Erhebung bei 25 000 Bürgerinnen und Bürgern und ein umfangreiches Konsultationsverfahren durchgeführt, an dem das Europäische Parlament und knapp 500 Interessenträger beteiligt waren. Auf der Grundlage dieser Analyse hat die Kommission am 30. Januar 2013 sechs Legislativvorschläge vorgelegt.

Sie hat damit die Anforderungen des Artikels 63 der Richtlinie 2012/34/EU erfüllt, wenn man von der einmonatigen Verspätung gegenüber dem vorgesehenen Datum (31. Dezember 2012) absieht. Nach Ansicht der Kommission ist diese Verspätung jedoch vor dem Hintergrund der Komplexität, Diversität und Sensibilität der zu behandelnden Probleme zu sehen. Zudem ist zu berücksichtigen, dass die Richtlinie 2012/34/EU erst am 21. November 2012 in Kraft trat.

Die Kommission ist der Auffassung, dass ihre Vorschläge auf einer sehr soliden Evidenzgrundlage beruhen und notwendig sind, um die zahlreichen Herausforderungen im Eisenbahnsektor zu bewältigen. Das 4. Eisenbahnpaket enthält weitreichende, aber pragmatische Vorschläge im Hinblick auf eine bessere Qualität und eine größere Auswahl im Eisenbahnverkehr.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/kallas/headlines/news/2013/01/fourth-railway-package_de.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003487/13
to the Commission
Ismail Ertug (S&D)
(27 March 2013)

Subject: Impact assessment: fourth Railway Package

Article 63 of Directive 2012/34/EU requires the Commission to submit a report, by 31 December 2012, on the development of the market, the state of preparation of a further opening-up of the market and an analysis of different models for organising the rail market, taking into account the differences between Member States (density of networks, number of passengers, average travel distance).

On 30 January 2013, the Commission tabled the fourth Railway Package, along with an impact assessment of the effects of further separation measures. This impact assessment has serious methodological shortcomings in terms of demonstrability and completeness. In particular, there is no empirical basis for the conclusions it draws. Evidence is instead furnished essentially on the basis of biased and incorrect 'anecdotal' evidence.

1. Why has the Commission failed to fulfil its obligations under Directive 2012/34/EU and not adequately informed Parliament of the impact of the different models for organising the rail market in good time prior to tabling further legislative proposals (the fourth Railway Package)?
2. In view of the clear qualitative and methodological shortcomings of the impact assessment that has now been submitted concerning the further separation of infrastructure and operations, does the Commission believe that it has established an adequate basis for its very far-reaching legislative proposal?
3. What will the Commission do to rectify the quality defects in its impact assessment in relation to the question of the structure of the rail system for the next stage of the process?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(6 May 2013)

The Honourable Member rightly points out that, in the context of the negotiations of Directive 2012/34/EU, the co-legislators have themselves invited the Commission to envisage legislative measures in relation to the opening of the domestic rail passenger market and to ensure non-discriminatory access to the infrastructure, building on the existing separation requirements between infrastructure management and transport operations.

The Commission carried out three detailed impact assessments on rail domestic market opening, the governance of the railway infrastructure and a common approach to safety and interoperability rules ⁽¹⁾. These impact assessments are based on a thorough analysis of various policy options. They have been supported by external support studies, a Eurobarometer survey of 25 000 citizens and an extensive consultation process which involved the European Parliament as well as nearly 500 stakeholders. Based on this analysis, the Commission put forward six legislative proposals on 30 January 2013.

The Commission therefore fulfilled the requirements of Article 63 of Directive 2012/34/EU, except for the one month delay compared to the date of 31 December 2012. The Commission believes however that this delay should be seen in light of the fact that Directive 2012/34/EU only entered into force on 21 November 2012 and the complexity, diversity and sensitivity of the problems addressed.

The Commission believes that its proposals rely on very sound evidence and are necessary to address the numerous challenges faced by the rail sector. The 4th railway package proposes far reaching but pragmatic solutions to provide better quality and more choice in railway services.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/kallas/headlines/news/2013/01/fourth-railway-package_en.htm

(Wersja polska)

**Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-003488/13
do Komisji**

Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)

(27 marca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Stanowisko Europejskiej Izby Handlowej Tajwan (European Chamber of Commerce Taiwan – ECCT) w sprawie wymiany handlowej UE-Tajwan

Stanowisko opublikowane w 2013 r. przez Europejską Izbę Handlową Tajwan (ECCT) „Unleashing the Taiwan Tiger: A Path to Economic Prosperity” (Uwolnienie tajwańskiego tygrysa: droga do gospodarczej prosperity) zdecydowanie popiera podpisanie umowy o wolnym handlu między UE a Tajwanem (termin stosowany przez ECCT to „środki wspierania handlu”).

W stanowisku stwierdzono: „Wywóz towarów z UE do Tajwanu wzrósł w okresie od 2008 r. do 2011 r. o 40 %, a wywóz usług – o 50 % w tym samym okresie. [...] Badanie z 2008 r. szacowało wzrost wywozu UE do Tajwanu o 12 mld EUR, a korzyść gospodarczą netto dla gospodarki europejskiej – 2 mld EUR rocznie”. Następnie podkreśla się, że: „UE podpisała umowę o wolnym handlu z Koreą Południową, która weszła w życie w dniu 1 lipca 2011 r. UE rozpoczęła także negocjacje umowy o wolnym handlu z Japonią. W miarę jak UE zawiera coraz więcej umów o wolnym handlu w Azji, zwiększą się niekorzystne skutki zakłócające handel w wymianie handlowej UE-Tajwan i wyraźniejsza stanie się potrzeba środków wspierania handlu UE-Tajwan”. W stanowisku stwierdza się także, że podpisanie umowy ramowej o współpracy gospodarczej między Chinami i Tajwanem poprawiło warunki „traktowania Tajwanu jako furtki do rynku Chin kontynentalnych”.

W stanowisku podkreśla się fakt, że „Tajwan także aktywnie działa na rzecz umów o handlu i inwestycjach z innymi krajami, w tym ze Stanami Zjednoczonymi i Japonią. Jeżeli nie podejmie się działań na rzecz umowy handlowej UE-Tajwan, UE może znaleźć się w tyle za swoimi głównymi partnerami handlowymi, jeżeli chodzi o zdobywanie dostępu do rynku tajwańskiego”.

1. Jakie jest stanowisko Komisji wobec powyższych argumentów?
2. Czy Komisja podziela poglądy przedstawione przez ECCT?
3. Jaka jest opinia Komisji o ostatnim stwierdzeniu dotyczącym możliwych utrudnień dla UE w zdobywaniu dostępu do rynku tajwańskiego?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Karela De Guchta w imieniu Komisji

(26 kwietnia 2013 r.)

Komisja ściśle współpracuje z Europejską Izbą Handlową Tajwan (ECCT) i jest oczywiście dobrze poinformowana o kwestiach przedstawionych w dokumentach określających stanowisko ECCT oraz w sprawozdaniach dotyczących środków wspierania handlu pomiędzy UE a Tajwanem z 2008 r. i 2012 r.

Stanowisko wobec niekorzystnych skutków zakłócających handel pomiędzy UE a Tajwanem wywołanych przez umowy o wolnym handlu zawarte przez UE w Azji, wyrażone w sprawozdaniu dotyczącym środków wspierania handlu pomiędzy UE a Tajwanem, jest ostrożne. Odnośnie do potencjalnego szybkiego wpływu umowy o wolnym handlu pomiędzy UE a Koreą Południową na unijny przywóz z Korei, a więc pośrednich skutków dla unijnego przywozu z Tajwanu, sprawozdanie stanowi, że „trudno jest dostrzec wymierny wpływ umowy o wolnym handlu na przywóz do UE”.

Jeśli chodzi o umowę ramową o współpracy gospodarczej (ECFA), analiza Komisji oraz niepotwierdzone dane płynące z sektora przemysłowego UE wykazują, że wcześniejsze wdrożenie tej umowy jest rzadko wykorzystywane przez UE – i w ujęciu ogólnym ograniczone przedsiębiorstwa – z przyczyn nierozzerwalnie związanych z ECFA.

Odnośnie do pozycji UE na rynku tajwańskim w stosunku do innych konkurentów, Stany Zjednoczone nie zawarły z Tajwanem umowy o wolnym handlu ani dwustronnej umowy inwestycyjnej. Japonia zawarła natomiast umowę inwestycyjną, która nie uwzględniła żadnych dodatkowych korzyści w zakresie dostępu do rynku.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003488/13
to the Commission
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(27 March 2013)

Subject: Position paper by the European Chamber of Commerce Taiwan (ECCT) on EU-Taiwan trade

The position paper published in 2013 by the European Chamber of Commerce Taiwan (EECT), 'Unleashing the Taiwan Tiger: A Path to Economic Prosperity', strongly supports the signing of a Free Trade Agreement between the EU and Taiwan (the ECCT's term is 'trade enhancement measures').

The paper states: 'The EU's exports of goods to Taiwan increased by more than 40% between 2008 and 2011 while services exports increased by 50% over the same period. [...] The 2008 study estimated an increase in EU exports to Taiwan of EUR 12 billion and a net economic gain for the European economy of EUR 2 billion per year'. It further stresses: 'The EU has signed an FTA with South Korea, which entered into force on 1 July 2011. The EU has also initiated FTA negotiations with Japan. As the EU concludes more free trade agreements in Asia, the trade distorting impacts on EU-Taiwan trade will worsen and the rationale for EU-Taiwan trade enhancement measures will strengthen'. The position paper also states that the signing of the Economic Cooperation Framework Agreement (ECFA) between mainland China and Taiwan has improved the conditions 'for using Taiwan as a stepping stone into the mainland Chinese market'.

The position paper underscores the fact that 'Taiwan has also been actively pursuing trade and investment agreements with other nations, including the United States (US) and Japan. If no action is taken towards an EU-Taiwan trade deal, the EU could find itself one step behind its main trading partners with respect to gaining access to the Taiwanese market'.

1. What is the Commission's position regarding the above arguments?
2. Does the Commission share the views presented by the ECCT?
3. What is the Commission's view on the final statement concerning potential setbacks for the EU in gaining access to the Taiwanese market?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(26 April 2013)

The Commission works closely with the European Chamber of Commerce Taiwan (ECCT) and is naturally well aware of the positions developed in the ECCT position papers and in the 2008 and 2012 EU-Taiwan Trade Enhancement Measures reports.

Concerning the trade distorting impacts on EU-Taiwan trade of Free Trade Agreements (FTA) concluded in Asia by the EU, the 2012 EU-Taiwan Trade Enhancement Measures report takes a cautious position. Regarding a potential early impact of the EU-Korea FTA on EU imports from Korea, and thus on an indirect effect on EU imports from Taiwan, the report notes that 'it is hard to see a measurable impact of the FTA on EU imports'.

Regarding the Economic Cooperation Framework Agreement (ECFA), the Commission's analysis and anecdotal evidence from EU industry show that its early harvest is hardly used by the EU, and more generally foreign companies for reasons inherent to the ECFA.

Concerning the EU's relative position regarding access to the Taiwanese market, the US has not concluded a FTA or a bilateral investment agreement with Taiwan. Japan has concluded an investment agreement but it does not include any additional gains in terms of market access.

(Version française)

**Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003489/13
à la Commission
Michel Dantin (PPE)
(27 mars 2013)**

Objet: Industrie européenne des panneaux photovoltaïques

Le développement des énergies renouvelables représente un enjeu considérable pour le devenir de l'Union européenne, et l'industrie des panneaux photovoltaïques illustre tous les défis auxquels se confronte le secteur.

En effet, l'industrie des panneaux photovoltaïques est aujourd'hui menacée dans toute l'Europe par le dumping des entreprises et des autorités chinoises.

Les États-Unis ont pris des dispositions pour protéger cette industrie nationale notamment en prenant des mesures de taxation des importations en provenance de la République de Chine.

La Commission peut-elle indiquer quelles mesures elle compte essayer de mettre en œuvre pour préserver l'industrie des énergies renouvelables, et spécialement celle des panneaux solaires, ayant la même finalité que les mesures prises aux États-Unis? L'Union européenne envisage-t-elle la mise en place d'une taxation des importations en provenance de la République populaire de Chine? Plus globalement, quelles mesures la Commission envisage-t-elle de mettre en œuvre pour relancer l'industrie du photovoltaïque dans l'Union?

**Réponse donnée par M. De Gucht au nom de la Commission
(15 mai 2013)**

La Commission invite l'auteur de la question à se référer aux réponses qu'elle a données aux questions écrites E-002027/2013, E-000425/2013, E-000220/2013, E-010933/2012, E-010653/2012, E-009749/2012 et E-009296/2012 ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003489/13
to the Commission
Michel Dantin (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: European photovoltaic panel industry

The development of renewable energies is vital for the future of the European Union. The photovoltaic panel industry in particular is a good example of all the challenges facing the renewables sector.

Dumping by Chinese businesses and authorities has put the entire European photovoltaic panel industry under threat.

The United States has taken steps to protect its national industry, in particular by taxing imports from the Republic of China.

Can the Commission say whether it intends to follow the example of the United States and take measures to protect the renewable energy industry, particularly the solar panel industry? If so, what will these measures be? Does the EU plan to tax imports from China? More generally, what does the Commission intend to do to boost the Union's photovoltaic industry?

**Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(15 May 2013)**

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to previous written questions E-002027/2013, E-000425/2013, E-000220/2013, E-010933/2012, E-010653/2012, E-009749/2012 and E-009296/2012 ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EN>.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003491/13
à la Commission
Astrid Lulling (PPE)
(27 mars 2013)

Objet: Application de la Directive 2010/41/UE

La 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, prévoit dans son article 16 sur la mise en œuvre, que les États membres mettent en vigueur les dispositions législatives, réglementaires et administratives nécessaires pour se conformer à ladite directive au plus tard le 5 août 2012.

1. Quels États membres ont déjà communiqué à la Commission le texte des dispositions essentielles de droit interne qu'ils ont adopté dans le domaine régi par la directive 2010/41/UE?

L'article 7 dispose que lorsqu'il existe, dans un État membre, un système de protection sociale pour les travailleurs indépendants, ledit État membre prend les mesures nécessaires pour que les conjoints et les partenaires de vie visés à l'article 2, point b) puissent bénéficier d'une protection sociale en conformité avec le droit national.

L'article 8 sur les prestations de maternité vise le droit, conformément au droit national, à une allocation de maternité suffisante leur permettant d'interrompre leur activité professionnelle pour raison de grossesse ou de maternité pendant au moins quatorze semaines, et des services de remplacement temporaire et sociaux existants au niveau national. Les États membres peuvent prévoir que l'accès à ces services constitue une solution de substitution à l'allocation visée dans le paragraphe 1 de l'article 8.

2. Quels États membres ont justifié des difficultés particulières pour un délai supplémentaire de deux ans jusqu'au 5 août 2015 afin de se conformer aux articles 7 et 8 visant les conjointes et les partenaires de vie qui participent, de manière habituelle et dans les conditions prévues par le droit national, à l'activité du travailleur indépendant en accomplissant soit les mêmes tâches, soit des tâches complémentaires (article 2, point b)?

Réponse donnée par Mme Reding au nom de la Commission
(27 mai 2013)

Tous les États membres ont notifié à la Commission des mesures de transposition de la directive 2010/41/UE.

Quatre États membres (l'Irlande, la France, la Slovénie et le Royaume-Uni) ont sollicité le délai supplémentaire visé à l'article 16, paragraphe 2, afin de se conformer aux articles 7 et 8.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003491/13
to the Commission
Astrid Lulling (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Application of Directive 2010/41/EU

Directive 2010/41/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 7 July 2010 on the application of the principle of equal treatment between men and women engaged in an activity in a self-employed capacity and repealing Council Directive 86/613/EEC stipulates, in Article 16 on implementation, that the Member States shall bring into force the laws, regulations and administrative provisions necessary to comply with this directive by 5 August 2012 at the latest.

1. Which Member States have already communicated to the Commission the text of the main provisions of national law which they have adopted in the field covered by Directive 2010/41/EU?

Article 7 lays down that where a system for social protection for self-employed workers exists in a Member State, that Member State shall take the necessary measures to ensure that spouses and life partners referred to in Article 2(b) can benefit from a social protection in accordance with national law.

Article 8 on maternity benefits refers to the right, in accordance with national law, to be granted a sufficient maternity allowance enabling interruptions in their occupational activity owing to pregnancy or motherhood for at least 14 weeks, and access to existing services supplying temporary replacements and existing national social services. The Member States may provide that access to those services is an alternative to the allowance referred to in Article 8(1).

2. Which Member States have justified particular difficulties to obtain an additional period of two years until 5 August 2014 in order to comply with Articles 7 and 8 as regards female spouses and life partners who habitually, under the conditions laid down by national law, participate in the activities of the self-employed worker and perform the same tasks or ancillary tasks (Article 2(b))?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(27 May 2013)**

All Member States have notified measures to the Commission transposing Directive 2010/41/EU.

Four Member States (Ireland, France, Slovenia and the United Kingdom) have requested the additional period mentioned in Article 16(2) to comply with Articles 7 and 8.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003492/13
alla Commissione
Giuseppe Gargani (PPE)
(27 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Richiesta di un calendario di attività per la presentazione di una proposta legislativa per un'etichettatura dei prodotti in pelle

Una regolamentazione europea per una corretta etichettatura di composizione dei prodotti in pelle è fondamentale per tutelare i consumatori da informazioni fuorvianti e difendere le PMI da una concorrenza sleale. L'industria conciaria ha infatti reso l'Europa leader mondiale nel settore grazie al suo forte impegno in termini di tutela ambientale e responsabilità sociale. Essa è inoltre rinomata per la sua internazionalizzazione e per l'eccellente capacità stilistica.

Considerato il documento di lavoro adottato dalla Commissione europea il 5 ottobre 2012 dal titolo «Scelte strategiche per la competitività dell'industria europea della moda — Punto d'incontro tra produzione e creatività», nel quale si riconosce questo vuoto legislativo e si esprime l'impegno a esaminare la necessità e la fattibilità di una proposta di legge sull'utilizzo legittimo del termine «pelle»;

considerata la risoluzione del Parlamento europeo del 17 gennaio 2013 sull'indicazione del paese di origine di taluni prodotti importati da paesi terzi nell'UE (P7_TA(2013)0029), nella quale viene ribadita l'importanza della marcatura del paese di origine per garantire la competitività delle imprese europee e tutelare i consumatori;

considerati i risultati dello studio relativo alla fattibilità e alla necessità di un'etichettatura dei prodotti in pelle promosso dalla Commissione ed eseguito da MATRIX, pubblicato il 1° febbraio 2013;

considerato inoltre che il Parlamento italiano ha già legiferato in materia, adottando la legge del 14 gennaio 2013 n. 8 recante nuove disposizioni in materia di utilizzo dei termini «cuoio», «pelle» e «pelliccia» e di quelli da essi derivati o loro sinonimi;

può la Commissione far sapere:

- quando intende avviare la valutazione di impatto legislativo;
- qual è il calendario dei lavori per la presentazione di una proposta legislativa in materia?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(7 maggio 2013)

In seguito ai risultati dello studio MATRIX la Commissione ha già avviato una valutazione d'impatto in merito a un eventuale sistema di etichettatura dell'autenticità dei pellami ⁽¹⁾.

Nell'ambito di tale processo verrà commissionato ad un consulente esterno uno studio addizionale per approfondire l'analisi. Si procederà inoltre ad indire una consultazione pubblica per raccogliere i punti di vista e le opinioni degli stakeholder e dei cittadini per quanto concerne l'etichettatura dell'autenticità della pelle.

Sulla base di questi contributi la valutazione d'impatto condotta dalla Commissione analizzerà le diverse opzioni d'intervento, tra cui un'opzione zero (nessun intervento). Qualora la Commissione concludesse, sulla base delle risultanze della valutazione d'impatto, che sia necessaria una misura giuridica, la proposta del Collegio potrebbe essere adottata al più presto nel secondo semestre del 2014.

L'etichettatura d'origine quale elemento di regole rafforzate in tema di tracciabilità per tutti i prodotti di consumo è stata proposta dalla Commissione nel suo Pacchetto «Sicurezza dei prodotti e vigilanza del mercato» ed adottata il 13 febbraio 2013. I pellami derivanti da un processo di trasformazione che sono destinati ai consumatori o quelli per i quali è ragionevole prevedibile prevedere un uso da parte dei consumatori, anche se non ad essi destinati, e che sono messi a disposizione sul mercato sono coperti dal progetto di regolamento sulla sicurezza dei prodotti di consumo che fa parte del Pacchetto summenzionato ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ «vera» pelle.

⁽²⁾ Proposta di regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio sulla sicurezza dei prodotti di consumo e che abroga la direttiva 87/357/CEE del Consiglio e la direttiva 2001/95/CE, COM(2013)78 def., 13.02.2013.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003492/13
to the Commission**

Giuseppe Gargani (PPE)

(27 March 2013)

Subject: Request for a timetable for the presentation of a draft law on the labelling of leather products

EU legislation on the proper labelling of the composition of leather products is essential to protect consumers from misleading information and to defend SMEs from unfair competition. The tanning industry has made Europe the world leader in the sector, thanks to its great efforts in terms of environmental protection and social responsibility. It is also renowned for its internationalisation and its excellent fashion sense.

On 5 October 2012, the Commission adopted the working document on entitled 'Policy options for the competitiveness of the European fashion industries: where manufacturing meets creativity', which acknowledges this legal vacuum and expresses a commitment to examine the need for — and feasibility of — a draft law on the legitimate use of the term 'leather'.

On 17 January 2013, the European Parliament adopted the resolution on the indication of country of origin for certain products entering the EU from third countries (P7_TA(2013)0029), which stresses the importance of indicating the country of origin in order to guarantee the competitiveness of European businesses and to protect consumers.

On 1 February 2013, the results were published of the study sponsored by the Commission and carried out by MATRIX into the feasibility and desirability of a labelling system for leather products.

The Italian Parliament has already passed legislation on this matter, adopting Law No 8 of 14 January 2013 setting out new provisions on the use of the terms 'hide', 'leather' and 'fur' and their derivatives or synonyms.

Can the Commission answer the following questions:

- When does it intend to begin the legislative impact assessment?
- What is the timetable for the presentation of a draft law on this issue?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission

(7 May 2013)

Following the results of the Matrix study, the Commission has already launched an impact assessment on a possible labelling scheme on leather authenticity ⁽¹⁾.

In this process, an additional study will be carried out by an external consultant in order to deepen the analysis. Moreover, a public consultation will be launched in order to gather stakeholders' and citizens' views and opinions as regards labelling on leather authenticity.

Drawing on this input, the Commission impact assessment will analyse different policy options, including a 'no action' option. In the case the Commission concludes, informed by the findings of the impact assessment, that a legal measure is necessary, the proposal by the College could be adopted in the second half of 2014 at the earliest.

Origin marking as part of reinforced traceability rules for all consumer products was proposed by the Commission in its Product Safety and Market Surveillance Package as adopted on 13 February 2013. Leather products resulting from a manufacturing process which are intended for consumers or leather products in respect of which it is reasonably foreseeable that they would be used by consumers, even if not intended for them, and were made available on the market are covered by the draft of the Consumer Product Safety Regulation which is part of the abovementioned Package ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ 'real' leather.

⁽²⁾ Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on consumer product safety and repealing Council Directive 87/357/EEC and Directive 2001/95/EC, COM(2013) 78 final, 13.2.2013.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003493/13
alla Commissione**

Claudio Morganti (EFD)

(27 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Salvataggio bancario di Cipro

Il presidente dell'Eurogruppo, Jeroen Dijsselbloem, ha recentemente dichiarato che il modello utilizzato per il salvataggio di Cipro, ovvero un prelievo forzoso sui conti correnti oltre i 100 000 euro, sarebbe un metodo auspicabile ed esportabile per risolvere i problemi bancari anche in altri paesi dell'Unione.

Se passasse questa logica, si potrebbe creare una pericolosa fuga di capitali da banche e paesi considerati a rischio verso istituti considerati più affidabili: una simile situazione contribuirebbe a un drammatico peggioramento delle condizioni di chi si trova già più in difficoltà di altri.

1. Ritiene la Commissione che la misura applicata a Cipro sia un modello da seguire ed eventualmente esportare altrove?
2. Non ritiene che l'applicazione di un simile paradigma, creando panico e allarmismi tra risparmiatori e investitori, possa portare a un immediato peggioramento dei conti degli istituti bancari e dei paesi in difficoltà, sul modello di quanto descritto precedentemente?

Risposta di Olli Rehn a nome della Commissione

(27 maggio 2013)

Le dimensioni del settore bancario, unitamente alla sua struttura, al livello di rischi assunti e alla vigilanza non ottimale, fanno di Cipro un caso unico. Le misure adottate sono state studiate appositamente per rispondere alla situazione eccezionale di Cipro e perseguono l'obiettivo di risanare un settore bancario di dimensioni più limitate, proteggendo al tempo stesso tutti i depositi al di sotto di 100.000 euro, conformemente ai principi dell'UE.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003493/13
to the Commission**

Claudio Morganti (EFD)

(27 March 2013)

Subject: Bank rescue in Cyprus

The President of the Eurogroup, Jeroen Dijsselbloem, recently stated that the model used for the bank rescue in Cyprus, namely a compulsory levy on deposits of more than EUR 100 000, would be an advantageous method that could also be used to resolve the problems of banks in other EU countries.

If this logic were accepted, it could create a dangerous outflow of capital from banks and countries considered to be at risk, in favour of establishments regarded as more reliable. Such a situation would contribute to a dramatic worsening of the prospects for those who are already facing the greatest difficulties.

1. Does the Commission believe that the measure taken in Cyprus is a model that should be followed and possibly exported elsewhere?
2. Does it not believe that the application of this kind of model, creating panic and alarmism among savers and investors, could result in an immediate deterioration of the finances of banks and countries in difficulty?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission

(27 May 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.

(Versione italiana)

**Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003494/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(27 marzo 2013)**

Oggetto: Lotta alla pirateria

È purtroppo nota la vicenda dei due marò italiani trattenuti in carcere nello stato del Kerala in India in attesa del processo. Facevano parte di un nucleo militare di protezione dalla pirateria sulla petroliera «Enrica Lexie». La stampa italiana denuncia la mancanza di accordi di tutela con i paesi rivieraschi, che avrebbero dovuto far seguito alla legge del luglio 2011 istitutiva del servizio antipirateria, per lo stazionamento e il transito dei fucilieri della Marina militare facenti parte dei nuclei di protezione. La vicenda con l'India è emblematica di questa mancanza di accordi preventivi.

La Commissione:

1. È al corrente di come altri Stati dell'Unione, le cui navi sono state interessate da atti di pirateria, abbiano provveduto alla loro protezione e a quella del relativo personale marittimo?
2. In caso affermativo, può dirci se la protezione è assicurata da personale militare?
3. È al corrente di accordi di tutela intervenuti con i paesi rivieraschi?
4. Non ritiene opportuno, fino a quando il rischio di attacchi di pirateria è possibile, proporre regole uniche di comportamento agli Stati membri per la tutela degli equipaggi e dei nuclei militari di protezione nei confronti dei paesi rivieraschi?

**Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(11 giugno 2013)**

Gli Stati membri adottano politiche diverse per proteggere dalla piaga della pirateria le navi mercantili battenti la loro bandiera nazionale. Alcuni hanno modificato o adottato la legislazione che autorizza l'impiego di guardie di sicurezza private a bordo delle navi, altri invece ricorrono alla protezione garantita dalle loro forze armate. L'Organizzazione marittima internazionale (IMO) ha emanato una serie di orientamenti in merito destinati agli armatori e agli operatori e ha prodotto un questionario per gli Stati di approdo e gli Stati costieri per identificare la legislazione e le pratiche adottate in materia.

EUNAVFOR Atalanta fornisce pattuglie di protezione militare alle navi vulnerabili in transito al largo delle coste della Somalia, in particolare quelle noleggiate nel quadro del programma alimentare mondiale. Lo status del personale militare a bordo delle pattuglie è disciplinato dagli accordi sullo status delle forze armate conclusi dall'UE con gli Stati della regione, in particolare Gibuti, le Seychelles e la Somalia. In Kenya, le pattuglie sono protette ai sensi di una dichiarazione unilaterale del governo del paese. Lo status è applicabile solo al personale e alle unità che operano sotto il comando e il controllo di EUNAVFOR.

La questione dello status e delle migliori pratiche in merito al personale di sicurezza a bordo di navi mercantili è oggetto di discussioni nel comitato «Sicurezza marittima» dell'IMO e con il gruppo di contatto sulla pirateria al largo delle coste della Somalia.

La Commissione ritiene auspicabile l'applicazione di regole uniformi per l'impiego sia di pattuglie di protezione per le navi che di personale di sicurezza armato assunto privatamente a bordo delle navi. Si impegna a favore della definizione di tali regole in primo luogo al livello internazionale dell'IMO. In caso contrario, sarà valutata la possibilità di elaborare regole uniformi all'interno dell'UE, da applicare sia alle navi battenti bandiera dell'Unione europea che alle imprese che forniscono personale di sicurezza privato a protezione delle navi.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003494/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Fight against piracy

We are all unfortunately aware of the case of the two Italian marines held in prison in the State of Kerala in India, awaiting trial. The men were part of an anti-piracy military protection unit on the tanker 'Enrica Lexie'. The Italian press has criticised the lack of protection agreements with coastal countries, which should have followed on from the law of July 2011 establishing an anti-piracy service, for the stationing and transit of Navy riflemen who are members of protective units. The incident in India is emblematic of this lack of prior agreements.

Does the Commission

1. Have any information about the measures taken to protect vessels and their crews by other EU States whose ships have been affected by acts of piracy?
2. If so, can it state whether the protection is provided by military personnel?
3. Is it aware of any protection agreements entered into with coastal countries?
4. Does it not believe that, as long as there is a possible risk of attacks by pirates, it would be appropriate to propose uniform rules of conduct to the Member States for the protection of crews and military protection units with regard to coastal countries?

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

Practice among Member States with regard to the protection of merchant vessels flying their flag from the scourge of piracy varies. Some have either amended or adopted legislation to authorise private security guards aboard their vessels, others rely on protection teams of their armed forces. The international Maritime Organisation (IMO) has issued guidance with regard to the operation of such security details to ship owners and operators and a questionnaire to port and coastal States to identify legislation and practice in this regard.

EUNAVFOR Atalanta has been providing military Vessel Protection Detachments (VPD) to vulnerable shipping off the coast of Somalia, in particular ships chartered by the World Food Programme. The status of the military personnel of such VPD is governed by the Status of Forces Agreements concluded with States in the region by the EU, notably with Djibouti, the Seychelles and Somalia. In Kenya, the VPDs are protected under the terms of a unilateral Kenyan governmental declaration. This status is available only to personnel and units operating under the Command and control of EUNAVFOR.

The issue of status and best practices with regard to security personnel on board merchant vessels is being discussed within the Maritime Security Committee of the IMO and the Contact Group on Piracy off the Coast of Somalia.

The Commission believes that uniform rules for the use of both VPDs and privately contracted armed security personnel (PCASPs) on board ships would be desirable. The Commission is striving for such rules to be set firstly at the international level by IMO. If not possible, the development of uniform rules within the EU, applying to both EU-flagged ships and EU companies providing PCASPs to ships, will be considered.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003495/13
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(27 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Necessità che la Commissione tuteli la portabilità dei telefoni cellulari

La portabilità del numero di telefono cellulare, sancita dalla legislazione europea, è messa a rischio, in Italia, dalla richiesta di limitare il diritto alla portabilità rivolta dalle compagnie telefoniche all'AgCom.

Le compagnie lamentano che la portabilità le espone a pratiche truffaldine da parte dei consumatori, i quali ricorrono al cambio di gestore telefonico per non pagare gli importi dovuti. Tuttavia, se da un lato nel Codice Civile sono disponibili tutti gli strumenti di rivalsa contro i clienti morosi, dall'altro la richiesta di limitare il diritto del consumatore di cambiare azienda fornitrice comporterebbe il rischio che quest'ultima possa in qualche modo trattenere il cliente sulla base di presunte irregolarità.

Intende la Commissione vigilare affinché non si verifichino violazioni dei diritti dei consumatori in relazione al diritto alla portabilità sancito dalla direttiva europea 98/61/CE?

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

La Commissione si impegna a garantire la piena attuazione da parte di tutti gli Stati membri delle norme dell'UE, compreso il diritto alla portabilità del numero in un giorno conformemente alla direttiva sul servizio universale.

L'articolo 30, paragrafo 4, della direttiva prevede che le autorità nazionali di regolamentazione delle telecomunicazioni stabiliscano la procedura per la portabilità del numero, tenendo conto delle disposizioni nazionali in materia di contratti, della fattibilità tecnica e della necessità di assicurare all'abbonato la continuità del servizio. In ogni caso, l'interruzione del servizio durante l'espletamento della procedura non dovrebbe superare un giorno lavorativo. Le autorità nazionali devono garantire la tutela degli abbonati durante l'intera procedura di trasferimento, evitando altresì il trasferimento ad altro operatore contro la loro volontà. Ai sensi dell'articolo 30, paragrafo 6, della direttiva citata, gli Stati membri hanno l'obbligo di provvedere affinché le condizioni e le procedure di risoluzione del contratto non agiscano da disincentivo al cambiamento del fornitore di servizi.

Secondo le informazioni a disposizione della Commissione, le regole applicabili in Italia ⁽¹⁾ stabiliscono chiaramente che la portabilità del numero non pregiudica gli obblighi contrattuali concernenti la relazione dell'abbonato con l'operatore *donating*, mentre quest'ultimo può respingere la richiesta soltanto in casi specifici che non includono le violazioni contrattuali, a meno che la disattivazione del numero trasferito sia sancita da un provvedimento giudiziario.

La Commissione continuerà a seguire da vicino l'evolversi della situazione per quanto concerne l'efficace attuazione in Italia della legislazione dell'UE in materia di portabilità del numero.

⁽¹⁾ Delibera n. 147/11/CIR.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003495/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Need for the Commission to protect the portability of mobile telephone numbers

The portability of mobile telephone numbers, as provided for by EU legislation, is being put at risk in Italy by a request to AgCom by the telephone companies to limit the right of portability.

The companies complain that portability exposes them to fraudulent practices on the part of consumers, who change operator to avoid paying the sums owed. However, while the Italian Civil Code provides all measures for recovering debts from defaulting customers, the request to limit consumers' right to change supplier entails the risk that the supplier might in some way restrain the customer on the grounds of alleged unlawful behaviour.

Does the Commission intend to ensure that there are no violations of consumers' rights in relation to the right of portability set out in Directive 98/61/EC?

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

The Commission is committed to ensuring full implementation by all Member States of EU rules including the right to number portability within one day in accordance with the Universal Service Directive.

Article 30(4) of that directive gives national telecom regulators the task of establishing the process of number portability, taking into account national provisions on contracts, technical feasibility and the need to maintain continuity of service to the subscriber. In any event, loss of service during the process should not exceed one working day. National authorities need to ensure that subscribers are protected throughout the switching process and are not switched to another provider against their will. Under Article 30(6) of this directive Member States have to ensure that conditions and procedures for contract termination do not act as a disincentive against changing service provider.

According to information available to the Commission, the rules applicable in Italy ⁽¹⁾ make it clear that number portability does not affect any contractual claim concerning the relationship of the subscriber with the donating operator, while the latter can refuse the request only in specified cases that do not include contractual breaches unless deactivation of the ported number is imposed by judicial order.

The Commission will continue to monitor any further developments regarding the effective implementation of EU legislation regarding number portability in Italy.

(1) Delibera n. 147/11/CIR.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003496/13
aan de Commissie
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(27 maart 2013)

Betref: Videogames — stand van zaken pan-Europese gedragscode en leeftijdsverificatie

In haar mededeling over videospellen en de bescherming van minderjarigen van 22 april 2008 riep de Commissie alle belanghebbenden die betrokken zijn bij de detailhandel in videospellen op om binnen twee jaar overeenstemming te bereiken over een pan-Europese gedragscode inzake de verkoop van spellen aan minderjarigen.

Ook erkende de Commissie dat online-videospellen nieuwe uitdagingen met zich meebrengen, zoals doeltreffende systemen voor leeftijdsverificatie, en riep zij de lidstaten en belanghebbenden op om samen aan innoverende oplossingen te werken;

In zijn resolutie van 12 maart 2009 verzocht het Europees Parlement de lidstaten ook om passende maatregelen te nemen om te voorkomen dat kinderen spellen kopen en spelen die geclassificeerd zijn voor een hogere leeftijdsgroep, bijvoorbeeld door middel van identiteitscontroles. Het voorstel van de Commissie om een pan-Europese gedragscode voor detailhandelaars en producenten van videospellen in te voeren, werd ook nadrukkelijk onderschreven.

— Hoe staat het inmiddels met de gedragscode voor detailhandel en de naleving ervan?

— Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie de huidige situatie wat betreft de toegankelijkheid van online games voor minderjarigen die volgens de PEGI classificatie niet tot de doelgroep behoren?

Antwoord van mevrouw Kroes namens de Commissie
(15 mei 2013)

In het verslag „Bescherming van kinderen in de digitale wereld” ⁽¹⁾ van de Commissie uit 2011 wordt aangegeven dat „de door de lidstaten gegeven antwoorden de noodzaak verder bevestigen om meer actie te ondernemen als het gaat om de detailhandel van videospellen teneinde de verkoop van videospellen aan minderjarigen aan te pakken. In slechts zes lidstaten en Noorwegen waren er bewustmakingsmaatregelen op dit gebied en in slechts vier lidstaten hebben detailhandelaren relevante gedragscodes toegepast.”

In de Europese Strategie voor een beter internet voor kinderen ⁽²⁾ benadrukt de Commissie het belang van een algemeen toepasbare, transparante en consistente aanpak voor leeftijdclassificaties voor de hele EU. Deze aanpak zou ouders duidelijke informatie moeten bieden over leeftijdscategorieën voor online spelletjes, apps en andere inhoud. Er moet worden gezocht naar innovatieve oplossingen, bijvoorbeeld classificatie door gebruikers of automatische classificatie.

Het PEGI (Pan-European Game Information System) heeft zich aangepast aan de onlineomgeving. Zo heeft het in juli 2012 „PEGI for APPS” geïntroduceerd, dat is ontworpen om leeftijdclassificaties eveneens toe te passen op platformen waar kleine softwareapplicaties, zoals spelletjes, kunnen worden gedownload en gebruikt. Een van de uitdagingen in dit opzicht houdt verband met het feit dat sommige grote operatoren van internetplatformen hun eigen classificaties hanteren en niet die van het PEGI.

De betrokkenheid van de sector is belangrijk om de doelstellingen te verwezenlijken: naar aanleiding van een oproep van de Commissie hebben 31 bedrijven toegezegd ⁽³⁾ om aan concrete maatregelen te werken, met inbegrip van een ruimer gebruik van inhoudsclassificaties.

⁽¹⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52012DC0209:NL:NOT>.

⁽²⁾ http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-12-445_en.htm?locale=en.

⁽³⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/news/better-internet-kids-ceo-coalition-1-year>.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003496/13
to the Commission**

Ivo Belet (PPE)

(27 March 2013)

Subject: Video games — status of the pan-European code of conduct and age verification

In its communication on the protection of consumers, in particular minors, in respect of the use of video games of 22 April 2008, the Commission called on all stakeholders involved in the sale of video games in retail shops to agree within two years on a pan-European code of conduct on the sale of games to minors.

The Commission also recognised that online video games bring new challenges, such as effective age verification systems and called upon Member States and stakeholders to work together on innovative solutions.

In its resolution of 12 March 2009, the European Parliament also called on the Member States to put in place adequate measures to prevent children buying and playing games which are rated for a higher age level, for example through identity checks. The resolution also emphatically supported the Commission's proposal to introduce a pan-European code of conduct for retailers and producers of video games.

— What is the current situation with regard to the code of conduct for retailers and compliance therewith?

— What is the Commission's assessment of the current situation with regard to access to online games for minors who do not fall within the target group under the PEGI classification?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission

(15 May 2013)

The Commission's 2011 report 'Protecting Children in the Digital World' ⁽¹⁾ indicates that 'the replies given by the Member States furthermore confirm the need for more action on the retail sale of video games in shops in order to deal with the "underage" sale of video games. There have been relevant awareness raising measures in six Member States and Norway only and in only four Member States retailers have implemented relevant codes of conduct'.

In the European Strategy for a Better Internet for Children ⁽²⁾, the Commission underlines the importance of having a generally applicable, transparent and consistent approach to age ratings EU-wide. It should give parents information on understandable age-categories applied to online games, apps and other content. Innovative solutions should be explored e.g. rating by users or automated rating.

PEGI — Pan-European Game Information System — has been adapting to the online environment. In particular, in July 2012 it introduced 'PEGI for APPS', designed to bring the age ratings to platforms where small software applications, including games, can be downloaded and used. One of the challenges in this respect is the fact that some major Internet platform operators use their own proprietary ratings rather than PEGI.

Engagement by industry is important to reach the aims: following invitation by the Commission 31 companies have made commitments ⁽³⁾ 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⁾ http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-12-445_en.htm?locale=en.

⁽³⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/news/better-internet-kids-ceo-coalition-1-year>.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003497/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Mecanismos de financiamento inovadores

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-0177/2010, o senhor Comissário Algirdas Šemeta declarou, em nome da Comissão, que «A Comissão Europeia está a examinar mecanismos de financiamento inovadores a nível global, tal como solicitado pelo Conselho Europeu em outubro de 2009».

1. Que mecanismos de financiamento inovadores examinou a Comissão a nível global?
2. Que mecanismos parecem à Comissão mais adequados à estrutura e às circunstâncias da União Europeia?
3. Que principais benefícios e riscos destaca a Comissão?
4. Que medidas tomou ou prevê a Comissão tomar no sentido de esses mecanismos poderem vir a ser postos em prática?

Resposta dada por Algirdas Šemeta em nome da Comissão

(23 de maio de 2013)

1. Em abril de 2010, foi publicado ⁽¹⁾um documento de trabalho dos serviços da Comissão relativo ao financiamento inovador a nível mundial. Este documento discute os benefícios e os custos de uma série de instrumentos de financiamento e incide, em termos gerais, sobre as questões levantadas pelo Senhor Deputado.

Além disso, em 25 de março de 2013, a Comissão publicou um Livro Verde sobre o financiamento a longo prazo da economia Europeia ⁽²⁾, no qual procede a uma reflexão em matéria de fontes de financiamento inovadoras.

2. Ver 4.
3. Cada opção configura o seu próprio conjunto de benefícios e riscos, constantes dos relatórios.
4. O financiamento da União através de recursos próprios é regulamentado nos termos das regras consignadas no Tratado (artigo 310.º do Tratado sobre o Funcionamento da União Europeia). Para o período de 2014, a Comissão apresentou uma proposta ⁽³⁾ com vista a adaptar o sistema em vigor, designadamente apresentando uma definição mais simples e transparente dos recursos próprios baseados no IVA e incluindo um recurso próprio baseado num imposto sobre as transações financeiras ⁽⁴⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Para mais informações consultar:

http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/articles/international/2010-04-06-global_innovative_financing_en.htm

⁽²⁾ COM(2013) 150 final.

⁽³⁾ COM(2011) 739 final.

⁽⁴⁾ Um sistema comum de imposto sobre transações financeiras constitui o objeto de uma iniciativa distinta conduzida pela Comissão. Todos os documentos relativos a essa iniciativa estão publicados no seguinte endereço eletrónico:
http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/taxation/other_taxes/financial_sector/index_en.htm

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003497/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Innovative financing

In answer to my Question E-0177/2010, Commissioner Šemeta stated on behalf of the Commission that 'The European Commission is examining innovative financing at a global level following a request by the European Council in October 2009.'

1. What innovative global-level financing has the Commission examined?
2. What financing does the Commission consider to be best suited to the EU's structure and circumstances?
3. What are the main benefits and risks that the Commission would highlight?
4. What measures has the Commission taken or does it plan to take to actually implement this financing?

**Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(23 May 2013)**

1. In April 2010, a Commission Staff Working Document on innovative finance at a global level has been published ⁽¹⁾: This document discusses the benefits and costs of a number of financing instruments and covers in general terms the issues raised by the honourable Member of Parliament.

Moreover, on 25 March 2013 the Commission published a Green Paper on long-term financing of the European economy ⁽²⁾ where reflection is given to innovative sources of finance.

2. See 4.
3. Each option contained its own set of benefits and risks which are spelled out in the reports.
4. The financing of the Union through own resources is regulated in Treaty rules (Article 310 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union). For the period as from 2014, the Commission has made a proposal ⁽³⁾ with a view to adapt the current system, notably through a simpler and more transparent definition of the VAT based own resource and the inclusion of an own resource based on a financial transaction tax ⁽⁴⁾.

⁽¹⁾ For all details see http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/articles/international/2010-04-06-global_innovative_financing_en.htm

⁽²⁾ COM(2013)150 final.

⁽³⁾ COM(2011) 739 final.

⁽⁴⁾ A common system of financial transaction tax forms the object of a separate initiative pursued by the Commission. All documents relating to that initiative are published here: http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/taxation/other_taxes/financial_sector/index_en.htm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003498/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Estágios profissionais — função e qualidade

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-000831/2013, o senhor Comissário László Andor declarou, em nome da Comissão, que, «No âmbito deste pacote de medidas, foi igualmente lançada uma consulta dos parceiros sociais sobre um quadro de qualidade para os estágios, destinado a garantir que os estágios servem realmente de trampolim para o emprego.»

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

- Obteve muitos contributos por parte dos parceiros sociais?
- Quais deles destaca? Quais as principais linhas das propostas recebidas?
- Dispõe de dados sobre quantas pessoas ingressaram no mercado de trabalho por via dos estágios profissionais realizados? E sobre a qualidade da formação ministrada no seu decurso?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão

(17 de maio de 2013)

A Comissão recebeu nove contributos dos parceiros sociais a nível europeu e dois de organizações de parceiros sociais nacionais.

A consulta confirmou o apoio à ideia de um quadro de qualidade para os estágios, mas não conduziu a negociações entre os parceiros sociais sobre esta matéria. A CES manifestou a sua disponibilidade para negociar com os empregadores um acordo autónomo, ao abrigo do artigo 154.º do TFUE. No entanto, a BusinessEurope e outras organizações de empregadores consideram que os estágios profissionais devem ser tratados no quadro das ações dos parceiros sociais europeus para combater o emprego dos jovens, e não ao abrigo do artigo 154.º do TFUE.

A Comissão não dispõe de dados sobre o número de pessoas que entraram no mercado de trabalho graças à participação num estágio. No entanto, 16 % dos inquiridos num estudo realizado pelo Fórum Europeu da Juventude em 2011 afirmaram terem sido recrutados pela organização que lhes facultou um estágio profissional e outros 18 % consideraram que os estágios os tinham ajudado a encontrar um emprego junto de outra empresa. Embora estas considerações possam não ter por base critérios quantitativos absolutamente objetivos, 75 a 80 % dos inquiridos nesse estudo classificaram a qualidade dos seus estágios como satisfatória, boa ou excelente, em termos do conteúdo da aprendizagem, do desempenho do mentor e da compensação/remuneração.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003498/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Professional traineeships — role and quality

In answer to my Question E-000831/2013, Commissioner Andor stated on behalf of the Commission that '[t]he [Youth Employment Package] also launched a social partner consultation on a Quality Framework for Traineeships to ensure that traineeships really serve as a stepping stone to a job.'

- Has the Commission had many contributions from social partners?
- Which contributions are particularly significant and what are the main areas in which proposals have been received?
- Does the Commission have any figures on the number of people who have entered the labour market via a traineeship and on the quality of training that these provide?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(17 May 2013)**

The Commission has received nine contributions from European-level social partners and two contributions from national social-partner organisations.

The consultation has confirmed the support for the idea of a quality framework for traineeships, but has not led to social-partner negotiations on this subject. ETUC has expressed its readiness to negotiate with the employers on an autonomous agreement under Article 154 TFEU. However, BusinessEurope and other employers' organisations consider that traineeships should be dealt with as part of the European social partners' framework of actions to tackle youth employment rather than under Article 154 TFEU.

The Commission has no figures on the number of people who have entered the labour market thanks to a traineeship. However, 16% of the respondents to a survey conducted by the European Youth Forum in 2011 said they were recruited by the organisation that gave them a traineeship, and another 18% felt that their traineeships had helped them to find a job with another company. While their assessments may not be based on wholly objective quantitative criteria, 75 to 80% of the respondents to that survey rated the quality of their traineeships as satisfactory, good or excellent, on the basis of learning content, mentor performance and compensation/pay.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003499/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Pagamentos Contactless — Projetos-piloto

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-0470/2010, o senhor Comissário Michel Barnier declarou, em nome da Comissão, que «No que respeita aos pagamentos Contactless, nomeadamente através de telemóveis, estão em curso na Europa (Reino Unido, Itália, França, Alemanha, Polónia e Espanha) alguns projetos-piloto.»

1. Dispõe a Comissão de informações acerca dos projetos-piloto em curso?
2. Que resultados destaca a Comissão?
3. Que riscos identifica a Comissão?

Resposta dada por Michel Barnier em nome da Comissão
(6 de junho de 2013)

A Comissão está a acompanhar de perto a evolução do mercado dos cartões «sem contacto» (contactless) e dos pagamentos móveis. Após análise dos resultados de uma consulta pública sobre o Livro Verde ⁽¹⁾, realizada em 2012, a Comissão tenciona facilitar e acelerar os esforços no sentido da normalização e da interoperabilidade no setor dos pagamentos móveis. Ainda este ano, deverão ser anunciadas ações concretas, no âmbito da proposta de revisão da Diretiva Serviços de Pagamento (2007/64/CE) ⁽²⁾.

1. Atualmente, muitos dos projetos da UE no domínio dos pagamentos baseiam-se, em grande medida, nos pagamentos por cartão sem contacto. Em vez de inserir um cartão de pagamento no terminal de retalhista, o titular do cartão aproxima simplesmente o seu cartão do dispositivo. Em função do montante da transação, poderá ser solicitado um código pessoal. A aplicação que permite o pagamento com um cartão desse tipo pode também ser incorporada num telemóvel. A Comissão investigou recentemente (no âmbito do Regulamento Concentrações) o maior desses projetos, o WEVE, um empreendimento conjunto entre as principais empresas de telecomunicações do Reino Unido. Este projeto foi aprovado sem condições suplementares.
2. O mercado dos pagamentos móveis continua a estar numa fase de desenvolvimento muito precoce, com o surgimento de inúmeras soluções nacionais ou locais que procuram chamar a atenção dos consumidores e dos restantes utilizadores. Ainda não se destacou nenhuma solução de mercado claramente vencedora ou que se sobreponha às restantes, embora os pagamentos por cartão utilizando o telemóvel estejam a ser fortemente promovidos pelos sistemas internacionais de cartões de pagamento.
3. O principal risco identificado pela Comissão é a ausência de normas abertas, o que conduz à fragmentação do mercado e, por conseguinte, a soluções que não serão perfeitas em termos de custo, eficiência e alcance do mercado. Outro risco é o desenvolvimento de modelos de pagamento móvel com base nas comissões interbancárias, dominante nos sistemas de pagamento por cartão, o que teria um impacto negativo em termos das tarifas cobradas aos utilizadores dos serviços de pagamento.

⁽¹⁾ «Para um mercado europeu integrado dos pagamentos por cartão, por Internet e por telemóvel» — COM(2011) 941 final.

⁽²⁾ JO L 319 de 5.12.2007, p. 1.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003499/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Contactless payments — pilot projects

In answer to my Question E-0470/2010, Commissioner Barnier stated on behalf of the Commission that 'As far as contactless payments are concerned, in particular via mobile phones, a certain number of pilot projects are ongoing in Europe, notably in the United Kingdom, Italy, France, Germany, Poland and Spain.'

1. Does the Commission have any information about the ongoing pilot projects?
2. What results would the Commission highlight?
3. What risks has the Commission identified?

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

The Commission is closely following the developments in the contactless cards and m-payments markets. After analysing the results of a public consultation on the Green Paper ⁽¹⁾ in 2012, the Commission intends to facilitate and accelerate the standardisation and interoperability efforts in the mobile payments sector. Concrete actions should be announced with the proposal for the revised Payment Services Directive (2007/64/EC) ⁽²⁾ later this year.

1. Currently many payment projects in the EU are largely based on contactless card payments. Instead of inserting a payment card in the retailer's terminal, the cardholder moves it close to the device. Depending of the amount of the transaction, a personal code can be requested. The card payment application can also be embedded in a mobile phone. The Commission investigated recently (under the Merger Regulation) the largest of such projects, WEVE, a joint venture between the major telecommunication companies in the UK. It was approved without further conditions.
2. The mobile payments market is still in a very early development stage, with numerous national or local solutions emerging and competing for the attention of consumers and other users. No clear market winners or prevailing payment solutions have emerged, though card-based payments through mobile phones are heavily promoted by the international card schemes.
3. The main risk identified by the Commission is an absence of open standards, leading to market fragmentation and therefore suboptimal solutions in terms of costs, efficiency and market reach. Another risk is the development of m-payment models based on the interchange fees, dominant in the card payments, which would have negative impact on charges for payment service users.

⁽¹⁾ 'Towards an integrated European market for card, Internet and mobile payments' — COM(2011) 941 final.

⁽²⁾ OJ L 319/1 from 05 December 2007.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003500/13
à Comissão

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Apoios à reconversão de motores

Numa reunião recente que tive com o Sindicato dos Trabalhadores da Pesca do Centro, em Peniche, um dos temas abordados foi o da reconversão de motores, tendo em vista uma maior eficiência energética e poupança de combustível. Foi referida, em particular, a possível adaptação dos motores para o gás natural.

Solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre que programas e medidas podem apoiar esta reconversão, quer no atual Quadro Financeiro Plurianual quer no próximo (2014-2020), e quais as taxas de cofinanciamento previstas.

Resposta dada por Maria Damanaki em nome da Comissão

(3 de junho de 2013)

No presente período de programação, a conversão dos motores poderá ser elegível ao abrigo do Regulamento (CE) n.º 1198/2006 do Conselho, relativo ao Fundo Europeu das Pescas (FEP). O artigo 25.º, n.º 2, cobre os investimentos que permitam melhorar a eficiência energética, desde que não aumentem a capacidade de captura do navio. No seu Relatório Especial n.º 12/2011, contudo, o Tribunal de Contas Europeu ⁽¹⁾ indicou que o investimento na eficiência energética poderá, na realidade, resultar num aumento da capacidade de captura.

O Programa Operacional (PO) do FEP para Portugal prevê o apoio a soluções técnicas que permitam reduzir as emissões poluentes, aumentando assim a eficiência energética. Em conformidade tanto com o Regulamento FEP como com o PO para Portugal, a intensidade máxima dos auxílios para essas medidas será de 40 %, o que implica que o beneficiário final deverá contribuir com um mínimo de 60 %. A taxa de cofinanciamento prevista para medidas deste tipo é de 75 % do montante total do apoio público.

A Comissão está a procurar dar resposta, no que respeita ao período 2014-2020, às preocupações suscitadas pelo Tribunal de Contas Europeu. A proposta da Comissão relativa ao Fundo Europeu dos Assuntos Marítimos e das Pescas (FEAMP) refere explicitamente a necessidade de não aumentar a capacidade de pesca e prevê também que os investimentos ligados à modernização da frota deverão ser limitados e estar associados a objetivos claramente definidos. O FEAMP não prevê, portanto, disposições de apoio à substituição dos motores. No entanto, as propostas da Comissão incluem a possibilidade de apoio a investimentos a bordo concebidos para aumentar a eficiência energética e também a possibilidade de ajudas para a mudança de arte de pesca de uma forma que dê efetivamente resposta ao problema do consumo de combustível. O FEAMP encontra-se atualmente em discussão perante o Conselho e o Parlamento.

⁽¹⁾ Relatório Especial n.º 12/2011 do Tribunal de Contas, «As medidas da UE contribuíram para adaptar a capacidade das frotas de pesca às possibilidades de pesca disponíveis?».

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003500/13
to the Commission**

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)

(27 March 2013)

Subject: Support for engine reconditioning

One of the issues covered at my recent meeting with the Union of Fishery Workers of Central Portugal (STPC) in Peniche was the reconditioning of engines to make them more energy-efficient and to save fuel. In particular, we discussed the possible conversion of engines to run on natural gas.

Can the Commission say what programmes and measures could support this reconditioning, either under the present multiannual financial framework or the next one (2014-2020), and what co-financing rates it envisages.

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission

(3 June 2013)

In the current programming period, conversion of engines can be eligible under Council Regulation (EC) No 1198/2006 on the European Fisheries Fund (EFF). Article 25.2 covers investments improving energy efficiency provided that they do not increase the ability of the vessels to catch fish. In its Special Report 12/2011, however, the European Court of Auditors ⁽¹⁾ pointed out that investments in energy-efficient engines could in practice increase the ability to catch fish.

The EFF Operational Programme (OP) of Portugal foresees support for technical solutions resulting in the reduction of pollutant emissions, thus increasing energy efficiency. In line with both the EFF regulation and the Portuguese OP, the aid intensity for such actions is maximum 40%, meaning that the final beneficiary's contribution should be at least 60%. The co-financing rate foreseen for such actions is 75% of the total amount of public support.

For the 2014-2020 period, the Commission is seeking to address the concerns raised by the European Court of Auditors. The Commission proposal for the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) makes an explicit reference to 'non-increase of fishing capacity' and also foresees that investments linked to vessel modernisation should be restricted and linked to clearly defined objectives. Thus, the EMFF does not include provisions for support for engine replacement. Nevertheless, Commission's proposal does include support for on-board investments designed to improve energy efficiency and aid for change of fishing gear as a way to effectively address fuel consumption. Discussions in Council and Parliament on the EMFF are ongoing.

⁽¹⁾ European Court of Auditors Special Report No 12/2011 Have EU measures contributed to adapting the capacity of the fishing fleets to available fishing opportunities?.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003501/13

à Comissão

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Apoios comunitários à construção naval

Relativamente aos apoios à construção naval, oriundos do orçamento da UE, solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Que apoios foram dirigidos à construção naval no âmbito do 7.º Programa-Quadro? Quais as empresas de construção naval envolvidas e de que países são essas empresas?
2. Foi concedido algum apoio comunitário à construção naval no quadro de algum outro programa que não o Programa-Quadro?
3. Que possíveis apoios comunitários à construção naval estão previstos na proposta de Quadro Financeiro Plurianual 2014-2020?

Resposta dada por Máire Geoghegan-Quinn em nome da Comissão

(17 de maio de 2013)

1. O apoio à construção naval no âmbito do 7.º Programa-Quadro de atividades de investigação, desenvolvimento tecnológico e demonstração (7.º PQ, 2007-2013) insere-se na rubrica «Transportes de superfície sustentáveis». É difícil, contudo, quantificar exatamente os apoios de que beneficiaram estaleiros navais e construtores de equipamento naval, uma vez que os projetos envolvem geralmente parceiros de vários segmentos do setor marítimo e universidades. As dotações financeiras variam, assim, de projeto para projeto. Os apoios dirigem-se às tecnologias de construção naval e aos navios, mas contemplam igualmente as máquinas, os sistemas de navegação avançados, os materiais, a segurança e a eficiência energética.

O apoio ao subsetor do transporte por via aquática, no âmbito do 7.º PQ, cifrou-se em cerca de 240 milhões de euros, o que representa cerca de 28 % do apoio proporcionado a projetos no setor dos transportes. O número de projetos do 7.º PQ neste subsetor ronda os 65.

Entre os participantes nos projetos contam-se estaleiros navais (reparação e construção) de todos os Estados-Membros interessados, bem como da Croácia, da Noruega e da Turquia.

2. Não houve outros apoios comunitários diretos ao setor da construção naval.
3. Está previsto que o apoio direto à investigação e inovação no setor da construção naval, no âmbito do Quadro Financeiro Plurianual para 2014-2020, provenha de novo maioritariamente do orçamento da investigação e inovação. As oportunidades de financiamento ao abrigo do Horizonte 2020, o novo programa-quadro da UE para a investigação e a inovação, inscrever-se-ão na parte III (desafios societais), rubrica 4 (transportes inteligentes, ecológicos e integrados). Como as negociações interinstitucionais sobre o programa Horizonte 2020 estão ainda a decorrer, é demasiado cedo para definir que domínios específicos de investigação poderão ficar abrangidos.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003501/13
to the Commission**

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)

(27 March 2013)

Subject: EU support for shipbuilding

With regard to EU budgetary support for shipbuilding:

1. What support has been allocated to shipbuilding under the Seventh Framework Programme? Which shipbuilding companies are involved and which countries are these companies from?
2. Has EU support for shipbuilding been granted under any programme other than the framework Programme?
3. What possible EU support for shipbuilding is provided for in the draft Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-2020?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission

(17 May 2013)

1. In the Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013), support for shipbuilding has been provided under the 'Sustainable Surface Transport' heading. However, the exact benefit for shipyards and marine equipment manufacturers is difficult to establish as projects are generally undertaken with partners from various maritime sectors and from academia. Financial allocations vary therefore from project to project. The support concerns shipbuilding technologies and vessels but also includes aspects such as marine engines, safety, advanced navigation systems, energy efficiency, materials etc.

In FP7, the waterborne transport sector was funded with ca. EUR 240 mio, which represents ca. 28% of the funding for transport projects. The number of FP7 projects in waterborne transport is ca. 65.

Among the project participants are shipyards from all relevant Member States plus Croatia, Norway and Turkey (covering both the repair and new building segments).

2. There has been no other direct EU support to the shipbuilding industry.

3. It is expected that in the Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-2020, direct support for shipbuilding Research and Innovation activities will again come mainly from the research and innovation budget. Funding opportunities under Horizon 2020, the next EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation, would be in part III — Societal Challenges, '4. Smart, green and integrated transport'. However, since the interinstitutional negotiations on Horizon 2020 are still ongoing, it is too early to define the specific research issues that could be addressed.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003502/13
à Comissão

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Execução do eixo 4 do Promar (FEP) e reprogramação do Promar

Pergunto à Comissão se dispõe de informação atualizada relativa às taxas de execução do eixo 4 do Promar, em especial na região do Algarve. Discutiu recentemente alguma reprogramação do Promar com o governo português?

Resposta dada por Maria Damanaki em nome da Comissão

(17 de maio de 2013)

As autoridades portuguesas decidiram atribuir ao eixo 4 (desenvolvimento sustentável das zonas de pesca) do Programa Operacional Pesca (Promar), para o período 2007-2013, um montante de 17,4 milhões de euros. Cada um dos sete grupos de ação costeira tem ao seu dispor 2,3 milhões de euros, em média, provenientes do Fundo Europeu das Pescas (FEP) ⁽¹⁾, para desenvolver a sua estratégia territorial. No quadro da revisão em curso do Promar, está prevista a redução em 0,7 milhões de euros das dotações FEP afetas ao eixo 4, em resultado de a Região Autónoma dos Açores ter optado por não aplicar esta medida.

Em finais de fevereiro de 2013, os grupos de ação costeira tinham afetado 58,7 % dos montantes disponíveis e a taxa de execução situava-se em 11 % do orçamento total. As taxas de execução dos dois grupos de ação costeira do Algarve, o GAC Barlavento do Algarve e o GAC Sotavento do Algarve, eram de 7 % e 10,7 % respetivamente.

Caso pretenda obter mais informações, o Senhor Deputado deverá dirigir-se à Autoridade de Gestão portuguesa ⁽²⁾, a quem incumbe a responsabilidade pela gestão e execução do programa operacional. O texto do Programa Operacional Pesca 2007-2013 do FEP está disponível no sítio Web do governo português ⁽³⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Regulamento (CE) n.º 1198/2006 do Conselho, de 27 de julho de 2006, JO L 223 de 15.8.2006.

⁽²⁾ DGRM — Direção-Geral dos Recursos Naturais, Segurança e Serviços Marítimos.

⁽³⁾ <http://www.promar.gov.pt/>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003502/13
to the Commission**

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)

(27 March 2013)

Subject: Execution of Axis 4 of the Portuguese Fisheries Operational Programme (PROMAR) and the reprogramming of this programme

Could the Commission provide updated information on the execution rates of Axis 4 of the Portuguese Fisheries Operational Programme (PROMAR), particularly in the Algarve region? Has it recently discussed any reorganisation of this programme with the Portuguese Government?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission

(17 May 2013)

For the period 2007-2013, the Portuguese authorities have chosen to allocate an amount of EUR 17.4 million to the sustainable development of fisheries areas (Axis 4) inside of the Operational Programme for Fisheries in Portugal (PROMAR). Each of the seven Fisheries Local Action Group has at its disposal in average EUR 2.3 million of the European Fisheries Fund ⁽¹⁾ (EFF) to develop their territorial strategies. The ongoing revision of the PROMAR programme foresees a reduction of the EFF allocations to Axis 4 of EUR 0.7 million since the autonomous region of Azores has opted not to apply this measure.

By the end of February 2013 the Fisheries Local Action Groups had committed 58.7% of the available amounts and the level of execution was 11% of their total budget. The two Fisheries Local Action Groups from Algarve 'GAC Barlavento do Algarve' and 'GAC Sotavento do Algarve' present the execution rates of 7% and 10.7% respectively.

Should the Honourable Member need further details, he is invited to contact the Portuguese Managing Authorities ⁽²⁾, responsible for managing and implementing the Operational Programme. The text of the EFF Operational Programme 2007-2013 is available on the Portuguese Government web page ⁽³⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Council Regulation (EC) No 1198/2006 of 27 July 2006, OJ L 223, 15.8.2006.

⁽²⁾ DGRM — Direcção-Geral de Recursos Naturais, Segurança e Serviços Marítimos.

⁽³⁾ <http://www.promar.gov.pt/>

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003503/13

à Comissão

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Fundo ORIO

O Fundo ORIO, financiado pelo Ministério das Relações Exteriores dos Países Baixos, apoia a realização de grandes projetos de infraestrutura em diversos países. Este fundo prevê linhas de crédito no exterior e cobre parte do financiamento para possibilitar a compra de bens, conhecimentos e competência técnica. Os governos de países terceiros fazem o pedido, embora este possa ser iniciado por empresas privadas. Muitas empresas holandesas têm beneficiado das linhas de crédito abertas por este fundo que, assim, apoia a aquisição por países terceiros de bens e serviços produzidos ou prestados por estas empresas. É o caso da construção naval, por exemplo.

1. Tem a Comissão conhecimento da existência do Fundo ORIO, das quantias por ele já disponibilizadas e, bem assim, dos montantes envolvidos na aquisição de bens e serviços (financiados pelo ORIO) a empresas holandesas?
2. Tem a Comissão conhecimento da existência de outros fundos, com objetivos idênticos, noutros países da UE?

Resposta dada por Andris Piebalgs em nome da Comissão

(29 de maio de 2013)

A Comissão tem conhecimento do mecanismo para o desenvolvimento de infraestruturas/ORIO financiado pelos Países Baixos, mas não participa no seu cofinanciamento. A Comissão não dispõe de informações internas no que respeita aos montantes disponibilizados através do programa ou aos montantes envolvidos na aquisição de bens e serviços financiados pelo Fundo ORIO. No entanto, as informações sobre o orçamento do Fundo ORIO podem ser consultadas no sítio Web do programa ⁽¹⁾.

Em 2013 foi lançado um estudo com o objetivo, entre outros, de recolher informações sobre programas de desenvolvimento de parcerias público-privadas semelhantes financiados pelos Estados-Membros e outros grandes organismos de desenvolvimento. O estudo, relativo à participação do setor privado no desenvolvimento e ao alargamento das atividades de financiamento misto da UE (*Engaging the private sector in development and extending blending activities of the EU*), inclui, entre outros elementos, um recenseamento dos programas de colaboração público-privada que possam contribuir para a reflexão da Comissão em termos de saber onde e como a UE pode facilitar a colaboração público-privada na cooperação externa. As primeiras conclusões do estudo deverão estar disponíveis no final de 2013.

Nos diálogos políticos e processos de cooperação que a Comissão desenvolve com um certo número de países terceiros (por exemplo, os países vizinhos mediterrânicos), a experiência e as boas práticas em matéria de parcerias entre os setores público e privado são partilhadas, procurando-se a máxima sinergia com as ações dos Estados-Membros neste domínio.

Por outro lado, a Comissão estabelece diálogos idênticos diretamente com os Estados-Membros, nomeadamente através do Grupo de Peritos da UE com os Estados-Membros sobre o desenvolvimento do setor privado em países terceiros ⁽²⁾, e a plataforma da UE para o financiamento misto na cooperação externa.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.agentschapnl.nl/en/onderwerp/background-information-orio>

⁽²⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regexpert/index.cfm?do=groupDetail.groupDetail&groupID=2748&news=1&mod_groups=1&month=10&year=2012

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003503/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Facility for Infrastructure Development (ORIO)

The Facility for Infrastructure Development (ORIO), funded by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, supports the implementation of major infrastructure projects in a number of countries. ORIO provides credit lines abroad and provides partial funding for the purchase of goods, knowledge and technical know-how. The governments of third countries submit an application, although this can be started by private companies. Many Dutch companies have benefitted from credit lines opened by ORIO, which thereby helps third countries buy goods produced and services provided by these companies. That is the case with shipbuilding, for example.

1. Is the Commission aware of ORIO, the sums it has made available, and the sums involved in the purchasing of ORIO-funded goods and services from Dutch companies?
2. Is the Commission aware of other funds with the same objectives in other Member States?

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

The Commission is aware of the Facility for Infrastructure Development/ORIO funded by the Netherlands but does not co-finance this facility. The Commission has no internal information about sums made available through the programme and sums involved in the purchasing of ORIO -funded goods and services. However, information on the ORIO budget can be found on the official website of the programme ⁽¹⁾.

A study has just been launched in 2013 to, *inter alia*, gather information on similar private-public development partnership programmes funded by Member States and other major development agencies. This study 'Engaging the private sector in development and extending blending activities of the EU' comprises, among other things, a mapping of private-public collaboration programmes that should provide an input into the Commission's thinking on where and how the EU could facilitate private-public collaboration in external cooperation. The first conclusions of the study are expected in late 2013.

In policy dialogues and cooperation processes that the Commission has with a number of third countries (e.g. Mediterranean Neighbourhood countries), experience and good practice relating to public-private partnerships is shared and maximum synergy with Member States' actions in this field is sought.

The Commission also holds similar dialogues with Member States directly, for instance through the EU Expert Group with Member States on Private Sector Development in Third Countries ⁽²⁾, and the EU Platform for Blending in External Cooperation.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.agentschapnl.nl/en/onderwerp/background-information-orio>

⁽²⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regexpert/index.cfm?do=groupDetail.groupDetail&groupID=2748&news=1&mod_groups=1&month=10&year=2012

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003504/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Concursos públicos na área da construção naval divulgados no Jornal Oficial

Relativamente aos concursos públicos divulgados no Jornal Oficial da UE, na área da construção naval, solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Quantos concursos públicos internacionais na área da construção naval foram até à data anunciados no Jornal Oficial?
2. Quais as nacionalidades das entidades adjudicantes?
3. Quais as nacionalidades das empresas que ganharam os concursos?

Resposta dada por Michel Barnier em nome da Comissão
(13 de maio de 2013)

Desde o início de 2009, as entidades adjudicantes da União Europeia e do Espaço Económico Europeu publicaram 1 207 anúncios de adjudicação de contratos na área da construção naval (tal com especifica o grupo de códigos 345 do Vocabulário Comum para os Contratos Públicos (CPV) relativo a navios e barcos) no Jornal Oficial da União Europeia.

A tabela em anexo apresenta uma repartição por Estado-Membro da entidade adjudicante e do país das empresas a quem foram adjudicados contratos públicos. Tal está limitado aos contratos que contêm informações suficientes. Não há qualquer indicação quanto ao país de origem do contratante vencedor em relação a 105 destes contratos. Os anúncios de adjudicação não mencionam o país de origem de quaisquer subcontratantes.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003504/13
to the Commission**

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(27 March 2013)

Subject: Public tenders in the field of shipbuilding published in the Official Journal

With regard to public tenders in the field of shipbuilding published in the *Official Journal of the European Union*:

1. How many international public tenders in the field of shipbuilding have been published in the Official Journal to date?
2. What are the nationalities of the contracting authorities?
3. What are the nationalities of the companies that have won the tenders?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission

(13 May 2013)

Since the beginning of 2009 contracting authorities from the European Union and European Economic Area have published 1 207 contract award notices in the field of shipbuilding (as identified by the Common Procurement Vocabulary code group 345: ships and boats) in the Official Journal of the EU.

The table in annex gives the breakdown by Member State of the awarding authority and country of the companies which won the contracts. This is limited to those contracts where sufficient information is provided. For 105 of these contracts, there is no indication of the country of origin of the winning contractor. The notices do not record the country of origin of any subcontractors.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003505/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: «A água é um direito humano» — Iniciativa da Federação Europeia dos Serviços Públicos

A Federação Europeia dos Serviços Públicos anunciou que mais de um milhão de cidadãos de vários países da UE já subscreveu a sua iniciativa «A água é um direito humano». Esta iniciativa visa reconhecer e salvaguardar a água como um bem público, cuja posse, propriedade e gestão devem ser públicas, rejeitando qualquer forma de privatização. A iniciativa visa ainda a implementação das medidas necessárias para efetivar o direito à água e ao saneamento, considerado um direito humano fundamental pela Assembleia Geral das Nações Unidas.

Tendo em conta esta importante iniciativa e a impressionante mobilização que suscitou de mais de um milhão de cidadãos de diferentes países, perguntamos à Comissão:

1. Que seguimento vai dar à iniciativa da Federação Europeia dos Serviços Públicos «A água é um direito humano»?
2. Está disponível para rever a legislação pertinente, em especial no que diz respeito à contratação pública e às concessões, a fim de garantir que a propriedade e a gestão da água, bem como das empresas de distribuição, permaneçam no setor público?
3. Que outras iniciativas pensa desenvolver para garantir que a totalidade dos cidadãos, sem exclusões, possa gozar do direito à água e ao saneamento?

Resposta dada por Maroš Šefčovič em nome da Comissão
(23 de maio de 2013)

Os Senhores Deputados referem-se a uma proposta de iniciativa cívica que não foi apresentada à Comissão nos termos do artigo 9.º do Regulamento sobre a iniciativa de cidadania ⁽¹⁾

Por uma questão de princípio, a Comissão abstém-se de se pronunciar sobre iniciativas cujo processo de recolha de assinaturas esteja a decorrer.

A Comissão continuará a explicar aos cidadãos a sua proposta sobre a adjudicação de contratos de concessão ⁽²⁾. No que respeita à escolha de um regime de propriedade pública ou privada para gestão da água, tal como já reiteradamente indicado, a Comissão mantém uma posição neutra, nos termos do artigo 345.º do TFUE.

⁽¹⁾ Regulamento (UE) n.º 211/2011 sobre a iniciativa de cidadania.

⁽²⁾ Proposta de Diretiva do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativa à adjudicação de contratos de concessão [COM(2011) 897 final].

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003505/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: 'Water is a human right' — European Federation of Public Service Unions initiative

The European Federation of Public Service Unions has announced that it has collected over one million signatures from citizens of several EU countries for its 'Water is a human right' initiative. This initiative aims to recognise and protect water as a public good, to support the public possession, ownership and management of water and to reject of any form of privatisation. The initiative also aims to implement the measures needed to ensure the right to water and sanitation, which the United Nations General Assembly considers a fundamental human right.

In the light of this important initiative and the impressive mobilisation of over a million citizens from several countries:

1. What action will the Commission take regarding the European Federation of Public Service Unions initiative 'Water is a human right'?
2. It is prepared to review the relevant legislation, particularly that on public procurement and concessions, to ensure the continued public ownership and management of water and distribution companies?
3. What other initiatives will it develop to ensure that all citizens, without exception, can enjoy the right to water and sanitation?

**Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(23 May 2013)**

The Honourable Members are referring to a proposed citizens' initiative which has not been submitted to the Commission in accordance with Article 9 of the regulation on the citizens' initiative ⁽¹⁾.

As a matter of principle the Commission never pronounces itself on any registered initiative while the process of collecting signatures is still ongoing.

The Commission will continue to explain to citizens its proposal on the award of concession contracts ⁽²⁾. With regard to the choice of a regime of public or private ownership of water utilities, as it has indicated on several occasions, the Commission maintains a neutral position in accordance with Article 345 of the TFEU.

⁽¹⁾ Regulation (EU) No 211/2011 on the citizens' initiative.

⁽²⁾ Proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the award of concession contracts — COM(2011) 897 final.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003506/13

à Comissão

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Grupos de Ação Costeira e Grupos de Ação Local

Numa reunião recente com responsáveis autárquicos fui alertado para algumas dúvidas relativamente ao futuro dos Grupos de Ação Costeira (GAC — atual FEP, futuro FEAMP) e dos Grupos de Ação Local (GAL — Feader), nomeadamente quanto a uma possível abordagem comum ou fusão. Sucede que se os GAC têm de corresponder a um território com faixa litoral, já os GAL não podem ter litoral.

Assim, solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. O que está previsto relativamente ao futuro dos GAC e dos GAL?
2. Que medidas irão ser tomadas para incentivar a criação e a atividade destes grupos?
3. Que recursos lhes irão ser afetados em termos de orçamento?

Resposta dada por Maria Damanaki em nome da Comissão

(3 de junho de 2013)

A partir de 2014, o desenvolvimento promovido pelas comunidades locais (DPCL) poderá ser apoiado não só pelo Feader ⁽¹⁾ (Leader) e pelo FEAMP ⁽²⁾, como também pelo FEDER ⁽³⁾ e pelo FSE ⁽⁴⁾. Os grandes princípios do DPCL são estabelecidos no Regulamento Disposições Comuns ⁽⁵⁾ e complementados pelas regras específicas do Feader e do FEAMP. As regras comuns para o DPCL deverão facilitar a aplicação de abordagens integradas entre os diferentes Fundos.

No quadro da aplicação do DPCL pós-2013, um Estado-Membro ou região poderá decidir apoiar estratégias financiadas por um único Fundo ou poderá dar aos Grupos de Ação Local (GAL) a possibilidade de combinar o financiamento a partir de vários Fundos numa estratégia única e integrada. A Comissão já emitiu projetos de orientação sobre o DPCL em intenção dos Estados-Membros ⁽⁶⁾, nos termos das quais estes deverão descrever as suas abordagens no âmbito dos Acordos de Parceria. No entanto, e em última análise, caberá aos GAL decidir se optam por uma estratégia financiada apenas por um ou por vários Fundos, caso o Estado-Membro envolvido permita essa possibilidade.

Nos termos do FEAMP, os Grupos de Ação Local da Pesca (GALP) podem ser apoiados em todas as zonas de pesca, tanto costeiras como em águas interiores. No caso do Feader, os GAL podem ser apoiados em todas as zonas rurais definidas como tal pelo Estado-Membro envolvido.

Os Estados-Membros são encorajados a utilizar os seus respetivos orçamentos de assistência técnica ⁽⁷⁾ para prestar informação às partes interessadas sobre a forma como o DPCL irá funcionar a partir de 2014 e a utilizar os financiamentos disponíveis nesse contexto ⁽⁸⁾ para dar apoio à preparação de medidas de capacitação dos atores locais, de criação de parcerias locais e de conceção de estratégias de desenvolvimento local.

As autoridades responsáveis pela gestão dos diferentes Fundos definirão o orçamento para os GALP e os GAL Leader. O DPCL é voluntário ao abrigo do Fundo Europeu das Pescas ⁽⁹⁾ e da proposta relativa ao FEAMP. No que respeita ao Feader, pelo menos 5 % dos fundos terão de ser afetados através do programa Leader.

⁽¹⁾ Fundo Europeu Agrícola de Desenvolvimento Rural (ver: proposta de Regulamento do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativo ao apoio ao desenvolvimento rural pelo Fundo Europeu Agrícola de Desenvolvimento Rural (COM(2011) 627 final/2).

⁽²⁾ Fundo Europeu dos Assuntos Marítimos e da Pesca (ver: proposta de Regulamento do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativo ao Fundo Europeu dos Assuntos Marítimos e da Pesca (COM/2011/0804 final).

⁽³⁾ Fundo Europeu de Desenvolvimento Regional.

⁽⁴⁾ Fundo Social Europeu.

⁽⁵⁾ Proposta de Regulamento do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho que estabelece disposições comuns relativas ao Fundo Europeu de Desenvolvimento Regional, ao Fundo Social Europeu e ao Fundo de Coesão, ao Fundo Europeu Agrícola de Desenvolvimento Rural e ao Fundo Europeu para os Assuntos Marítimos e as Pescas, abrangidos pelo Quadro Estratégico Comum, e que estabelece disposições gerais relativas ao Fundo Europeu de Desenvolvimento Regional, ao Fundo Social Europeu e ao Fundo de Coesão, e que revoga o Regulamento (CE) n.º 1083/2006 do Conselho, COM(2011) 615 final, proposta alterada COM(2012) 496 final.

⁽⁶⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/what/future/experts_documents_en.cfm#3

⁽⁷⁾ No âmbito do FEP e do Feader (2007-2013).

⁽⁸⁾ No âmbito do Feader, do FEAMP, do FEDER e do FSE (2014-2020); ver o artigo 31.º da proposta relativa ao Regulamento Disposições Comuns.

⁽⁹⁾ Durante o período de 2007-2013, em média, 13 % do orçamento do FEP foram utilizados para o desenvolvimento sustentável das pescas nos vários Estados-Membros.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003506/13
to the Commission**

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)

(27 March 2013)

Subject: Coastal Action Groups and Local Action Groups

In a recent meeting with local authorities, my attention was drawn to doubts about the future of Coastal Action Groups (CAGs — current European Fisheries Fund, and future European Maritime and Fisheries Fund) and Local Action Groups (LAGs — European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development), in particular regarding a possible joint approach or merger. It follows that if CAGs must correspond to coastal territories, LAGs may not cover stretches of coastline.

1. What are the future plans for CAGs and LAGs?
2. What measures will be adopted to encourage the creation of these groups and activity within them?
3. What budgetary resources will be allocated to them?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission

(3 June 2013)

From 2014, community-led local development (CLLD) can be supported not only by the EAFRD ⁽¹⁾ (Leader) and EMFF ⁽²⁾, but also by the ERDF ⁽³⁾ and ESF ⁽⁴⁾. The main principles for CLLD are set out in the proposed Common Provisions Regulation ⁽⁵⁾ and complemented by fund-specific rules for the EAFRD and EMFF. The common rules for CLLD should facilitate the implementation of integrated approaches among the different Funds.

To implement CLLD post-2013, a Member State or region can decide to support strategies funded by one Fund only or it can make the option available to Local Action Groups (LAGs) to combine funding from several Funds into a single strategy in an integrated way. The Commission has already issued draft guidance to Member States on CLLD ⁽⁶⁾ and the Member States are expected to describe their approach in the Partnership Agreements. However, eventually it is up to the LAGs to decide if they opt for a strategy funded by one or several Funds, if this possibility has been made available in the MS.

Under the EMFF Fisheries Local Action Groups (FLAGs) can be supported both in coastal and inland fisheries areas. Under the EAFRD, LAGs can be supported in rural areas as defined by the Member State concerned.

Member States are encouraged to use their technical assistance budgets ⁽⁷⁾ to inform relevant stakeholders how CLLD will be implemented from 2014 and to use funding available under CLLD ⁽⁸⁾ for preparatory support to provide capacity-building for local actors and support the creation of local partnerships and design of local development strategies.

Managing authorities of the different Funds decide on the budget for FLAGs and Leader LAGs. CLLD is voluntary under the European Fisheries Fund ⁽⁹⁾ and the proposed EMFF. Under EAFRD, a minimum of 5% has to be allocated to Leader.

⁽¹⁾ European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (see: proposal for a regulation of the EP and the Council on support for rural development by the EAFRD (COM(2011) 627 final/2).

⁽²⁾ European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (see: proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and the Council on the EMFF (COM(2011) 804 final).

⁽³⁾ European Regional Development Fund.

⁽⁴⁾ European Social Fund.

⁽⁵⁾ Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and the Council laying down common provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund, the Cohesion Fund, the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund covered by the Common Strategic Framework and laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006, COM(2011) 615 final, amended proposal COM(2012) 496 final.

⁽⁶⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/what/future/experts_documents_en.cfm#3

⁽⁷⁾ From the EFF and EAFRD (2007-13).

⁽⁸⁾ From the EAFRD, EMFF, ERDF and ESF (2014-20); see Article 31 of the proposed Common Provisions Regulation.

⁽⁹⁾ In the 2007-13 period an average of 13% of the EFF budget is used for the sustainable development of fisheries areas across MS.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003507/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Condições de trabalho na ESIP (Portugal) e discriminação das mulheres trabalhadoras

Em outubro de 2010, na pergunta escrita E-8114/2010 foi referida a precariedade laboral reinante na ESIP (European Seafood Investments Portugal), uma das maiores unidades fabris da indústria conserveira existentes em Portugal, assim como a prática de discriminação salarial das mulheres trabalhadoras da empresa. A ESIP, atualmente detida por capitais tailandeses do maior grupo mundial conserveiro, fechou o ano de 2011 com um volume de negócios de 60 milhões de euros, prevendo-se que faturasse em 2012 mais de 10 milhões de euros.

Numa reunião recente com representantes dos trabalhadores fomos alertados para a persistência de grande precariedade laboral na empresa, assim como de significativas desigualdades salariais entre homens e mulheres. Com uma agravante: o despedimento preferencial de homens tem vindo a levar ao aumento da percentagem de mulheres na empresa (que eram já francamente maioritárias), que agora são chamadas a desempenhar tarefas mais pesadas, algumas exigindo um significativo esforço físico.

Este é um setor em que as condições de trabalho são tipicamente difíceis, mesmo violentas, com longos períodos de trabalho em exigentes linhas de produção/embalamento. Não obstante, dominam os salários baixos, pouco acima do salário mínimo nacional (que é de 485 euros mensais).

Em face do exposto, e tendo em conta a resposta da Comissão à pergunta E-8114/2010, perguntamos:

1. Que avaliação faz da situação descrita?
2. Que avaliação faz da sua «Estratégia para a igualdade entre homens e mulheres 2010/2015», que manifestamente tarda em ter aplicação concreta no terreno, como bem o demonstra a situação vivida na ESIP?
3. Quais os resultados práticos, até à data, do «conjunto de ações, incluindo estudos e projetos de intercâmbio, no âmbito de um projeto-piloto para tratar do problema da precariedade nas relações laborais e para promover a conversão de relações laborais precárias em contratos de trabalho com mais direitos sociais» que a Comissão disse em 2010 que ia lançar?
4. Sabe se esta empresa ou o respetivo grupo recebeu alguns apoios comunitários, em Portugal ou noutros países da UE?

Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão
(27 de maio de 2013)

1. A Comissão promove a responsabilidade social das empresas, o respeito pelos princípios da igualdade e não discriminação, as boas condições de trabalho, bem como as normas de saúde e segurança no trabalho. A discriminação em razão do sexo no que se refere às remunerações e a outras condições de trabalho, nomeadamente o despedimento, é proibida nos termos da Diretiva 2006/54/CE⁽¹⁾ e os Estados-Membros têm a obrigação de garantir que as disposições da diretiva são efetivamente respeitadas.

2. A Estratégia para a Igualdade entre Homens e Mulheres — 2010-2015⁽²⁾, é o quadro político da Comissão destinado a promover a igualdade entre homens e mulheres em todas as políticas da União e constitui o programa de trabalho da Comissão neste domínio. Está prevista para 2013 a publicação de uma revisão intercalar da referida estratégia.

3. Relativamente à discriminação em matéria de remunerações, a Comissão elegeu as disparidades salariais entre homens e mulheres como uma das prioridades da Estratégia para a Igualdade entre Homens e Mulheres — 2010-2015. Em 2013, a Comissão publicará um relatório sobre a aplicação da Diretiva 2006/54/CE. A fim de dar cumprimento à resolução do Parlamento Europeu de maio de 2012, esse relatório incidirá principalmente na avaliação da aplicação prática das disposições sobre igualdade de remuneração em todos os Estados-Membros, incluindo Portugal.

⁽¹⁾ JO L 204 de 26.7.2006, p. 23.

⁽²⁾ COM(2010) 491 final.

4. A Comissão não tem conhecimento de que a European Seafood Investments Portugal (ESIP) ou a sua empresa-mãe tenham recebido apoio financeiro da UE em Portugal ou noutros Estados-Membros. Em especial, de acordo com a informação prestada pelas autoridades portuguesas, nem o Fundo Social Europeu (FSE), nem o Fundo Europeu de Desenvolvimento Regional (FEDER) concederam qualquer contribuição financeira à empresa ESIP. Além disso, esta empresa não recebeu apoios do Fundo Europeu das Pescas.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003507/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Working conditions at ESIP (Portugal) and discrimination against female workers

In October 2010, written Question E-8114/2010 pointed out the prevalent job insecurity at European Seafood Investments Portugal (ESIP), one of the largest canning factories in Portugal, as well as the company's practice of pay discrimination against its female workers. ESIP's accounts for the financial year 2011 showed a turnover of EUR 60 million, with forecasted profits of over EUR 10 million for 2012. It is currently Thai-owned by the largest canning group in the world.

At a recent meeting with workers' representatives, they told us that there was a high level of job insecurity at the company and a significant gap between the wages paid to men and women. To make matters worse, the company has been laying off men as a matter of preference. Women were already very much in the majority at the company, but this has increased the percentage of women in the workforce and means that they are now called on to do very heavy work, some of which requires significant physical strength.

Working conditions are typically hard, even brutal, in this industry, with long working hours and demanding production/canning lines. Nevertheless, low wages predominate: they are barely above the national minimum wage of EUR 485 per month.

In view of this and in light of its answer to Question E-8114/2010:

1. What is the Commission's view of this situation?
2. The Commission's Strategy for equality between women and men 2010-15 is clearly overdue in terms of actually being implemented on the ground, as the situation at ESIP clearly demonstrates. What is the Commission's assessment of that strategy?
3. What are the practical results to date of the 'number of actions, including studies and exchange projects, under a pilot project to address the problem of precariousness in employment relationships and to promote the conversion of precarious employment relationships into work contracts carrying more social rights' that the Commission stated it would be launching in 2010?
4. Does the Commission know whether this company or its parent group has received any EU aid, in Portugal or other Member States?

**Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(27 May 2013)**

1. The Commission promotes corporate social responsibility, respect for principles of equality and anti-discrimination and good working conditions as well as occupational health standards and safety at work. Sex discrimination in relation to pay and to other working conditions including dismissal is prohibited under Directive 2006/54/EC ⁽¹⁾ and Member States are obliged to ensure that the provisions of this directive are respected in practice.
2. The strategy for equality between women and men 2010-2015 ⁽²⁾ is the Commission's policy framework for promoting gender equality in all policies of the Union and represents the work programme of the Commission on gender equality. A mid-term review of the strategy is scheduled to be published in 2013.
3. As regards pay discrimination, the Commission made tackling the gender pay gap one of its priorities in its Strategy for equality between women and men 2010-2015. The Commission will issue a report on the application of Directive 2006/54/EC in practice in 2013. Responding to the European Parliament's resolution on equal pay of May 2012, this report will in particular focus on assessing the implementation of the provisions on equal pay in practice in all Member States, including Portugal.

⁽¹⁾ OJL 204/23, 26.7.2006.

⁽²⁾ COM(2010) 491 final.

4. The Commission is not aware that European Seafood Investments Portugal (ESIP) or its parent group have received any EU aid in Portugal, or in other Member States. In particular, according to information received from the Portuguese authorities neither the European Social Fund (ESF) nor the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) has ever granted any financial contribution to the ESIP Company. Besides, this company has not received aid from the European Fisheries Fund.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003508/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Declarações de um responsável do BCE sobre o programa de privatizações em Chipre

Em declarações públicas feitas no passado mês de fevereiro, um alto responsável do Banco Central Europeu referiu esperar que o acordo a alcançar ao abrigo do chamado «plano de resgate» a Chipre pudesse incluir um «extenso» programa de privatizações.

Este responsável referiu-se às dificuldades colocadas pelo anterior Presidente da República de Chipre à concretização deste plano e afirmou esperar que, com a eleição de um novo presidente, o mesmo pudesse estar concluído até ao final de março.

Em face do exposto, pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Que avaliação faz dos comentários supramencionados, feitos por um alto responsável do BCE antes da segunda volta das eleições presidenciais em Chipre?
2. Foi já concretizado este plano? Que privatizações estão nele incluídas?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(27 de maio de 2013)

A Comissão informa o Senhor Deputado que o Memorando de Acordo contém as medidas acordadas neste domínio.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003508/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: ECB official's statements on the privatisation programme in Cyprus

In public statements made in February, a senior European Central Bank (ECB) official said that he hoped that the agreement to be reached under the so-called 'bailout plan' for Cyprus would include an 'extensive' privatisation programme.

The official mentioned how the former Cypriot President had hindered the development of this plan, and stated that he hoped that the election of a new president would enable the plan to be finalised by the end of March.

1. What is the Commission's view of the aforementioned comments, made by a senior ECB official before the second round of the Cypriot presidential elections?
2. Has the plan already been drawn up? What privatisations does it include?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(27 May 2013)**

The Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that the memorandum of understanding contains the agreed measures in this respect.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003509/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Estudo do Eurostat sobre os preços da eletricidade na UE — Classe IG

Num recente estudo sobre os preços da eletricidade na UE, relativamente a Portugal o Eurostat não apresenta dados para a classe IG — os maiores consumidores, com consumo acima de 150 000 MWh/ano.

Pode a Comissão informar sobre o motivo para a falta destes dados?

Resposta dada por Algirdas Šemeta em nome da Comissão
(14 de maio de 2013)

A Diretiva da Comissão 2008/92/CE ⁽¹⁾ estabelece a metodologia para a recolha e compilação dos preços da eletricidade para os consumidores finais industriais.

Tal como se refere no anexo II, alínea j), da referida diretiva, as autoridades competentes são obrigadas a comunicar os preços da eletricidade em 6 segmentos de consumo. O maior segmento de consumo corresponde a um consumo anual entre 70 000 e 150 000 MW/h por ano.

Os preços da eletricidade para os consumidores finais industriais com um consumo anual superior a 150 000 MW/h são apurados apenas numa base voluntária. Portugal (e vários outros Estados-Membros) não comunicam preços para este segmento de consumo.

A Comissão informa o Senhor Deputado do seguinte:

- 1) as grandes unidades industriais dispõem, muitas vezes, de geradores próprios e não compram energia elétrica no mercado. Deste modo, qualquer preço comunicado não seria representativo de todas as indústrias neste segmento de consumo.
- 2) em vários países, são muito poucas as indústrias neste segmento de consumo e, por conseguinte, os preços seriam declarados confidenciais.

⁽¹⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32008L0092:EN:NOT>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003509/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Eurostat study on electricity prices in the EU — Band IG

The recent Eurostat study on electricity prices in the EU does not provide data on Band IG consumers — the largest consumers, with consumption above 1 50 000 MWh/year — in Portugal.

Can the Commission explain the reason for the lack of these data?

**Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(14 May 2013)**

Commission Directive 2008/92/EC ⁽¹⁾ defines the methodology for the survey of natural gas and electricity prices for industrial end-users.

As stated in Annex II under point (j) of this directive, reporting authorities are obliged to report the electricity prices for 6 consumption bands. The largest consumption band is set to an annual consumption between 70 000 and 150 000 MWh per year.

Electricity prices of industrial end-users which annual electricity consumption is above 150 000 MWh is surveyed only on a voluntary basis. Portugal (and several other Member States) do not report prices in this consumption band.

The Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that:

1. Large industrial installations often have their own power generators and do not buy electricity power on the market. Thus any reported price would not be representative of all industries in this consumption band.
2. In several countries there are too few industries in this consumption band and consequently prices would be declared confidential.

⁽¹⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32008L0092:EN:NOT>

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003510/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Ajudas e garantias ao setor financeiro

Na sua intervenção na sessão plenária do Parlamento Europeu, em Estrasburgo, em 28 de setembro de 2011, sobre o estado da União, o Presidente da Comissão referiu que «nos últimos 3 anos, os Estados-Membros — ou, antes, os contribuintes — concederam ajuda e garantias ao setor financeiro no valor de 4,6 biliões de euros. Está na hora de o setor financeiro retribuir à sociedade a ajuda que recebeu».

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Qual a atualização do valor acima mencionado, ou seja, até à data qual o montante total das ajudas e garantias concedidas ao setor financeiro?
2. Do total de ajudas e garantias concedidas, dispõe a Comissão de alguma avaliação sobre quanto terá sido, até à data, devolvido?
3. De que formas (utilizando as palavras do Presidente da Comissão) retribuiu o setor financeiro, até à data, as ajudas que recebeu?
4. Dispõe de informação atualizada sobre a concessão de créditos às empresas e às famílias? Que avaliação faz da mesma?

Resposta dada por Joaquin Almunia em nome da Comissão
(24 de junho de 2013)

O montante total das ajudas e garantias concedidas ao setor financeiro, ou seja, «o montante de auxílio utilizado» ascendeu a 1 615,96 mil milhões de euros, dos quais 1 084,83 mil milhões de euros foram concedidos sob a forma de garantias (período compreendido entre 1 de outubro de 2008 e 31 de dezembro de 2011, segundo os últimos dados disponíveis).

No que se refere à segunda pergunta, não há qualquer estimativa sobre o montante já reembolsado, uma vez que, até à data, estes dados não são sistematicamente recolhidos. No entanto, prevê-se que o painel de avaliação dos auxílios estatais de 2013 dê uma panorâmica sobre os montantes de auxílio que as instituições financeiras reembolsaram em 2012. O painel de avaliação deste ano deve ser publicado no outono.

Note-se que o Eurostat publicou dados exaustivos sobre os fluxos e os montantes das transações entre os Estados-Membros e o setor financeiro, no quadro dos cálculos que efetuou no que respeita à dívida e ao défice ⁽¹⁾.

Quanto à terceira pergunta, a contribuição do setor financeiro para a sociedade é exemplificada da melhor forma através do seu apoio continuado ao financiamento da atividade da economia real. Foi evitada uma importante crise do crédito, e os bancos continuaram a conceder crédito, em consonância com a evolução da procura e tendo em conta a conjuntura económica geral. Por último, mas não menos importante, as poupanças individuais foram protegidas.

No que respeita à última pergunta, as informações mensais sobre a concessão de crédito às empresas e às famílias são recolhidas e publicadas pelo Banco Central Europeu. O abrandamento na concessão de crédito é compatível com a necessidade de corrigir desequilíbrios anteriores, bem como com as novas condições económicas. Os dados não são reveladores de escassez de crédito.

⁽¹⁾ Ver comunicados de imprensa a partir de 22 de abril de 2013, anexo 2.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003510/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Aid and guarantees to the financial sector

In his State of the Union address before the Strasbourg plenary on 28 September 2011, the President of the Commission stated that 'in the last three years, Member States — I should say taxpayers — have granted aid and provided guarantees of EUR 4.6 trillion to the financial sector. It is time for the financial sector to make a contribution back to society.'

1. What is the latest figure for the above amount; in other words, what is the total amount granted in aid and guarantees to the financial sector to date?
2. Of the total aid and guarantees granted, does the Commission have an estimate of how much has been repaid to date?
3. How — to use the President of the Commission's own words — has the financial sector contributed back to society up to now?
4. Does the Commission have up-to-date information on the granting of credit to businesses and households? What is its view of such granting of credit?

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

The total amount granted to the financial sector i.e. 'the amount of aid used' amounted to EUR 1615.96 billion, out of which EUR 1084.83 billion was granted in the form of guarantees (period 1 Oct 2008 until 31 Dec 2011, which refers to the latest data available).

As regards the second question, there is no estimate on how much has been repaid to date as these figures are not systemically collected so far. However, it is envisaged that the State Aid Scoreboard 2013 will give an overview on the aid amounts that financial institutions reimbursed in the year 2012. This year's Scoreboard can be expected to be published in the course of autumn.

Please note that Eurostat has published extensive data on the flows and amounts of the transactions between Member States and the financial sector in the frame of its determination on debt and deficit ⁽¹⁾.

On the third question, the contribution of the financial sector to society is best exemplified by its continued support to the funding of the activity of the real economy. A major credit crunch has been avoided, and banks have continued to provide credit, in line with the changes in demand and given the general economic conditions. Last but not least, individual savings have been protected.

As regards the final question, the monthly information on the granting of credit to businesses and households is gathered and published by the European Central Bank. The slowdown in credit granting is commensurate with the need to correct past imbalances, as well as with the new economic conditions. The data provides no evidence of shortage of credit.

⁽¹⁾ See Press release from 22 April 2013, Annex 2.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003511/13

à Comissão

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Projeto «Mar Vivo Sudoeste» — minimização de capturas acidentais

O Projeto «Mar Vivo Sudoeste», elaborado pela Sociedade Portuguesa para o Estudo das Aves (SPEA), tem como objetivo fundamental fomentar a pesca sustentável minimizando os impactos negativos nas aves e os prejuízos económicos dos profissionais da pesca, enquadrando-se assim nos objetivos do plano de ação da UE para reduzir as capturas ocasionais de aves marinhas nas artes de pesca.

Segundo estimativas da *BirdLife International*, mais de 200 mil aves morrem anualmente na Europa como consequência da captura acidental. Os dados que a SPEA tem vindo a recolher na Zona Económica Exclusiva Portuguesa indicam que a captura acidental é uma realidade, tendo expressão significativa para várias espécies de aves e determinadas artes de pesca. O projeto «Mar Vivo Sudoeste» (com um orçamento previsto de cerca de 75 mil euros) representa, assim, uma excelente oportunidade para integrar os interesses do setor pesqueiro com a preservação da avifauna marinha.

Em face do exposto, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que programas e medidas poderão apoiar a concretização do projeto «Mar Vivo Sudoeste»?
2. Tem conhecimento de projetos semelhantes em curso noutros países?

Resposta dada por Maria Damanaki em nome da Comissão

(28 de maio de 2013)

1. Em resposta à pergunta sobre possíveis fontes de financiamento do projeto, a Comissão gostaria de remeter o Senhor Deputado para o programa LIFE +. O sítio Web ⁽¹⁾ apresenta informações pormenorizadas sobre a elegibilidade, os prazos e o processo do atual convite à apresentação de propostas.

O projeto *Mar Vivo Sudoeste* poderá beneficiar de financiamento do FEP se o seu âmbito o permitir e se o Estado-Membro em causa tiver incluído no seu programa operacional ações ao abrigo do artigo 41.º do Regulamento (CE) n.º 1198/2006 do Conselho, de 27 de julho de 2006, relativo ao Fundo Europeu das Pescas. Por conseguinte, a Comissão sugere que o Senhor Deputado ou a Sociedade Portuguesa para o Estudo das Aves contactem diretamente as autoridades portuguesas.

2. A Comissão não tem conhecimento de outros projetos semelhantes que estejam atualmente a decorrer noutros países da UE. Gostaria, no entanto, de chamar a atenção do Senhor Deputado para o projeto MarPro ⁽²⁾, financiado no âmbito do programa LIFE+, que, embora tenha um âmbito mais vasto, inclui alguns elementos relacionados com as capturas acessórias de aves marinhas.

O projeto de monitorização das capturas acessórias de aves marinhas Filey ⁽³⁾ e o projeto GloBAL ⁽⁴⁾, já terminados, podem igualmente ter interesse.

⁽¹⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/life/funding/lifeplus2013/call/index.htm>

⁽²⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/environment/life/project/Projects/index.cfm?fuseaction=search.dspPage&n_proj_id=3842

⁽³⁾ http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/about_us/whatwedo/partnership/casestudies/fileyseabirds.aspx

⁽⁴⁾ <http://bycatch.nicholas.duke.edu/>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003511/13
to the Commission**

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)

(27 March 2013)

Subject: Mar Vivo Sudoeste project — minimising bycatch

The core objective of the *Mar Vivo Sudoeste* project of the Portuguese Society for the Study of Birds (SPEA) is to promote sustainable fishing, minimising negative impact on birds and economic damage to fishermen. As such, it is in line with the goals of the EU action plan for reducing seabird bycatch.

BirdLife International estimates that over 200 000 birds die as bycatch in Europe every year. The data that the SPEA has been gathering in Portugal's exclusive economic area indicate that bycatch is a reality, significantly affecting several bird species and involving certain types of fishing gear. The *Mar Vivo Sudoeste* project, which has a planned budget of around EUR 75 000, therefore provides an excellent opportunity to integrate the interests of the fishing sector with the preservation of seabirds.

1. What programmes and measures could support the implementation of the *Mar Vivo Sudoeste* project?
2. Is the Commission aware of similar projects under way in other EU countries?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission

(28 May 2013)

1. In response to the question on possible sources of funding of the project, the Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to the LIFE+ programme. The website ⁽¹⁾ provides details on eligibility, deadlines and process of the current call for proposals.

Depending on the scope of the *Mar Vivo Sudoeste* project, and on whether the Member State concerned has included actions under Article 41 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1198/2006 of 27 July 2006 on the European Fisheries Fund in its Operational Programme, there may be EFF funding available. The Commission would therefore suggest to the Honourable Member or to the Portuguese Society for the Study of Birds to contact directly the Portuguese authorities.

2. The Commission is not aware of similar projects currently under way in other EU countries. It would however draw the attention of the Honourable Member to the MarPro project ⁽²⁾ which is being funded under LIFE+. This project has a wider scope but includes some elements related to by-catch of seabirds.

Other projects which have already been concluded and which may be of interest are the Filey seabirds by-catch monitoring project ⁽³⁾ and the 'Project GloBAL' ⁽⁴⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/life/funding/lifeplus2013/call/index.htm>

⁽²⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/environment/life/project/Projects/index.cfm?fuseaction=search.dspPage&n_proj_id=3842.

⁽³⁾ http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/about_us/whatwedo/partnership/casestudies/fileyseabirds.aspx.

⁽⁴⁾ <http://bycatch.nicholas.duke.edu/>.

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003512/13
à Comissão**

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Projetos e ações no domínio do termalismo e saúde

Pode a Comissão prestar informações sobre os projetos e ações que a UE tem vindo a desenvolver, promover ou apoiar no domínio do termalismo e saúde?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão

(27 de maio de 2013)

A Comissão promove e incentiva a diversificação da oferta turística relacionada com o bem-estar e o turismo termal. Os projetos transnacionais que promovem o bem-estar e o turismo termal, entre outros, poderiam ser candidatos a subvenções da UE no âmbito dos convites à apresentação de propostas em matéria de produtos de turismo temáticos transnacionais. O convite à apresentação de candidaturas de 2013 para apoiar o reforço e a promoção dos produtos de turismo temáticos transnacionais (*Supporting the enhancement and promotion of sustainable transnational thematic tourism products*), a título do Programa-Quadro Competitividade e Inovação, será lançado no segundo trimestre de 2013 ⁽¹⁾.

A Comissão não desenvolveu nem apoia ações e projetos específicos no domínio da balneologia e saúde.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/contracts-grants/calls-for-proposals/index_en.htm

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003512/13
to the Commission**

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)

(27 March 2013)

Subject: Projects and actions in the field of balneology and health

Can the Commission provide information on the projects and actions that the EU has been developing, promoting and supporting in the field of balneology and health?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission

(27 May 2013)

The Commission promotes and encourages diversification of the tourism offer also related to wellness and spa tourism. Transnational projects promoting wellness and spa tourism, amongst others, could possibly apply for EU grants under the calls for proposals on sustainable transnational thematic tourism products. The 2013 call for proposals 'Supporting the enhancement and promotion of sustainable transnational thematic tourism products' under the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme will be launched during the second quarter 2013 ⁽¹⁾.

The Commission has not developed or supported specific projects and actions in the field of balneology and health.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/contracts-grants/calls-for-proposals/index_en.htm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003513/13

à Comissão

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Situação da Linha do Oeste (Portugal) e investimentos necessários

Numa reunião recente com a Comissão de Defesa da Linha do Oeste fui alertado para o preocupante desinvestimento nesta importante linha ferroviária, que acarreta claros prejuízos para as condições de vida das populações e para o desenvolvimento regional. A supressão de horários (cada vez mais desfasados das necessidades das populações), o encerramento de estações, a escassez de pessoal, os longos tempos de percurso, a vetusta idade das composições, a ausência de obras que procedam a correções na linha tendo em vista a otimização da circulação — são alguns dos problemas referidos.

Desde 2010 que existem estudos sobre a modernização da Linha do Oeste (e ramal de Alfarelos), tendo em vista uma otimização da circulação, uma melhoria das condições de segurança, melhores horários e diminuição dos tempos de percurso. Estes estudos incluem a modernização do troço Meleças/Caldas da Rainha. Mas são necessárias intervenções também noutros troços. Globalmente, as intervenções necessárias compreendem, entre outras, a eletrificação da linha (o que permitiria baixar significativamente os custos de operação) e a implementação de sistemas de sinalização eletrónica e telecomunicações.

Tendo em conta as sucessivas afirmações da Comissão sobre a importância da promoção do modo de transporte ferroviário e dos investimentos neste domínio, pergunta-se:

1. Tem conhecimento de algum projeto, envolvendo financiamento comunitário, para a modernização da Linha do Oeste?
2. Ao abrigo de que programas e medidas poderá ser apoiada a modernização da Linha do Oeste, com fundos da UE? Qual o financiamento máximo e quais as percentagens de cofinanciamento previstas?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão

(17 de maio de 2013)

1. Para o período atual, as autoridades portuguesas pretendem usar o Fundo de Coesão para financiar a quadruplicação da linha ferroviária entre Barcarena e Cacém. O objetivo é melhorar a capacidade e velocidade das linhas Lisboa-Sintra e do Oeste. No entanto, a Comissão ainda não recebeu qualquer pedido oficial por parte das autoridades portuguesas. O pedido terá de ser avaliado, uma vez que se tratará de um projeto grande (custo total superior a 50 milhões de euros).

2. No período de 2007-2013, as medidas para a eletrificação da linha ferroviária são elegíveis a título do Fundo de Coesão. A taxa máxima de cofinanciamento é de 85 %. Esta taxa poderia ser inferior, uma vez que o financiamento está sujeito ao cálculo do défice de financiamento dos projetos geradores de receitas ⁽¹⁾. No entanto, em princípio, não estão disponíveis mais fundos para o atual período, tendo em conta os compromissos já assumidos para o Fundo de Coesão. Para o período de 2014-2020, a Linha do Oeste não pertence às redes transeuropeias.

⁽¹⁾ Artigo 55.º do Regulamento (CE) n.º 1083/2006 do Conselho de 11 de julho de 2006.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003513/13
to the Commission**

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)

(27 March 2013)

Subject: Situation of the western railway line (Portugal) and required investment

At a recent meeting of the Western Line Protection Committee (CDLO), I was made aware of the worrying lack of investment in this major railway line, which is clearly damaging to the living conditions of local people and to regional development. Abolished timetables, which are increasingly out of step with the needs of the public, closed stations, staff shortages, long journey times, ancient rolling stock, and a lack of works to improve the line in order to improve usage; those are just some of the problems mentioned.

Since 2010, studies have been conducted into modernising the western railway line and the Alfarelos branch line, with a view to increasing usage, improving safety conditions, improving timetables and reducing journey times. These studies cover modernisation of the Meleças to Caldas da Rainha stretch. However, work is needed on other stretches of the line. Overall, the work needed includes, *inter alia*, electrification of the line — which would significantly lower operating costs — and installation of electronic signalling and telecommunications systems.

In view of the Commission's insistence on the importance of promoting rail transport and investing in this area:

1. Is it aware of any project involving EU funding to modernise the western railway line?
2. What programmes and measures could be used to support modernisation of the western railway line with EU funds? What is the maximum amount of funding and what proportion of co-financing does it envisage?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission

(17 May 2013)

1. For the current period, the Portuguese authorities intend to use the Cohesion Fund to finance the quadrupling of the railway line between Barcarena and Cacém. The objective is to improve capacity and speed for both the Lisboa-Sintra line and the Western Line (Linha do Oeste). However, the Commission has not yet received an official request from the Portuguese authorities which it will have to assess since this will be a major project (total cost above EUR 50 million).

2. In the 2007-2013 period, measures for the electrification of railways are eligible under the Cohesion Fund. The maximum co-financing rate is 85%; this rate could be lower since funding is subject to the calculation of the financing gap since these are revenue generating projects ⁽¹⁾. However, in principle no more funds are available for the current period, taking into account the commitments already made for the Cohesion Fund. For the 2014-2020 period, the Western Line is not part of the Trans-European networks.

⁽¹⁾ Article 55 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 of 11 July 2006.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003514/13

à Comissão

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Obras de renovação do Hospital Termal das Caldas da Rainha

A criação do Hospital Termal das Caldas da Rainha remonta ao século XV. Em meados do século XVIII, o hospital foi reedificado. No final do século XIX, construíram-se novos equipamentos, tendo as primeiras décadas do século XX correspondido a um período áureo da vida da instituição.

Hoje, este é o único hospital termal que, em Portugal, está integrado no Serviço Nacional de Saúde. Dispõe de serviços de otorrinolaringologia, reumatologia e ortopedia. Não obstante o seu carácter único e a procura que continua a ter, o hospital tem sido encerrado por períodos mais ou menos prolongados, devido a bactérias perigosas que se instalam nas suas condutas de ar. Fora desses períodos, apesar de continuar a desempenhar as funções para as quais foi criado, fá-lo de forma limitada. Para garantir o seu normal funcionamento são necessárias obras profundas de renovação, cujo orçamento poderá ascender a cerca de 3 milhões de euros.

Pergunto à Comissão:

1. Tem conhecimento de algum projeto, envolvendo financiamento comunitário, para a realização de obras de renovação do Hospital Termal das Caldas da Rainha?
2. Que programas e medidas poderão apoiar a realização das profundas obras de renovação necessárias ao bom funcionamento do hospital termal? Quais as percentagens de cofinanciamento previstas?
3. Tem conhecimento da existência de instituições semelhantes noutros países, igualmente integradas nos respetivos sistemas públicos de saúde?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão

(17 de maio de 2013)

1. A Comissão não tem conhecimento de qualquer projeto que envolva o financiamento da UE para realizar obras de renovação no Hospital Termal das Caldas da Rainha.
2. À luz do princípio da gestão partilhada, a seleção e implementação de projetos no âmbito de programas é da responsabilidade das autoridades nacionais e regionais dos Estados-Membros. Assim, a Comissão convida o Senhor Deputado a contactar diretamente a autoridade de gestão e a consultar o sítio web dos programas «Centro» e «Compete» do Fundo Europeu de Desenvolvimento Regional.

Autoridade de gestão: Mais Centro — Programa Operacional Regional do Centro

Rua Bernardim Ribeiro, 80

3000-069 Coimbra

Telefone: +351 239 863 505

Fax: +351 239 863 510

maiscentro@ccdr.pt

<http://www.maiscentro.qren.pt/>

Autoridade de gestão: PO Compete

Edifício Expo 98

Av. D. João II

Lote 1.07.2.1 (3 piso)

1998-014 Lisboa

Telefone: +351 211 548 700

info@compete-pofc.pt

www.pofc.qren.pt

3. Na sua generalidade, os tratamentos termais não são abrangidos pelos sistemas de saúde dos Estados-Membros. No entanto, alguns Estados-Membros, por razões culturais, reembolsam os tratamentos termais. A Comissão não dispõe da lista de hospitais públicos que ofereçam tratamentos termais.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003514/13
to the Commission**

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)

(27 March 2013)

Subject: Renovation works on the thermal treatment hospital in Caldas da Rainha

The thermal treatment hospital in Caldas da Rainha was built in the 15th century. The hospital was rebuilt in the mid-18th century. New facilities were built in the late 19th century and the first decades of the 20th century were a golden age in the life of the hospital.

It is now the only thermal treatment hospital that is part of the Portuguese health service. It has ear, nose and throat, rheumatology, and orthopaedics departments. Despite its uniqueness and continued demand for its services, the hospital has been closed several times for varying periods because of dangerous bacteria that have colonised its air ducts. Outside these periods, it has continued to provide the services for which it was built, albeit in a limited way. Extensive renovation works are required to ensure it keeps running normally, which could cost around EUR 3 million.

1. Is the Commission aware of any project involving EU funding to carry out renovation works on the thermal treatment hospital in Caldas da Rainha?
2. What programmes and measures could support the extensive renovation works required for the thermal treatment hospital to operate as normal? What amount of co-financing does the Commission envisage?
3. Is the Commission aware of similar institutions in other countries that are also part of their public health services?

Answer given by Mr Johannes Hahn on behalf of the Commission

(17 May 2013)

1. The Commission is not aware of any project involving EU funding to carry out renovation works on the thermal treatment hospital in Caldas da Rainha.
2. Within the framework of the shared management principle, the selection and implementation of projects within programmes is the responsibility of national and regional authorities in the Member States. Therefore the Commission invites the Honourable Member to contact directly the managing authority and to consult the Internet site of the 'Centro' and 'Compete' European Regional Development Fund programmes:

Managing authority: MAIS CENTRO — Programa Operacional Regional do Centro
Rua Bernardim Ribeiro, 80
3000-069 Coimbra
Tel.: +351 239 863 505
Fax: +351 239 863 510
maiscentro@ccdrc.pt
<http://www.maiscentro.qren.pt/>

Managing authority: PO COMPETE
Edifício Expo 98
Av. D. João II
Lote 1.07.2.1 (3 piso)
1998-014 Lisboa
Tel.: +351 211 548 700
info@compete-pofc.pt
www.pofc.qren.pt

3. Thermal treatments are usually not covered by Member State health systems. However, some Member States, for cultural reasons, reimburse thermal treatments. The Commission does not have a list of public hospitals providing thermal treatments.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003515/13
a la Comisión
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(27 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Explotación de la mina de oro de Corcoesto

El Diario Oficial de Galicia, de 2 de mayo de 2012, publicaba la resolución de la Xunta de Galicia de 20 de abril anterior por la que se sometía a información pública el proyecto de explotación, estudio de impacto ambiental y plan de restauración para la concesión de un proyecto de explotación sobre el conjunto minero sito en las municipalidades de Ponteceso, Cabana de Bergantiños y Coristanco de la provincia de A Coruña (Galicia, España). El proyecto fue promovido por la entidad canadiense Edgewater Corporation, cuya filial es Corcoesto Gold Mines. La resolución abría un período de información pública de 30 días hábiles cuando la normativa comunitaria establece para este tipo de proyectos un plazo de exposición pública de 6 meses y la necesidad de una evaluación medioambiental estratégica.

El 15 de diciembre de 2012, la Consellería de Medio Ambiente de la Xunta de Galicia emitió informe favorable a la Declaración de Impacto Ambiental en la explotación minera de oro.

Diversas organizaciones ecologistas han alertado de que la explotación producirá efectos perniciosos. Provocará más de 400 hectáreas de mina a cielo abierto por cada kilo de oro, el consumo de 128 kg de cianuro en el proceso, la generación de 4 000 toneladas de residuos y escombros que contendrán 250 kg de arsénico finamente molido y muy soluble, 20 millones de metros cúbicos de estériles de mina y 100 000 toneladas anuales de estériles de mina tratados con cianuro-sosa cáustica-ácido clorhídrico que, además del oro, solubilizarán también el arsénico de las rocas. En las piscinas de lixiviados, podrán quedar acumuladas 12 toneladas de cianuro.

¿Podría aclarar la Comisión si el procedimiento seguido para la explotación de la mina de oro de Corcoesto cumple la normativa comunitaria?

En caso contrario, ¿va a adoptar la Comisión medidas urgentes a fin de asegurar su cumplimiento y evitar los riesgos que, para el entorno natural de la zona y la salud humana, podría entrañar la puesta en marcha de esta explotación minera?

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

La Comisión quisiera remitir a Su Señoría a la respuesta a la pregunta escrita E-000329/2013 ⁽¹⁾, relativa a este proyecto minero en Galicia.

Mientras tanto, la Comisión ha solicitado información a las autoridades competentes de España en relación con los requisitos que impone la legislación medioambiental de la UE.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003515/13
to the Commission
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Exploitation of the Corcoesto gold mine

On 2 May 2012, the Official Gazette of Galicia published the resolution of the Galician regional government of 20 April 2012 under which information about the mining project, environmental impact study and restoration plan was made public with a view to authorising a mining project in the mining basin across the municipalities of Ponteceso, Cabana de Bergantiños and Coristanco in the province of A Coruña (Galicia, Spain). The project was put forward by Edgewater Corporation, a Canadian undertaking which is the parent company of Corcoesto Gold Mines. The resolution opened a public consultation period of 30 working days whereas Community legislation establishes a public consultation period of six months for this kind of project, and also calls for a strategic environmental impact assessment to be undertaken.

On 15 December 2012, the Environment Ministry of the Galician regional government issued a favourable report on the Environmental Impact Assessment on the gold mining.

Various environmental organisations have warned that the mining will have harmful effects. It will result in more than 400 hectares of open-cast mine per kilo of gold, the consumption of 128 kg of cyanide in the process, the generation of 4 000 tonnes of residual waste and rubble which will contain 250 kg of finely milled and highly soluble arsenic, 20 million cubic metres of mining tailings and 100 000 tonnes a year of mining tailings treated with cyanide-caustic soda-hydrochloric acid which will solubilise the arsenic in the rocks as well as the gold. Twelve tonnes of cyanide could accumulate in the leachate pools.

Can the Commission clarify whether the procedure followed for the exploitation of the Corcoesto gold mine complies with Community legislation?

If not, will the Commission adopt urgent measures to ensure compliance and avoid the risks to the natural environment of the area and human health which could result from this mining activity?

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

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-000329/2013 ⁽¹⁾ regarding this mining project in Galicia, Spain.

In the meantime, the Commission has requested information from the competent Spanish authorities concerning compliance with the relevant requirements under EU environmental law.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html>

(Versión española)

**Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003516/13
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(27 de marzo de 2013)**

Asunto: VP/HR — Acuerdo Pesquero UE-Marruecos

El Gobierno de Marruecos y la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante de la Unión Europea están manteniendo relaciones diplomáticas con respecto al Acuerdo Pesquero entre las dos partes. Sin embargo, Marruecos está negociando dicho acuerdo sobre aguas en las que carece de cualquier tipo de derecho, ya que se trata de las aguas pertenecientes a los territorios ocupados del Sahara Occidental.

La posición del Consejo con respecto a este tema fue fijada en las Conclusiones del 3 de febrero de 2012, que consideran que un acuerdo que incluya aguas pertenecientes a los territorios ocupados del Sahara Occidental solo puede ser firmado si se respeta el Derecho internacional y si Marruecos respeta los derechos humanos. Debido a que Marruecos carece de ningún tipo de soberanía sobre las aguas pertenecientes a los territorios ocupados, estos acuerdos no pueden ser firmados puesto que se oponen a la soberanía que el pueblo saharauí mantiene en los territorios ocupados si nos atenemos al Derecho internacional.

Sobre el respeto a los derechos humanos, existen numerosos informes que reflejan la dramática situación de los derechos humanos en los territorios ocupados. Desde los informes del Centro Robert F. Kennedy para la Justicia y los derechos humanos, hasta el reciente informe del Relator Especial de la ONU sobre la Tortura, Juan E. Méndez, señalan las numerosas violaciones que las autoridades marroquíes cometen a diario con el pueblo del Sahara Occidental. Esto convierte al Gobierno de Marruecos en un interlocutor diplomático que viola sistemáticamente el Derecho internacional, así como los derechos humanos, anulando cualquier tipo de soberanía que pudiera reclamar sobre dichas aguas.

El Parlamento Europeo también expresó su posición sobre el tema en la Resolución de 14 de diciembre de 2011 en la que sostenía que dicho acuerdo debería incluir como parte al pueblo del Sahara Occidental, así como contribuir a su beneficio.

¿Cómo evalúa la Comisión la situación de los derechos humanos en Marruecos? ¿Considera que las violaciones de derechos humanos documentadas por los citados informes pueden ser causa suficiente para la suspensión del acuerdo? A raíz de lo expuesto, ¿considera la Comisión que Marruecos cumple con el Derecho internacional para poder negociar dicho acuerdo de pesca? ¿Considera la Comisión que el acuerdo cumple con el Derecho internacional, considerando que se ha excluido al pueblo saharauí de la negociación y de los beneficios? ¿Puede informar la Comisión si en las negociaciones se está teniendo en cuenta el beneficio para el pueblo saharauí?

**Respuesta de la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(23 de mayo de 2013)**

Las negociaciones entre la Comisión (en nombre de la UE) y Marruecos sobre un nuevo protocolo en el marco del Acuerdo Pesquero se encuentran efectivamente en curso, de acuerdo con las directrices de negociación adoptadas por el Consejo el 14 de febrero de 2012. Estas negociaciones se están llevando a cabo teniendo presente la Resolución del Parlamento Europeo, de diciembre de 2011, referida al respeto del Derecho internacional, los derechos humanos y el posible impacto económico y social de dicho protocolo sobre las poblaciones locales.

En lo que respecta a los derechos humanos en el Sáhara Occidental, en repetidas ocasiones, la UE i) ha expresado su preocupación por la larga duración del conflicto del Sáhara Occidental y sus consecuencias; ii) ha instado a todas las partes a evitar la violencia; iii) ha apoyado la Resolución del Consejo de Seguridad de las Naciones Unidas 2044 (2012) que subraya la «importancia de mejorar la situación de los derechos humanos en el Sáhara Occidental y en los campos de Tinduf»; y iv) ha acogido con satisfacción la creación del Consejo Nacional de Comisiones de Derechos Humanos que operan en Dajla y El Aaiún.

Los derechos humanos son abordados con regularidad en las reuniones de los organismos conjuntos creados en virtud del Acuerdo de Asociación UE-Marruecos. La Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta considera que, en general, Marruecos avanza hacia un mayor respeto de los principios relativos a los derechos humanos internacionalmente acordados, y la UE sigue manteniendo su compromiso de apoyar a Marruecos en este proceso.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003516/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(27 March 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — EU-Morocco Fisheries Agreement

The Government of Morocco and the Vice-President/High Representative of the European Union are engaged in diplomatic relations concerning the Fisheries Agreement between the two parties. However, Morocco is negotiating this agreement for waters over which it does not have any rights, as the waters concerned belong to the occupied territories of Western Sahara.

The Council's position on this issue was established in the conclusions of 3 February 2012, which state that an agreement which includes waters belonging to the occupied territories of Western Sahara can only be signed if it respects international law and if Morocco respects human rights. Given that Morocco does not have any kind of sovereignty over waters belonging to the occupied territories, these agreements cannot be signed because under international law they violate the sovereignty maintained by the Saharawi people in the occupied territories.

Regarding respect for human rights, there are a number of reports detailing the dramatic human rights situation in the occupied territories. From the reports by the Robert F. Kennedy Centre for Justice and Human Rights to the recent report by the UN Special Rapporteur on Torture, Juan E. Méndez, they all highlight numerous violations committed by the Moroccan authorities on a daily basis against the people of Western Sahara. This means that the Moroccan Government is a diplomatic party which systematically violates international law and human rights, thereby forfeiting any kind of sovereignty it could claim over these waters.

The European Parliament also expressed its position on the subject in its Resolution of 14 December 2011 in which it stated that the people of Western Sahara should be a party to this agreement and benefit from it.

What is the Commission's assessment of the human rights situation in Morocco? Does it believe that the human rights violations documented in the aforementioned reports could be sufficient cause to suspend the agreement? In view of the above, does the Commission believe that Morocco is complying with international law and in a position to negotiate this fishing agreement? Does the Commission believe that the agreement complies with international law, bearing in mind that the Saharawi people have been excluded from the negotiation and the benefits? Can the Commission state whether the benefit to the Saharawi people is being taken into account in the negotiations?

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

Based on negotiating directives adopted by the Council on 14 February 2012, negotiations are indeed ongoing between the Commission (on behalf of the EU) and Morocco for a new protocol under the Fisheries Partnership Agreement EU-Morocco. These negotiations are carried out taking into account EP resolution of December 2011, including on the issue of the respect of international law, human rights and the economic and social impact of the protocol in question on the local populations.

Regarding human rights in Western Sahara, the EU has repeatedly (i) Expressed concern about the long duration of the Western Sahara conflict and the implications; (ii) Called on all parties to restrain from violence; (iii) Supported UN Security Council Resolution 2044 (2012) which underlines 'the importance of improving human rights situation in Western Sahara and the Tindouf camps;' (iv) Welcomed the opening of the National Council on Human Rights Commissions operating in Dakhla and Laayoune.

Human rights are regularly addressed in the meetings of the joint bodies established under the EU-Morocco Association Agreement. The HR/VP considers that overall Morocco is making progress towards more compliance with internationally agreed human rights principles; the EU remains committed to support Morocco in this process.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003517/13
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(27 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Prospecciones para la explotación de gas de esquisto en Cádiz (España)

Según informan diferentes fuentes periodísticas, la compañía estadounidense Scheuebach Energy está mostrando su interés en realizar prospecciones sobre el terreno en la búsqueda de yacimientos de gas de esquisto en la provincia de Cádiz (España). La citada empresa, que no ha realizado comunicado oficial alguno, lleva, al parecer, dos años interesada en dichas explotaciones, cumpliendo tareas administrativas y recopilando datos históricos sobre el suelo.

La provincia de Cádiz, una provincia llena de parques naturales y áreas con diferente grado de protección medioambiental, goza de ecosistemas únicos en todo el continente y la mera prospección en busca de estos yacimientos supondrá la contaminación de los acuíferos subterráneos de la zona. Con la gravísima contaminación que la práctica del gas fracking acarrea, se destruirían los acuíferos de la provincia, lo que afectará a su rica agricultura y ganadería e incluso a la calidad de sus aguas costeras debido a que los productos químicos contaminantes liberados en el subsuelo pueden llegar a alcanzar la costa. El Gobierno ha autorizado la unificación de los permisos para autorizar la exploración en dos parcelas que suponen 82 000 hectáreas y comprenden tres parques naturales y ricas tierras agrícolas.

La Plataforma Andalucía Libre de Fracking, así como el Alcalde de Medina Sidonia, municipio dentro de las zonas afectadas, han denunciado la falta de información con la que las autoridades locales son tratadas por el Gobierno central, así como por la empresa interesada. La legislación europea en materia de declaración de impacto ambiental en proyectos como este se encuentra en la Directiva 2011/92/UE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo. En dicha Directiva se especifica su competencia en el caso de este tipo de proyectos y además se recogen y, por tanto, garantizan los derechos de los ciudadanos a ser debidamente informados durante el proceso (artículo 9), y se estipula que los ciudadanos que aleguen el menoscabo de un derecho puedan hacer alegaciones a los proyectos de la administración competente. En el presente proyecto, los habitantes han denunciado que no se les ha facilitado información ninguna y que el proyecto carece de declaración de impacto ambiental si la empresa desea explotar dichos recursos.

¿Piensa solicitar la Comisión al Gobierno la declaración de impacto ambiental pertinente para una empresa que pretende explotar dicho gas?

¿Considera la Comisión que la Administración española está cumpliendo los artículos citados de la Directiva 2011/92/UE?

¿Piensa abrir la Comisión un procedimiento de infracción de confirmarse el incumplimiento de dicha Directiva?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(6 de mayo de 2013)

La Comisión se ha puesto en contacto con las autoridades españolas para pedirles más información. Schuepbach Energy España ha recibido permisos de investigación de hidrocarburos ⁽¹⁾ por un periodo de seis años a partir de 2011. La perforación de sondeos de exploración está prevista para 2015 y 2016. Según las autoridades españolas, estos proyectos estarán sujetos a la legislación en materia de evaluación del impacto ambiental.

(1) Puede consultarse una copia del permiso en http://www.boe.es/diario_boe/txt.php?id=BOE-A-2011-1194

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003517/13
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Exploration for the exploitation of shale gas in Cádiz (Spain)

According to various media sources, the US company Scheuebach Energy is interested in carrying out field explorations in search of shale gas fields in the province of Cádiz (Spain). The company, which has not released an official communication, has apparently been interested in these exploitations for two years, and has been undertaking administrative tasks and gathering historical data about the site.

The province of Cádiz is full of natural parks and areas enjoying varying degrees of environmental protection. It has unique ecosystems which cannot be found anywhere else in Europe and mere exploration in search of these fields will result in pollution of the underground aquifers in the area. The serious pollution caused by gas fracking would destroy the region's aquifers, which will affect its successful agriculture and livestock rearing and even the quality of its coastal water, as the polluting chemical products released into the ground could reach the coast. The Government has authorised the amalgamation of permits authorising exploration in two plots of land totalling 82 000 hectares and encompassing three natural parks and rich agricultural land.

The Andalusia Anti-Fracking Platform and the Mayor of Medina Sidonia, a municipality located within the affected areas, have complained that central government and the company concerned have failed to share information with local authorities. European legislation on environmental impact assessments for projects such as this is contained in Directive 2011/92/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council. This directive applies specifically to projects of this kind and, moreover, it recognises and therefore guarantees the citizens' right to be duly informed throughout the process (Article 9). It also states that citizens claiming their rights have not been respected may lodge complaints about the competent authority's projects. Regarding this project, residents have complained that no information has been provided to them and that the project lacks the environmental impact assessment required if the company wishes to exploit these resources.

Does the Commission intend to ask the government for the environmental impact assessment required concerning any company intending to exploit this gas?

Does the Commission believe that the Spanish Government is complying with the aforementioned articles of Directive 2011/92/EU?

Does the Commission intend to open infringement proceedings if non-compliance with this directive is confirmed?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission
(6 May 2013)**

The Commission contacted the Spanish authorities and asked for further information. Schuepbach Energy España has received operational permits ⁽¹⁾ that allow exploration of hydrocarbon reserves over a period of 6 years, starting in 2011. Exploratory drilling is planned for the years 2015 and 2016. According to the Spanish authorities, these projects will be subject to EIA legislation.

⁽¹⁾ A copy of the permit is available at http://www.boe.es/diario_boe/txt.php?id=BOE-A-2011-1194

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003518/13
à la Commission
Alain Cadec (PPE)
(27 mars 2013)

Objet: Collecte des données sur la population de phoques

La proposition de création d'un Fonds européen pour les affaires maritimes et la pêche (FEAMP) confirme l'importance des données scientifiques et la façon dont la collecte des données et avis scientifiques peut soutenir la coopération et contribuer à la régionalisation de la nouvelle PCP.

La Commission pourrait-elle préciser si elle a l'intention de faire usage de cet instrument notamment pour:

- évaluer l'évolution de la population des phoques dans les eaux européennes;
- déterminer le seuil acceptable pour la population des phoques qui permettrait d'assurer la durabilité de l'écosystème?

Réponse donnée par Mme Damanaki au nom de la Commission
(28 mai 2013)

La proposition de création d'un Fonds européen pour les affaires maritimes et la pêche (FEAMP) prévoit la possibilité pour la Commission d'octroyer aux États membres un soutien financier pour la collecte de données relatives aux effets de la pêche sur l'écosystème marin, et notamment aux effets des prises accessoires sur les populations de phoques.

Il n'existe actuellement aucune obligation légale de l'Union relative à la surveillance des populations de phoques. La proposition de nouvelle politique commune de la pêche (PCP) définit les obligations qui incombent aux États membres en ce qui concerne la collecte de données relatives à l'état des ressources biologiques marines exploitées et aux incidences de la pêche sur ces ressources et sur les écosystèmes marins. En vertu de ces dispositions, les États membres seront tenus de collecter des données sur les prises accessoires d'oiseaux et de mammifères marins, dont les phoques.

De plus, en vertu de la directive-cadre «stratégie pour le milieu marin» ⁽¹⁾, les États membres doivent surveiller la qualité environnementale des écosystèmes marins. Les données relatives aux populations de phoques, qui seront collectées dans le contexte de la PCP, pourront être utilisées pour évaluer l'état écologique des écosystèmes marins, en particulier du point de vue de leur biodiversité.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 2008/56/CE du Parlement européen et du Conseil, JO L 164 du 25.6.2008.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003518/13
to the Commission
Alain Cadec (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Collecting data on the seal population

The proposal to create a European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) confirms the importance of scientific data and the way in which the collection of scientific data and opinions can support cooperation and play a part in the regionalisation of the new CFP.

Can the Commission specify whether it intends to use this instrument in order to, in particular:

- evaluate the evolution of the seal population in European waters;
- establish an acceptable threshold for the seal population which would ensure the sustainability of the ecosystem?

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

The proposed European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) provides possibilities for the Commission to provide financial support to Member States for data collection regarding the effects of fisheries on the marine ecosystem — such as on seal populations due to by catch.

Currently there are no EU legal obligations to monitor seal populations. Under the proposed Future Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) obligations are defined for Member States on data collection with regard to the state of the exploited marine biological resources and the impact of fisheries on those resources and on marine ecosystems. Under these provisions Member States will be required to collect data on by-catch of birds and mammals, including seals.

In addition under the Marine Strategy Framework Directive⁽¹⁾ Member States are required to monitor the environmental quality of marine ecosystems. Data on populations of seals, when collected under the CFP, may in future be used to evaluate the environmental status of marine ecosystems, in particular with regard to biodiversity.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 2008/56/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council, OJ L 164, 25.6.2008.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003519/13
alla Commissione
Crescenzo Rivellini (PPE)
(27 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Estendere il progetto «Erasmus» agli istituti nautici e alberghieri

Nell'ambito dei nuovi programmi «Erasmus per tutti» 2014-2020 lanciati dalla Commissione europea nel campo dell'istruzione per incrementare le competenze e l'occupabilità delle persone, modernizzando altresì i sistemi di istruzione e formazione, sarebbe il caso di estendere il progetto «Erasmus» anche agli istituti nautici e alberghieri, al fine di permettere ai giovani iscritti in questi istituti di migliorare la loro conoscenza dell'inglese, recuperando così decine di migliaia di posti di lavoro per i ragazzi europei nel settore crocieristico, dove i lavoratori sono in larghissima maggioranza filippini, indonesiani e indiani provenienti da paesi che hanno già avviato una sorta di processo formativo all'inizio del percorso lavorativo.

Questo personale «non comunitario» di qualità professionale discutibile ha un'ottima conoscenza della lingua inglese. È questo l'elemento che potrebbe farci rimettere migliaia di posti di lavoro nel prossimo futuro se non si provvederà con iniziative specifiche. Pertanto, è indispensabile che siano intrapresi programmi di scambio per permettere ai nostri giovani, in particolare in Italia dove la formazione scolastica per le lingue è scadente, di superare l'handicap linguistico e competere con il personale «non comunitario» per posti di lavoro nel polo crocieristico, unico settore attualmente in forte sviluppo economico.

La dotazione finanziaria proposta dalla Commissione europea nell'ambito del piano pluriennale 2014-2020 per i nuovi programmi «Erasmus per tutti» è di 19 miliardi di EUR, inclusi 1,8 miliardi per la cooperazione internazionale. Si tratta di un impegno importante da parte della Commissione europea, un aumento del budget di oltre il 70 % rispetto agli attuali programmi considerati singolarmente, per giungere ad offrire a cinque milioni di persone l'opportunità di studiare o formarsi all'estero.

A fronte di questo, non crede la Commissione che sia il caso di estendere il progetto «Erasmus per tutti» anche agli istituti nautici e alberghieri, visto anche l'aumento del bilancio per tali programmi?

Risposta di Androulla Vassiliou a nome della Commissione
(17 maggio 2013)

La proposta della Commissione relativa al programma «Erasmus per tutti» coprirà gli aspetti dell'istruzione, della formazione, della gioventù e dello sport per il periodo 2014-2020.

Il programma è rivolto a tutte le organizzazioni, pubbliche o private, attive nel campo dell'istruzione, della formazione, della gioventù e dello sport (ad esempio scuole, istituzioni di istruzione e formazione professionali, istituzioni di istruzione superiore, ONG, ecc.), a condizione che soddisfino i criteri di ammissibilità esposti negli inviti a presentare proposte per il nuovo programma.

Per quanto concerne le istituzioni di istruzione superiore, il rilascio di una Carta Erasmus per l'istruzione superiore (ECHE) continua ad essere condizione indispensabile per la loro partecipazione al programma.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003519/13
to the Commission
Crescenzo Rivellini (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Extending the 'Erasmus' project to maritime and hospitality colleges

Within the context of the new 2014-2020 'Erasmus for All' programmes launched by the Commission in the field of education for increasing skills and employability, as well as the modernisation of the education and training systems, the 'Erasmus' project should also be extended to maritime and hospitality colleges. This would allow the young people enrolled in these colleges to improve their knowledge of English, thus recovering tens of thousands of jobs for young Europeans in the cruise industry, where the vast majority of workers are Filipino, Indonesian and Indian, coming from countries that have already begun some kind of training process to start young people on their career path.

These 'non-EU' employees, whose professional quality is questionable, have an excellent command of English, and this is a factor that could lead to the loss of thousands of jobs unless special measures are taken. It is therefore essential that exchange programmes are launched to enable our young people — especially in Italy, where school education in languages is poor — to overcome the linguistic handicap and compete with 'non-EU' staff for jobs in the cruise industry, the only sector that is currently enjoying strong economic growth.

The funding proposed by the Commission within the framework of the 2014-2020 multiannual plan for the new 'Erasmus for All' programmes is EUR 19 billion, including EUR 1.8 billion for international cooperation. This is a major commitment by the Commission, representing a budget increase of more than 70% compared with the current programmes (considered individually), aiming to offer five million people the chance of studying or training abroad.

Does the Commission not believe that the 'Erasmus for All' project should also be extended to maritime and hospitality colleges, particularly in view of the increase in the budget for these programmes?

**Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(17 May 2013)**

The Commission's programme proposal 'Erasmus for All' will cover education, training, youth and sport for the period 2014-2020.

The programme is addressed to any organisation, public or private, active in the fields of education, training, youth and sport (e.g. schools, vocational education and training institutions, higher education institutions, NGOs, etc.), provided they meet the eligibility criteria that will be established in the calls for proposals for the new programme.

For higher education institutions, the award of an Erasmus Charter for Higher Education (ECHE) will continue to be a pre-requisite for their participation in the programme.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-003520/13

Komisijai

Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)

(2013 m. kovo 27 d.)

Tema: Draudimo užsieniečiams įsigyti žemės ūkio paskirties žemę ir miškus Lietuvoje susiejimas su tiesioginėmis išmokomis

2003 m. Stojimo Akte Lietuvai yra numatyta teisė septynerius metus nuo įstojimo dienos taikyti draudimą užsieniečiams pirkti žemės ūkio paskirties žemę ir miškus Lietuvoje. Ši išimtis yra grindžiama tuo, kad, nesant tokio apribojimo, iškiltų rimtos grėsmės nacionalinės žemės ūkio paskirties žemės rinkos iškraipymui.

Stojimo akte taip pat numatoma galimybė pratęsti pereinamąjį laikotarpį trejiems metams, jei yra pagrindo manyti, kad pasibaigus pereinamajam laikotarpiui atsiras didelių trikdymų ar kils didelių trikdymų grėsmė Lietuvos žemės ūkio paskirties žemės rinkai.

2011 m. balandžio 11 d. Komisijos sprendimu Lietuvai buvo suteiktas pereinamojo laikotarpio pratęsimas iki 2014 m. birželio 30 d. Šis sprendimas buvo grindžiamas Komisijos išvada, jog netaikant papildomo apribojamojo laikotarpio gali būti iškreipta žemės ūkio paskirties žemės rinka Lietuvoje. Tuo pat metu Lietuva raginama kuo skubiau vykdyti struktūrines reformas žemės ūkio srityje.

Žemės ūkio perspektyvos Lietuvoje yra tiesiogiai susijusios su ES parama žemės ūkiui, ypač tiesioginių išmokų srityje. Šiuo metu Lietuvoje, dėl itin didelių tiesioginių žemės išmokų skirtumų lyginant su kitoms ES valstybėmis narėmis, žemės ūkis tampa vis mažiau konkurencingas nacionalinėje rinkoje, nekalbant apie konkurenciją ES žemės ūkio rinkoje. Todėl tinkamų ir teisingų struktūrinių žemės ūkio reformų vykdymas nebus įmanomas, kol tiesioginių išmokų lygis už hektarą nepasieks ES vidurkio. Todėl minėto apribojimo panaikinimas 2014 m. dar labiau iškreips žemės ūkio paskirties žemės rinką Lietuvoje.

Jau dabar yra aišku, kad iki kitos daugiametės finansinės perspektyvos pabaigos tiesioginių išmokų lygis Lietuvos žemdirbiams gali siekti vos 75 proc. ES vidurkio, o tiesioginių išmokų priartinimas prie ES vidurkio bus nukeliamas po 2020 m.

Ar Komisija nemano, kad atsižvelgiant į lėtą tiesioginių išmokų didėjimą Lietuvai ir po 2014 m. toliau turi būti suteikta išimtinė galimybė taikyti apribojimus dėl žemės ūkio paskirties žemės ir miškų įsigijimo užsieniečiams, kol tiesioginių išmokų lygis Lietuvoje nepasieks ES tiesioginių išmokų vidurkio?

Komisijos nario M. Barnier atsakymas Komisijos vardu

(2013 m. gegužės 8 d.)

Kaip nurodo gerbiamas Europos Parlamento narys, 2003 m. Stojimo akte žemės ūkio paskirties nekilnojamojo turto rinkos visiškam atvėrimui buvo numatytas septynerių metų pirminis pereinamasis laikotarpis. Pagal Stojimo aktą Lietuvai suteikta teisė prašyti pratęsti pereinamąjį laikotarpį, per kurį tam tikromis sąlygomis būtų galima įsigyti žemės ūkio paskirties žemės, ne daugiau kaip dar trejiems metams. Komisija leido šį laikotarpį pratęsti dar trejiems metams, todėl Lietuva savo žemės ūkio paskirties žemės rinką visų ES ir EEE valstybių narių investicijoms turėtų atverti ne vėliau kaip 2014 m. gegužės 1 d. Laikina taikoma nukrypti leidžianti nuostata nesieta su tiesioginių išmokų Lietuvos ūkininkams arba daugiametės finansinės programos pokyčiais, tad daugiau pratęsti pereinamojo laikotarpio pagal Stojimo aktą ir Sutartį dėl Europos Sąjungos veikimo (SESV) galimybių nėra. Taigi nuo nurodytos datos taikomos visos SESV nuostatos, o Lietuvos teisės aktai, susiję žemės ūkio paskirties nekilnojamojo turto įsigijimu, turi atitikti ES teisę, visų pirma laisvo kapitalo judėjimo ir atitinkamos ES Teisingumo Teismo jurisprudencijos nuostatas.

Kadangi pagal Sutartį pereinamąjį laikotarpį žemės ūkio paskirties nekilnojamajam turtui įsigyti Lietuvoje galima pratęsti ne daugiau kaip trejiems metams ir šia pratęsimo teise jau pasinaudota, dar kartą jo pratęsti Komisija negali.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003520/13
to the Commission
Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)
(27 March 2013)

Subject: Linking of the ban on foreigners acquiring agricultural land and forests in Lithuania with direct payments

The 2003 Act of Accession provides for the right of Lithuania to impose a ban on foreigners purchasing agricultural land and forests in Lithuania for seven years from the date of accession. This right is based on the fact that without such a restriction, there would be a serious threat that the national agricultural land market could be distorted.

The Act of Accession also provides for the possibility to extend the transitional period for three years if there is reason to suppose that at the end of the transitional period there will be major disturbances or a threat of major disturbances to the Lithuanian agricultural land market.

The Commission decision of 11 April 2011 granted Lithuania an extension of the transitional period until 30 June 2014. This decision was based on the Commission's conclusion that without the application of an additional restrictive period, the agricultural land market in Lithuania could be distorted. At the same time, Lithuania has been urged to implement structural reforms in the field of agriculture as soon as possible.

Agricultural prospects in Lithuania are directly linked to EU support for agriculture, particularly in the field of direct payments. At present in Lithuania, due to the particularly significant discrepancies in direct payments compared to other EU Member States, agriculture is becoming less and less competitive in the national market, not to mention the competitive EU agricultural market. The implementation of adequate and fair structural reforms in agriculture will therefore be impossible until the direct payment rate per hectare reaches the EU average. The abolition of the abovementioned restriction in 2014 will therefore further distort the agricultural market in Lithuania.

It is already clear that by the end of the next multi-annual financial framework, the level of direct payments for Lithuanian farmers may be barely 75% of the EU average, and the movement of direct payments towards the EU average will be postponed until after 2020.

Does the Commission not feel that given the slow increase in direct payments, Lithuania should continue to be granted the exceptional opportunity to impose restrictions on the acquisition of agricultural land and forests by foreigners after 2014 until the level of direct payments in Lithuania reaches the EU direct payment average?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(8 May 2013)

As the Honourable Member indicates, according to the Act of Accession of 2003, the original transitional period for the full opening of the agricultural real estate market in Lithuania was seven years. Under the Act of Accession Lithuania was entitled to request an extension of the transition period for the acquisition of agricultural land, under certain conditions, for a maximum of three more years. The Commission granted this extension for three years, therefore, Lithuania should open its agricultural land markets to investments from all EU/EEA Member States at the latest by 1 May 2014. The temporary derogation was not linked to developments in direct payments to Lithuanian farmers or in the multiannual financial framework and 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 said date the TFEU fully applies and the Lithuanian legislation on the acquisition of agricultural real estate has to comply with EC law, in particular with the provisions on free movement of capital and the relevant jurisprudence of the Court of Justice of the EU.

As the three years extension of the transitional period for the acquisition of agricultural real estate in Lithuania is the maximum permitted under the Treaty and was already granted, the Commission has no competence to further prolong this extension.

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003521/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)**

Nuno Melo (PPE)
(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Turistas raptados no Sinai

Considerando o seguinte:

- Dois turistas foram hoje raptados na península egípcia do Sinai por beduínos armados;
- O rapto de turistas no Sinai é frequente, sobretudo após a deposição de Hosni Mubarak, há dois anos, facto que fragilizou as forças de segurança no local, e os raptadores visam usar os reféns como moeda de troca para a libertação de beduínos presos.

Assim, pergunta-se à Vice-Presidente/Alta-Representante:

Tem conhecimento desta situação?

Em que medida estes raptos recorrentes contribuem para a deterioração da segurança nesta zona do Egito junto à fronteira com Israel?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão

(13 de maio de 2013)

A AR/VP tem conhecimento dos acontecimentos referidos e está profundamente preocupada com o agravamento da situação da segurança no Sinai.

O Egito prossegue a sua transição complexa. É evidente que há necessidade de proceder a profundas reformas em diferentes domínios, incluindo no setor da segurança.

A UE tem repetidamente disponibilizado apoio à reforma do setor da segurança no Egito e aguarda uma reação da sua parte.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003521/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

Nuno Melo (PPE)
(27 March 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Tourists kidnapped in Sinai

Two tourists were kidnapped today in the Egyptian peninsula of Sinai by armed Bedouin tribesmen.

Tourist kidnappings in Sinai are frequent, particularly since the overthrow of Hosni Mubarak, two years ago, which weakened security forces in the area. The kidnappers aim to use the hostages as bargaining chips for the release of Bedouin prisoners.

Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of this situation?

To what extent are these recurrent kidnappings contributing to worsening security in this Egyptian region bordering Israel?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(13 May 2013)

The HR/VP is aware of the events referred to and is deeply concerned of the worsening of the security situation in Sinai.

Egypt is continuing its complex transition. Clearly there is a need for Egypt to undertake serious reforms in different areas, including the reform of the security sector.

The EU has repeatedly offered support to the reform of Egypt's security sector and awaits a reaction from the Egyptian side.

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003522/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)**

Nuno Melo (PPE)
(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Irão ameaça Israel

O líder iraniano Ali Khamenei ameaçou recentemente Israel, afirmando que, se for alvo de um ataque militar israelita, tem capacidade para «aniquilar» as cidades de Telavive e Haifa.

Assim, pergunta-se à Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante:

Como avalia esta ameaça?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(22 de maio de 2013)

A retórica deve ser entendida no contexto da campanha eleitoral e da visita recente do Presidente Barack Obama a Israel, durante a qual apoiou publicamente as preocupações do país em matéria de segurança. A AR/VP considera inaceitáveis as ameaças contra Israel.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003522/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

Nuno Melo (PPE)

(27 March 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Iran threatens Israel

Iranian Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei recently threatened Israel, saying that the Islamic Republic could 'destroy' the cities of Tel Aviv and Haifa if it were subjected to an Israeli military attack.

How does the Vice-President/High Representative assess this threat?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(22 May 2013)

This rhetoric should be understood in the context of the electoral campaign and the recent visit of President Obama to Israel, during which he publicly supported Israel's security concerns. The HR/VP considers that such threats against Israel are unacceptable.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003523/13

à Comissão

Nuno Melo (PPE)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Insinuação de Dmitry Medvedev

Recentemente, o primeiro-ministro russo Dmitry Medvedev insinuou que a UE quer destruir o sistema bancário cipriota.

Assim, pergunta-se à Comissão:

De que forma avalia e como justifica a particular ingerência das autoridades russas numa questão da UE?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão

(13 de maio de 2013)

Relativamente à questão colocada pelo Senhor Deputado, é de referir que a União Europeia e os seus Estados-Membros tiveram de intervir em circunstâncias particularmente difíceis. Com efeito, Chipre foi vítima de uma crise bancária sem precedentes e era necessária uma ação rápida para impedir um colapso total do sistema financeiro do país e o contágio a outros Estados-Membros da UE.

A Comissão rejeita as alegações de que o envolvimento da UE contribui para a destruição do sistema bancário cipriota. É verdade que as autoridades cipriotas tiveram de tomar medidas drásticas, nomeadamente a autonomização das sucursais gregas e a resolução de um banco, a fim de fazer face à situação económica e financeira insustentável e à fragilidade da liquidez das instituições de crédito. O sistema bancário cipriota não está a ser destruído, pelo contrário. O sistema bancário tornar-se-á mais forte e racional, e irá financiar a economia cipriota de modo produtivo. A Comissão está consciente de que Chipre tem grandes desafios a enfrentar e está a seu lado para o ajudar a restabelecer a estabilidade financeira e criar condições propícias ao crescimento sustentável e à criação de emprego.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003523/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Comments by Dmitry Medvedev

Russian Prime Minister Dmitry Medvedev recently suggested that the EU wants to destroy the Cypriot banking system.

How does the Commission evaluate and justify this particular interference by the Russian authorities in an EU issue?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(13 May 2013)**

With respect to the issue raised by the Honourable Member, it has to be stressed that the European Union and its Member States had to intervene in particularly difficult circumstances. Indeed, Cyprus suffered from an unprecedented banking crisis and swift action was necessary to stop a complete melt-down of the financial system in the country and contagion to other EU Member States.

The Commission disagrees with allegations that the EU involvement destroys the Cypriot banking system. True, drastic measures had to be taken by the Cypriot authorities, including carving out the Greek branches and the resolution of one bank, to address the unsustainable financial and economic situation and the fragile liquidity position of the credit institutions. Rather than destroying the Cypriot banking system, the contrary is true. The result will be a stronger and leaner banking system that will finance the Cypriot economy in a productive way. The Commission realises that significant challenges lie ahead and stands by Cyprus in helping to restore financial stability, and create conditions for sustainable growth and job creation.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003524/13

ao Conselho

Nuno Melo (PPE)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Armas químicas na Síria

Considerando o seguinte:

- Com base nos últimos documentos do Departamento de Informações dos Estados Unidos sobre a situação na Síria, o Presidente do Comité de Informações da Câmara dos Representantes afirmou recentemente existirem «grandes probabilidades de uso de armas químicas na Síria»;
- A situação na Síria, apesar de todas as medidas de contenção para travar o conflito, tem vindo a piorar, com mais de 70 000 mortos, um milhão de refugiados e um maior número de deslocados internamente, depois de quase três anos de guerra civil entre as forças rebeldes e as forças do regime.

Assim, pergunta-se ao Conselho:

Que comentário faz destas afirmações?

Resposta

(24 de junho de 2013)

A UE tem repetidamente manifestado grande preocupação perante a probabilidade de uso de armas químicas na Síria e tem instado a Síria a não utilizar os seus arsenais, em circunstância alguma, e a armazenar as armas em condições de segurança, até que sejam destruídas sob verificação independente.

Através da averiguação que está a realizar, a missão nomeada pelo Secretário-Geral da ONU, Ban Ki-moon, de que fazem parte membros da Organização para a Proibição de Armas Químicas (OPAQ), vai procurar determinar apenas se foram ou não utilizadas armas químicas. Ainda falta que o regime sírio dê o seu acordo a esta missão. A OPAQ é a única organização internacional com capacidade para confirmar o uso de armas químicas e empreender uma análise e uma avaliação a respeito do seu uso e natureza.

A UE continuará a acompanhar de muito perto o evoluir da situação.

A UE e os seus Estados-Membros têm prestado assistência a todos os sírios, num montante de quase 800 milhões de euros. A assistência é dirigida tanto a quem se encontra na Síria como aos refugiados e comunidades de acolhimento nos países vizinhos. O Conselho está empenhado em colaborar com todas as partes envolvidas, em especial a ONU, no sentido de uma resolução política do conflito, e em prosseguir a ação de assistência em curso.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003524/13
to the Council
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Chemical weapons in Syria

In the light of the latest US intelligence documents on the situation in Syria, the Chairman of the US House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has recently stated that there is a 'high probability' that chemical weapons have been deployed.

The situation in Syria has worsened, despite all efforts to end the conflict. After almost three years of civil war between rebel forces and those fighting for the regime, over 70 000 people have been killed, and there are one million refugees and an even greater number of internally displaced persons.

What is the Council's assessment of this statement?

**Reply
(24 June 2013)**

The EU has repeatedly expressed serious concern at the possible use of chemical weapons in Syria and has called on Syria not to use its stockpile under any circumstances and to store the weapons securely pending independently verified destruction.

The investigation by the mission appointed by UN 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 have been used. The Syrian regime still has to agree to this mission. OPCW is the only international organisation with the capacity to confirm the use of chemical weapons and undertake an analysis and assessment related to its use and nature.

EU will continue to monitor developments very closely.

The EU and its Member States have provided assistance to all Syrians amounting to almost EUR 800 million. Assistance is directed both to persons inside Syria and to refugees and host communities in neighbouring countries. The Council is committed to working with all stakeholders, in particular the UN, towards a political settlement of the conflict and to maintaining current assistance efforts.

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003525/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)**

Nuno Melo (PPE)
(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Armas químicas na Síria

Considerando o seguinte:

- Com base nos últimos documentos do Departamento de Informações dos Estados Unidos sobre a situação na Síria, o Presidente do Comité de Informações da Câmara dos Representantes afirmou recentemente existirem «grandes probabilidades de uso de armas químicas na Síria».
- A situação na Síria, apesar de todas as medidas de contenção para travar o conflito, tem vindo a piorar, com mais de 70 000 mortos, um milhão de refugiados e um maior número de deslocados internamente, depois de quase três anos de guerra civil entre as forças rebeldes e as do regime.

Assim, pergunta-se à Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante:

Que comentário faz destas afirmações?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(9 de julho de 2013)

A UE tem repetidamente manifestado grande preocupação perante a probabilidade de uso de armas químicas na Síria e tem instado este país a não utilizar os seus arsenais, em circunstância alguma, e a armazenar as armas em condições de segurança, até que sejam destruídas sob verificação independente.

Com base nas informações de livre acesso atualmente disponíveis, os serviços da UE avaliam que podem ter sido utilizadas substâncias químicas, de forma limitada e com um número limitado de vítimas.

As investigações efetuadas pela missão designada pelo Secretário-Geral das Nações Unidas, 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. Não devemos esquecer que a OPCW é a única organização internacional que tem inspetores com capacidade para confirmar a utilização de armas químicas e fornecer qualquer análise e avaliação relacionadas com a sua utilização e a natureza.

Um inquérito da ONU na Síria será extremamente útil para que se possa investigar uma série de recentes alegações sobre o emprego de armas químicas no conflito.

A UE continuará a acompanhar de perto este assunto em consulta com os seus parceiros.

A assistência total da UE (incluindo os Estados-Membros da UE) a todos os sírios afetados pelo conflito, através da utilização de todos os instrumentos disponíveis, ascende a quase 800 milhões de EUR. A assistência destina-se a pessoas na Síria, mas também aos refugiados e às comunidades de acolhimento nos países vizinhos. A União Europeia está empenhada em trabalhar com todas as partes interessadas, como as Nações Unidas, em primeiro lugar, e sobretudo no sentido de uma solução política para o conflito e em manter os atuais esforços de assistência.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003525/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

Nuno Melo (PPE)
(27 March 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Chemical weapons in Syria

In the light of the latest US intelligence documents on the situation in Syria, the Chairman of the US House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has recently stated that there is a 'high probability' that chemical weapons have been deployed.

After almost three years of civil war between rebel forces and those fighting for the regime, over 70 000 people have been killed, and there are one million refugees and an even greater number of internally displaced persons.

What is the Vice-President/High Representative's assessment of this statement?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(9 July 2013)

The EU has repeatedly expressed serious concern at the possible use of chemical weapons in Syria and has called on Syria never to use its stockpile under any circumstances and to store the stockpile securely pending independently verified destruction.

On the basis of currently available open source information, the EU services assess that chemical substances might 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) and the World Health Organisation (WHO), 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 deploy the team will be reached soon. We must remember that the OPCW is the only international organisation that has inspectors with the capacity to confirm the use of chemical weapons and undertake any analysis and assessment related to its use and nature.

A UN investigation inside Syria will be extremely useful in order to investigate a range of recent allegations about the employment of chemical weapons in the fighting.

The EU will continue to monitor very closely this matter in consultation with its partners.

The EU's (including EU member states) total assistance to all Syrians affected by the conflict through the use of all available instruments amounts to almost EUR 800M. Assistance is directed to persons inside Syria, but also to refugees and host communities in neighbouring countries. The EU is committed to work with all stakeholders such as the UN first and foremost towards a political settlement of the conflict and to maintain the current assistance efforts.

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003526/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)**

Nuno Melo (PPE)
(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Ataque cibernético na Coreia do Sul

Considerando que:

- A polícia sul-coreana detetou endereços IP dos EUA e de três países europeus durante a investigação que foi posta em curso para encontrar os responsáveis pelo ataque informático de que foram alvo várias entidades sul-coreanas na semana passada, e que gerou um «apagão» generalizado nos computadores de vários bancos e televisões;
- A polícia da Coreia do Sul pediu ao governo dos quatro países — EUA e os três países europeus (que não foram identificados) — para cooperarem com a investigação,

Pergunto à Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante:

Que comentários faz desta situação?

Qual deve ser o papel da UE nesta investigação?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(20 de junho de 2013)

O incidente referido pelo Senhor Deputado demonstra uma vez mais que o cibercrime é um fenómeno que não pode ser atacado com êxito de uma forma unilateral. É necessário estabelecer uma cooperação entre os diferentes países e comunidades de partes interessadas, públicas e privadas. A cooperação na aplicação do direito internacional à investigação dos ciberataques é regida por acordos entre os Estados-Membros da UE e países terceiros. A Convenção do Conselho da Europa sobre o Cibercrime («Convenção de Budapeste») constitui um instrumento jurídico eficaz para facilitar a cooperação internacional na investigação dos crimes informáticos.

A visão da UE sobre a forma de responder às questões de cibersegurança foi recentemente adotada pela «Estratégia da União Europeia para a Cibersegurança». A Comissão assegura, em cooperação com os Estados-Membros, uma ação coordenada a nível internacional no domínio da cibersegurança. Desta forma, a Comissão defende os valores fundamentais da UE e promove uma utilização pacífica, aberta e transparente das cibertecnologias.

Em determinadas condições e numa base casuística, o recém-criado Centro Europeu da Cibercriminalidade da Europol também pode ser encarregado pelos Estados-Membros da UE da coordenação de investigações em matéria de cibercriminalidade.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003526/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

Nuno Melo (PPE)
(27 March 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Cyber-attack on South Korea

South Korean police have detected IP addresses from the United States and from three European countries during the investigation launched to find those responsible for the cyber-attack that targeted various South Korean institutions last week and that caused a widespread 'shutdown' of computer networks at several banks and television stations.

South Korean police have asked the governments of the four countries — the United States and the three European countries (which have not been named) — to cooperate with the investigation.

What is the Vice-President/High Representative's assessment of this situation?

What role should the EU play in this investigation?

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

The incident cited by the Honourable Representative demonstrates once more that cybercrime is not an issue that can be addressed successfully in a unilateral manner. It requires cooperation across countries and across the different communities of stakeholders, both public and private. International law enforcement cooperation to investigate cyber attacks is regulated by agreements among EU Member States and third countries. The Council of Europe Convention on Cybercrime (the 'Budapest Convention') constitutes an effective legal instrument to facilitate international cooperation in cybercrime investigations.

The EU's vision of how to respond to cybersecurity issues is set out in the recently adopted 'Cybersecurity Strategy for the European Union'. The Commission ensures, together with the Member States, coordinated international action in the field of cybersecurity. In so doing, the Commission will uphold EU core values and promote a peaceful, open and transparent use of cyber technologies.

Under certain conditions and on a case by case basis, the newly established EU Cybercrime Center within Europol can also be tasked by EU Member States to coordinate cybercrime investigations.

(Versão portuguesa)

**Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003527/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)**

Nuno Melo (PPE)
(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Plano contra eventuais agressões da Coreia do Norte

— A Coreia do Sul e os Estados Unidos implementarem um novo plano conjunto de defesa contra eventuais agressões da Coreia do Norte. Esta informação foi já confirmada pelo Ministério da Defesa sul-coreano;

— A resposta a eventuais agressões norte-coreanas era, até agora, da exclusiva responsabilidade do exército da Coreia do Sul, sendo a intervenção dos EUA apenas contemplada em caso de guerra total;

— Este acordo, que já entrou em vigor e que inclui «procedimentos de consulta e ação para permitir uma dura e decisiva resposta», surge como um elemento dissuasor de eventuais «provocações» levadas a cabo pelo regime de Kim Jong-un.

Pergunto à Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante:

Como avalia este plano conjunto?

Qual deve ser o papel da UE nesta questão?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(7 de junho de 2013)

A aliança militar entre a Coreia do Sul e os EUA data de 1953 e, desde então, tem sido um fator de estabilidade na Península Coreana e em toda a região do Nordeste Asiático.

Os EUA têm 28 000 militares estacionados na Coreia do Sul e dispõem de meios militares importantes na região.

Por conseguinte, uma estreita consulta entre os EUA e a República da Coreia, uma prerrogativa de Estados soberanos, é desejável para responder de forma coerente e mais eficaz possível a eventuais incidentes no atual contexto de tensão na Península Coreana.

A UE está em contacto com todos os países diretamente envolvidos e continuará a desenvolver esforços para manter e reforçar a unidade da comunidade internacional na procura de um acordo duradouro para uma Península Coreana sem armas nucleares e de melhores perspetivas para o povo norte-coreano, que há muito vive em condições difíceis.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003527/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)**

Nuno Melo (PPE)

(27 March 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Plan to combat possible attacks from North Korea

— South Korea and the United States have adopted a new joint defence plan to combat possible attacks from North Korea. The South Korean Ministry of Defence has confirmed this information.

— Until now, the South Korean army has been solely responsible for responding to possible North Korean attacks, with US intervention contemplated only in the event of all-out war.

— This agreement, which has already entered into force, includes 'procedures for consultation and action to allow for a strong and decisive combined ROK-US response' and acts as a deterrent to any 'provocation' from Kim Jong-un's regime.

What is the Vice-President/High Representative's assessment of this joint plan?

What is the role of the EU in this scenario?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission

(7 June 2013)

The RoK and the US established a military alliance in 1953 and, since then, this has been a factor of stability on the Korean Peninsula and the wider North East Asia region.

There are 28 000 US troops stationed in South Korea and the US have significant military assets deployed in the region.

Therefore close consultation between the US and ROK, a prerogative of sovereign States, is desirable in order to deal coherently and to best effect with any possible incidents in the context of the current tension on the Korea Peninsula.

The EU keeps contact with all the countries immediately involved and will continue to work to maintain and strengthen the unity of the international community in seeking a durable agreement for a nuclear free Korean Peninsula and in offering the long-suffering people of the DPRK a better perspective for their welfare.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003529/13
an die Kommission
Jürgen Creutzmann (ALDE)
(27. März 2013)

Betrifft: Verbraucherschutz bei der grenzüberschreitenden Erbringung von Dienstleistungen im Bereich Online-Glücksspiel

Nach uns vorliegenden Beschwerden von betroffenen Spielern verzögert ein bei der maltesischen Lotterien- und Geldspielaufsichtsbehörde (Malta Lotteries and Gaming Authority, LGA) lizenziertes Glücksspielunternehmen seit Sommer 2012 Auszahlungen gegenüber gewinnberechtigten Mitgliedern. Seit Herbst 2012 blockiert das Unternehmen jegliche Auszahlungen. Die zuständige Kontrollbehörde (LGA) reagiert schon seit mehreren Monaten nicht mehr auf diesbezügliche Anfragen betroffener Spieler.

1. Liegen der Kommission bereits Informationen bezüglich des beschriebenen Sachverhalts vor?
2. Steht die Kommission diesbezüglich im Kontakt mit der zuständigen Kontrollbehörde (LGA)?
3. Wie viele ähnliche Beschwerden von Verbrauchern über unterlassene Kontrollpflichten von Regulierungsbehörden anderer Mitgliedstaaten liegen der Kommission insgesamt vor? Welche Mitgliedstaaten sind dabei betroffen?
4. Sind derartige Probleme im Zusammenhang mit Verbraucherschutz bei der grenzüberschreitenden Erbringung von Dienstleistungen innerhalb der Expertengruppe für Glücksspiel diskutiert worden oder ist dies für die Zukunft geplant?
5. Welche Maßnahmen könnten im Rahmen des Aktionsplans der Kommission für Online-Glücksspiele getroffen werden, um Verbraucher künftig besser vor Verlusten ihrer Einzahlungen zu schützen?

Antwort von Herrn Barnier im Namen der Kommission
(6. Juni 2013)

Die Kommission hat keine Kenntnis von den angeblichen Beschwerden und steht diesbezüglich auch nicht in Kontakt mit der zuständigen Kontrollbehörde.

Die Kommission erkennt die Bedeutung der Frage des Verbraucherschutzes an. Gegenwärtig können die Mitgliedstaaten im Rahmen der vom Gerichtshof der Europäischen Union vorgegebenen Grenzen die Ziele ihrer Glücksspielpolitik und das angestrebte Schutzniveau festlegen. Die Kommission erkennt an, dass wirksame Maßnahmen der Mitgliedstaaten zur Durchsetzung ihrer nationalen Rechtsvorschriften — wofür die Einhaltung des EU-Rechts eine Grundvoraussetzung bildet — der Schlüssel zur Verwirklichung der öffentlichen Interessen sind, die Mitgliedstaaten mit ihrer Glücksspielpolitik verfolgen.

Wie in ihrer im Oktober 2012 angenommenen Mitteilung über Online-Glücksspiele⁽¹⁾ angekündigt wird, die Kommission als eine zentrale Maßnahme eine Empfehlung verabschieden mit dem Ziel, Verbrauchern, die Glücksspieldienstleistungen in Anspruch nehmen, ein hohes Maß an einheitlichem Schutz zu bieten. In der Expertengruppe zu Glücksspieldienstleistungen konzentrieren sich die Diskussionen betreffend den Verbraucherschutz auf die Ausarbeitung der oben genannten Empfehlung, die Grundsätze wie Spielererkennungskontrollen, Setzung finanzieller und zeitlicher Grenzen sowie Ausschlussmöglichkeiten umfassen sollte. Die Sachverständigengruppe wird einen Austausch von Erfahrungen und bewährten Verfahren herbeiführen, unter anderem zu nationalen Durchsetzungsstrategien.

Darüber hinaus erhielt die Kommission Anfragen von Bürgern in Bezug auf das Anbieten von Glücksspieldiensten in den Mitgliedstaaten. Diese Anfragen enthielten jedoch keine Beschwerden über die Kontrollbehörden.

⁽¹⁾ KOM(2012)596 endg.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003529/13
to the Commission**

Jürgen Creutzmann (ALDE)

(27 March 2013)

Subject: Consumer protection in connection with the cross-border provision of online gambling services

According to complaints we have received from players who have been affected, since summer 2012 a gambling company, which is licensed by the Lotteries and Gaming Authority of Malta (LGA), has delayed payouts to its winning members. The company has blocked all payments since autumn 2012. The competent supervisory authority (the LGA) has apparently failed for several months to respond to enquiries regarding this issue from players who have been affected.

1. Has the Commission received any information on the facts set out above?
2. Has the Commission made any contact with the competent supervisory authority (the LGA) regarding this issue?
3. How many similar complaints has the Commission received in total from consumers concerning the non-performance of supervisory duties by regulatory authorities in other Member States? Which Member States are affected?
4. Has the Expert Group on Gambling Services debated problems of this kind relating to consumer protection in connection with the cross-border provision of services, or are there plans for such a debate in the future?
5. What measures could be taken under the Commission's action plan for online gambling in order to provide consumers with better protection in future against the loss of money they have paid in?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission

(6 June 2013)

The Commission is not aware of the alleged complaints nor is it in contact with the competent supervisory authority on this matter.

The Commission acknowledges the pertinence of the issue of protection of consumers. In the current situation, Member States may, within the limits established by the Court of Justice of the EU, set the objectives of their gambling policy and define the level of protection sought. The Commission recognises that effective enforcement by Member States of their national legislation — a prerequisite of which is compliance with EC law — is essential for the attainment of the public interest objectives of their gambling policy.

As announced in its communication on online gambling ⁽¹⁾ adopted in October 2012, the Commission will, as one of the key measures, adopt a recommendation with the aim of providing a high level of common protection of consumers of gambling services. Discussions in the Group of Experts on Gambling Services regarding consumer protection are focusing on the elaboration of the abovementioned recommendation, which should include principles such as player identification controls, financial and temporal limit setting, and exclusion possibilities. The expert group will bring about an exchange of experiences and good practices, including on national enforcement policies.

Further to the above, the Commission has received questions from citizens regarding the offer of gambling services in the Member States. However, these do not include complaints about the regulatory authorities.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2012) 596 final.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003530/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Niki Tzavela (EFD)
(27 Μαρτίου 2013)

Θέμα: Δηλώσεις Μπαγίς

Σε πρόσφατες δηλώσεις του, ο Τούρκος υπουργός Ευρωπαϊκών Υποθέσεων, Εγκεμέν Μπαγίς, προσφέρει τα 5 δισ. ευρώ που χρειάζεται η Κύπρος με την προϋπόθεση να τα ζητήσει αυτά η Λευκωσία από το κατοχικό καθεστώς.

Παράλληλα, δηλώνει ότι η Αγκυρα δεν θα είχε αντίρρηση εάν η Κύπρος επέλεγε να χρησιμοποιήσει ως νόμισμά της την τουρκική λίρα. Για την ακρίβεια, δήλωσε: «Αυτά είναι πλέον για εμάς μικρά ποσά. Μπορούν να κάνουν αίτηση για να εκμεταλλευτούν το δάνειο των 5 δισ. ευρώ που θα δώσουμε στο ΔΝΤ. Δεν θα είχαμε μάλιστα αντίρρηση, εάν ήθελαν, να χρησιμοποιήσουν, ως νόμισμα, αντί του ευρώ την τουρκική λίρα, όπως κάνει η ΤΑΒΚ».

Ο Τούρκος υπουργός με ιδιαίτερη υπεροψία ζήτησε να ασκηθούν πιέσεις στη Λευκωσία για να δεχτεί λύση του Κυπριακού, όπως φυσικά εννοεί τη λύση η Τουρκία: «Η ΕΕ πρέπει να πιέσει τους Ελληνοκυπρίους να αποδεχτούν μία λύση στη νήσο και πρέπει να καταλάβουν οι Ελληνοκύπριοι ότι δεν έχουν άλλη επιλογή από τη λύση. Γνώρισαν με άσχημο τρόπο και σε σύντομο διάστημα τι σημαίνει να έχεις απέναντί σου την τουρκική πλευρά».

Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη πως οι ανωτέρω δηλώσεις ελέγχθησαν από τον υπουργό Ευρωπαϊκών Υποθέσεων της Τουρκίας, αξιωματούχο αρμόδιο για την ενταξιακή πορεία της Τουρκίας στην ΕΕ, και οι δηλώσεις αυτές δεν προσβάλλουν την Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία, αλλά την ΕΕ συνολικά, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Προτίθεται να του απαντήσει επισήμως.

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(30 Μαΐου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή αναμένει από την Τουρκία να στηρίξει ενεργά τις τρέχουσες διαπραγματεύσεις που αποσκοπούν στη δίκαιη, συνολική και βιώσιμη διευθέτηση του κυπριακού ζητήματος στο πλαίσιο του ΟΗΕ, σύμφωνα με τις σχετικές αποφάσεις του Συμβουλίου Ασφαλείας των ΗΕ και με τις αρχές στις οποίες θεμελιώνεται η Ένωση. Η Επιτροπή κάλεσε επανειλημμένως την Τουρκία να δεσμευτεί και να συνεργαστεί με συγκεκριμένο τρόπο για συνολική διευθέτηση, μεταξύ άλλων και με την έκθεση προόδου 2012 σχετικά με την Τουρκία⁽¹⁾.

(¹) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003530/13
to the Commission
Niki Tzavela (EFD)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Statements by Bağış

In a recent statement, the Turkish Minister for EU Affairs, Egemen Bağış, offered Cyprus the EUR 5 billion it needs, on condition that Nicosia requests it from the occupying regime.

At the same time, he stated that Ankara would have no objection if Cyprus were to choose the Turkish pound as its currency. What he actually said was: 'This is peanuts for us. They can apply to use the EUR 5 billion loan that we shall give the IMF. We would have no objection if they wanted to use the Turkish pound as their currency, as does the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.'

The Turkish minister asked with a great deal of arrogance for pressure to be exerted on Nicosia to accept a solution to the Cyprus question, by which of course he meant the Turkish solution to the Cyprus question: he said that the EU needs to persuade the Greek Cypriots to accept a solution on the island and that the Greek Cypriots need to understand that they have no option other than to accept a solution, having seen in a very short space of time what it means to be up against the Turkish side.

Given that the above statements were made by the Turkish Minister for EU Affairs, the official responsible for Turkey's accession prospects, and that these statements insult not the Republic of Cyprus but the EU as a whole, will the Commission say:

— Does it intend to respond officially?

**Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2013)**

The Commission expects Turkey to actively support the ongoing negotiations aimed at a fair, comprehensive and viable settlement of the Cyprus issue within the UN framework, in accordance with the relevant UN Security Council resolutions and in line with the principles on which the Union is founded. The Commission has repeatedly called on Turkey to commit and contribute in concrete terms to such a comprehensive settlement, including in its 2012 Progress Report on Turkey ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003531/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Niki Tzavela (EFD)
(27 Μαρτίου 2013)

Θέμα: Τραπεζικές καταθέσεις στην Ευρώπη

Μιλώντας στο πρακτορείο Reuters και τους Financial Times, ο κ. Ντάσελμπλουμ δήλωσε ότι η αξιοποίηση καταθέσεων για την αναδιάρθρωση των κυπριακών τραπεζών μπορεί να αποτελέσει ένα πρότυπο για τη διαχείριση των τραπεζικών προβλημάτων στην ευρωζώνη. «Εάν υπάρχει κάποιο ρίσκο σε μία τράπεζα, το πρώτο μας ερώτημα θα πρέπει να είναι: “Εντάξει, τι θα κάνεις εσύ, στην τράπεζα για αυτό; Τι μπορείς να κάνεις προκειμένου να ανακεφαλαιοποιηθείς μόνος σου;”. Εάν η τράπεζα δεν μπορεί ανταποκριθεί, τότε θα απευθυνθούμε στους μετόχους και τους ομολογιούχους, θα τους ζητήσουμε να εισφέρουν στην ανακεφαλαιοποίηση της τράπεζας. Και, εάν είναι απαραίτητο, θα στραφούμε στους καταθέτες με μη εγγυημένες καταθέσεις [άνω των 100 000 ευρώ]», σχολίασε χαρακτηριστικά ο κ. Ντάσελμπλουμ. Επιπρόσθετα, την Τρίτη, η κ. Σαντάλ Χιούς, εκπρόσωπος του αρμόδιου επίτροπου της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης για ζητήματα Εσωτερικής Αγοράς και Υπηρεσιών κ. Μισέλ Μπαρνιέ, δήλωσε πως οι καταθέσεις άνω των 100 000 ευρώ δεν αποκλείεται να χρησιμοποιούνται για τις διασώσεις προβληματικών τραπεζών, στο πλαίσιο νέου νομοσχεδίου που επεξεργάζεται η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση.

«Στην πρόταση της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής, η οποία έχει τεθεί προς συζήτηση, δεν εξαιρείται το ενδεχόμενο οι καταθέσεις άνω των 100 000 ευρώ να χρησιμοποιηθούν ως εργαλεία ενός bail-in», όπως σχολίασε η εκπρόσωπος του Επίτροπου Μπαρνιέ, Σαντάλ Χιούς, μιλώντας σε δημοσιογράφους. «Είναι μία πιθανότητα».

Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη τα ανωτέρω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

- Η οικονομική πολιτική της ΕΕ οδηγείται πλέον σε φορολογία των καταθέσεων άνω των 100 000;
- Είναι αυτή η πρώτη ένδειξη ότι η ηγεσία της νομισματικής ένωσης προτίθεται να υποχρεώσει τις μη βιώσιμες τράπεζες να επωμισθούν μεγάλο μέρος τυχόν αναδιάρθρωσης ή ανακεφαλαιοποίησής τους, μειώνοντας αντίστοιχα το βάρος που θα κληθούν να σηκώσουν οι φορολογούμενοι;
- Το μοντέλο που προαναγγέλλει ο κ. Ντάσελμπλουμ θα σημαίνει το τέλος του παλαιότερου σχεδίου που προέβλεπε την απ' ευθείας ανακεφαλαιοποίηση αδύναμων χρηματοπιστωτικών ιδρυμάτων από τον μόνιμο μηχανισμό διάσωσης ESM;

Απάντηση του κ. Barnier εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(15 Μαΐου 2013)

Το σχέδιο οδηγίας για την ανάκαμψη και την εξυγίανση των τραπεζών (BRR) αποβλέπει στην αποσαφήνιση των όρων που θα εφαρμόζονται στην εξυγίανση προβληματικών τραπεζών στο μέλλον. Αφ' ης στιγμής εκδοθεί η οδηγία, τα κράτη μέλη θα έχουν τα απαραίτητα εργαλεία παρέμβασης για την πρόληψη και την διευθέτηση τραπεζικών κρίσεων, συμπεριλαμβανομένων εθνικών ταμείων εξυγίανσης χρηματοδοτούμενων από συμβολές του ιδιωτικού τομέα. Για να ελαχιστοποιηθεί η εμπλοκή του φορολογούμενου σε τραπεζικές κρίσεις, το ενσωματωμένο στο πλαίσιο αυτό εργαλείο διάσωσης με ίδια μέσα θα επιτρέψει την ανακεφαλαιοποίηση τραπεζών, αποκλείοντας ή περιορίζοντας τη βαρύτητα των παλαιών μετόχων και μειώνοντας ή μετατρέποντας σε μετοχές τις απαιτήσεις των πιστωτών. Οι καταθέσεις κάτω των 100 000 ευρώ θα εξακολουθήσουν να προστατεύονται πλήρως και θα αποκλείονται ρητά από το εργαλείο διάσωσης με ίδια μέσα. Όσον αφορά την ακριβή αντιμετώπιση των άνω των 100 000 ευρώ καταθέσεων στο μελλοντικό πλαίσιο εξυγίανσης, αυτή αποτελεί ακόμη το αντικείμενο διαπραγματεύσεων.

Σκοπός της οδηγίας είναι να εξασφαλιστεί ότι η ανακεφαλαιοποίηση προβληματικών τραπεζών με δημόσια μέσα θα αποτελεί το ύστατο καταφύγιο. Τυχόν προσφυγή σε δημόσια χρήματα (εθνικής προέλευσης ή από τον Ευρωπαϊκό Μηχανισμό Σταθερότητας (ΕΜΣ)), θα εξακολουθήσει να υπόκειται στο ευρωπαϊκό πλαίσιο κρατικών ενισχύσεων.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003531/13
to the Commission
Niki Tzavela (EFD)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Bank deposits in Europe

Speaking to *Reuters* and the *Financial Times*, Mr Dijsselbloem stated that the use of deposits to restructure the Cypriot banks may set a precedent for managing banking problems in the euro area. 'If there is a risk to a bank, the first question we ask must be: "Okay, what are you the bank going to do about that? What can you do to recapitalise yourself?" If the bank can't do it, we'll talk to the shareholders and the bondholders, we'll ask them to contribute in recapitalising the bank, and if necessary the uninsured deposit holders [deposits over EUR 100 000]', was what Mr Dijsselbloem had to say. Furthermore, on Tuesday, Chantal Hughes, spokesperson for Mr Michel Barnier, the EU Commissioner responsible for internal market and services, stated that there was a possibility that deposits over EUR 100 000 would be used to save ailing banks under new legislation being prepared by the European Union.

Speaking to journalists, Chantal Hughes, spokesperson for Commission Barnier, said: 'In the Commission's proposal, which is under discussion, it is not excluded that deposits over EUR 100 000 could be instruments eligible for bail-in. It is a possibility.'

Considering the above, will the Commission say:

- Is the EU's economic policy now moving towards taxation of deposits over EUR 100 000?
- Is this the first sign that the leaders of monetary union intend to force ailing banks to shoulder the lion's share of any restructuring or recapitalisation, by reducing the burden that taxpayers will be required to pay?
- Will the model predicted by Mr Dijsselbloem mean the end of the previous scheme of direct recapitalisation of ailing credit institutions from the permanent rescue mechanism (ESM)?

**Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(15 May 2013)**

The draft Directive on Bank Recovery and Resolution (BRR) aims to clarify the rules applicable to the resolution of ailing banks in the future. Once the directive is in place, Member States will have the necessary tools to intervene to prevent and resolve bank crises, including national resolution funds which should be financed by contributions from the private sector. To minimise taxpayer involvement in bank crises, the bail-in tool enshrined in that framework will allow a bank to be recapitalised by wiping out or diluting shareholders and by reducing or converting the claims of creditors into shares. Deposits below EUR 100 000 will continue to be fully protected and explicitly excluded from the bail-in tool. As regards the exact treatment of deposits above EUR 100 000 within the future resolution framework, this is still subject to negotiations.

The purpose of the directive is to ensure that recapitalisation of ailing banks through public means will become the very last resort. Any possible recourse to public money (be it national or the ESM), will remain subject to the EU state aid framework.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003532/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(27 Μαρτίου 2013)

Θέμα: Νέος Ευρωπαϊκός Μηχανισμός Διάσωσης Τραπεζών (Bail-in)

Σε δηλώσεις της, η εκπρόσωπος του Επιτρόπου Barnier, αναφερόμενη στο θέμα της εγγύησης των καταθέσεων στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, είπε ότι «Στην πρόταση της Επιτροπής, που έχει τεθεί σε διάλογο, δεν αποκλείεται καταθέσεις άνω των 100 000 ευρώ να μπορούν να αποτελούν επιλέξιμα εργαλεία σε διασώσεις τραπεζών, bail-in».

Με βάση τα παραπάνω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

- Η πρόταση της Επιτροπής αφορά σε ένα μελλοντικό μηχανισμό διάσωσης τραπεζών με τη συμμετοχή των καταθετών; Θα υπάρξει πανευρωπαϊκός μηχανισμός εγγύησης καταθέσεων σε αντικατάσταση της οδηγίας 2009/14, που αφορά την εγγύηση καταθέσεων από τα κράτη μέλη και έως του ποσού των 100 000 ευρώ;
- Υπάρχει σκέψη για «εθελοντική ασφάλιση καταθέσεων» με ευθύνη των αποταμιευτών;

Απάντηση του κ. Barnier εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(13 Μαΐου 2013)

Η μελλοντική οδηγία για την ανάκαμψη και την εξυγίανση των τραπεζών θα αποσαφηνίσει τους εφαρμοστέους κανόνες για την εξυγίανση των προβληματικών τραπεζών στο μέλλον. Μετά την έκδοση της εν λόγω οδηγίας, τα κράτη μέλη θα έχουν τα απαραίτητα εργαλεία για να παρεμβαίνουν στην τραπεζική κρίση, περιλαμβανομένης της διάσωσης με ίδια μέσα (bail-in). Οι καταθέσεις κάτω των 100 000 ευρώ θα εξακολουθήσουν να είναι πλήρως εγγυημένες και θα εξαιρούνται ρητά από τη συνεισφορά για δαπάνες εξυγίανσης μέσω του εργαλείου διάσωσης με ίδια μέσα. Όσον αφορά τη μεταχείριση των καταθέσεων άνω των 100 000 ευρώ στο πλαίσιο του μελλοντικού πλαισίου εξυγίανσης, το ζήτημα αυτό αποτελεί ακόμη αντικείμενο διαπραγματεύσεων.

Το σχέδιο οδηγίας περί ΣΕΚ που έχει υποβληθεί επικεντρώνεται στην εναρμόνιση των εθνικών συστημάτων εγγύησης των καταθέσεων που προβλέπονται εκ του νόμου. Ταυτόχρονα, τα εθελοντικά συστήματα εγγύησης των καταθέσεων που λειτουργούν σε συμβατική βάση και παρέχουν επιπλέον εγγυήσεις πέραν των 100 000 ευρώ επιτρέπονται από τη νομοθεσία της ΕΕ.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003532/13
to the Commission**

Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)

(27 March 2013)

Subject: New European bail-in mechanism for banks

Referring to the question of deposit guarantee schemes in the European Union, Commissioner Barnier's spokesperson said that in the Commission's proposal, which is under discussion, it is not excluded that deposits over EUR 100 000 could be instruments eligible for bail-in.

In light of the above, will the Commission say:

- Does the Commission proposal refer to a future bank rescue mechanism supported by depositors? Will there be a pan-European deposit guarantee scheme to replace Directive 2009/14/EC in order to guarantee Member States' deposits up to the sum of EUR 100 000?
- Is it giving any thought to the 'voluntary deposit guarantees' for which savers are responsible?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission

(13 May 2013)

The forthcoming Directive on Bank Recovery and Resolution will clarify the rules applicable to the resolution of ailing banks in the future. Once the directive is in place, Member States will have the necessary tools to intervene in banking crisis, including bail-in. Deposits below EUR 100 000 will continue to be fully guaranteed and explicitly excluded from contributing to resolution costs through the bail-in tool. As regards the treatment of deposits above EUR 100 000 within the future resolution framework, this is still subject to negotiations.

The draft DGS Directive which is currently on the table focuses on harmonising national statutory deposit guarantee schemes. At the same time, voluntary deposit guarantee schemes functioning on a contractual basis and offering additional guarantees beyond EUR 100 000 are allowed by EU legislation.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003533/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(27 Μαρτίου 2013)

Θέμα: Προβληματικά δάνεια γερμανικών τραπεζών στη ναυπηγική βιομηχανία

Ο οίκος Moody's έχει ήδη υποβαθμίσει μεγάλες γερμανικές τράπεζες, επειδή, όπως αναφέρει, έχουν εκτεθεί σε προβληματικά δάνεια προς τη ναυπηγική βιομηχανία, ύψους περίπου 100 δις. ευρώ. Σύμφωνα με τον ίδιο οίκο, το ποσό αυτό είναι υπερδιπλάσιο από το σύνολο της αξίας των ομολόγων Ελλάδας, Ισπανίας, Ιταλίας, Πορτογαλίας και Ιρλανδίας, που κατέχουν οι ίδιες τράπεζες.

Τις ίδιες ανησυχίες εξέφρασε και μέλος του διοικητικού συμβουλίου της Deutsche Bundesbank (Andreas Dombert — «The year 2013: Challenges from a financial stability perspective»), ο οποίος πρόβλεψε πρόσφατα ότι η κρίση στη ναυτιλία θα προκαλέσει τριγμούς στο τραπεζικό σύστημα της Γερμανίας, καθώς οι γερμανικές τράπεζες διαδραματίζουν πρωτεύοντα ρόλο στην παγκόσμια ναυτιλιακή χρηματοδότηση, επισημαίνοντας μάλιστα πως πολλά funds που δραστηριοποιούνται στη ναυτιλία, σημειώνουν μεγάλες απώλειες, ενώ άλλα έχουν ήδη καταθέσει αίτηση πτώχευσης.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

- Γνωρίζει ποιες γερμανικές τράπεζες έχουν τη μεγαλύτερη έκθεση στη ναυπηγική βιομηχανία; Πώς αξιολογεί τον κίνδυνο που έχουν αναλάβει;
- Τι κατέδειξαν τα stress-test των ευρωπαϊκών τραπεζών σχετικά με το θέμα αυτό; Υπάρχει ευρωπαϊκό νομικό πλαίσιο αντιμετώπισης τέτοιων καταστάσεων;
- Υπάρχει σχετική έκθεση της εθνικής ρυθμιστικής αρχής της Γερμανίας; Έχει ασχοληθεί με το θέμα η Ευρωπαϊκή Αρχή Τραπεζών; Πώς αντιμετωπίζεται το πρόβλημα; Ποιος θα καλύψει τα ελλείμματα;

Απάντηση του κ. Barnier εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(3 Ιουνίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή έχει υπόψη της την ομιλία του κ. Dombret στην οποία αναφέρεται το Αξιότιμο Μέλος. Ωστόσο, η Επιτροπή δεν γνωρίζει την έκταση των ελλειμμάτων στον ναυπηγοεπισκευαστικό κλάδο.

Η Επιτροπή δεν συγκεντρώνει στοιχεία σχετικά με τα ανοίγματα των γερμανικών τραπεζών στον ναυπηγοεπισκευαστικό κλάδο ή τη ναυτιλία. Επίσης, δεν σταθμίζει τους κινδύνους που αναλαμβάνουν οι τράπεζες.

Υπό το δυσμενές μακροοικονομικό σενάριο της προηγούμενης προσομοίωσης ακραίων καταστάσεων σε ολόκληρη την ΕΕ, η οποία πραγματοποιήθηκε από την Ευρωπαϊκή Αρχή Τραπεζών (EAT) το 2011 για τις γερμανικές τράπεζες που συμπεριλήφθηκαν στην προσομοίωση αυτή, εκτιμήθηκαν συμπληρωματικές προβλέψεις και κεφαλαιακές απαιτήσεις για την παροχή δανείων προς τον ναυπηγοεπισκευαστικό κλάδο — πέραν των δανείων σε άλλους τομείς της οικονομίας. Τα αποτελέσματα της προσομοίωσης αυτής δημοσιεύθηκαν από την EAT τον Ιούλιο του 2011. Στο πλαίσιο αυτό, πρέπει να υπενθυμίσουμε ότι η τελευταία προσομοίωση που αφορούσε τα χαρτοφυλάκια τραπεζικών δανείων πραγματοποιήθηκε στο τέλος του 2010 και ότι ο χρονικός ορίζοντας της προσομοίωσης κάλυψε την περίοδο 2011-2012.

Γενικότερα, το νομικό πλαίσιο της ΕΕ καλύπτει τους κανόνες σύστασης προβλέψεων για μη εξυπηρετούμενα δάνεια, καθώς και δημιουργία αποθεματικών, ανάλογα με τον κίνδυνο που αντιπροσωπεύουν τα ανοίγματα για τυχόν μελλοντικές μη αναμενόμενες ζημιές.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003533/13
to the Commission**

Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)

(27 March 2013)

Subject: Problem loans by German banks to the shipbuilding industry

Moody's has already downgraded major German banks, because they have underwritten problem loans to the shipbuilding industry totalling approximately EUR 100 billion. According to Moody's, that is over double the total value of Greek, Spanish, Italian, Portuguese and Irish bonds held by those same banks.

The same concerns were expressed by a member of the board of directors of the Deutsche Bundesbank (Andreas Dombert: 'The year 2013: Challenges from a financial stability perspective'), who recently predicted that the crisis in the shipbuilding industry would send shockwaves through the German banking system, because German banks play a leading role in financing shipbuilding worldwide, and pointed out that numerous funds active in the shipbuilding industry have reported major losses, while others have already filed for bankruptcy.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

- Does it know which German banks have the greatest exposure to the shipbuilding industry? How does it rate the risk which they have underwritten?
- What was the outcome of the stress tests on European banks in connection with this matter? Is there a European legal framework for addressing such situations?
- Has the German regulatory authority reported on this matter? Has the European Banking Authority addressed this matter? How is it addressing the problem? Who will cover the shortfalls?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission

(3 June 2013)

The Commission is aware of Mr Dombret's speech quoted by the Honourable Member. However, the Commission is not aware of the extent of shortfalls in the shipbuilding industry.

The Commission does not collect information about German banks' exposures to shipbuilding or shipping. It also does not rate the risks banks have underwritten.

For those German banks that participated in the previous EU-wide stress test exercise conducted by EBA in 2011, additional provisions and capital requirements for loans to the shipping — together with loans to other sectors of the economy — were estimated under the adverse macroeconomic scenario. The results of the stress test were published by EBA in July 2011. In this context, it shall be reminded that the last stress test was conducted on bank loan portfolios as of end 2010 and the stress horizon covered the period of 2011-2012.

More generally, the EU legal framework covers the rules on provisioning for non-performing loans and setting aside capital, commensurate with the risk level of exposures, for any further unexpected losses.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003534/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Roupakis (PPE)
(27 Μαρτίου 2013)

Θέμα: Σημαντική επιδείνωση του φαινομένου της φτώχειας στην Ελλάδα. Επιτακτική η ανάγκη στήριξης των ευπαθών κοινωνικών ομάδων

Όπως προκύπτει τόσο από τα σχετικά στατιστικά στοιχεία της Eurostat, όσο και από έγκυρες επιστημονικές μελέτες Διεθνών και Ευρωπαϊκών Ινστιτούτων, τα φαινόμενα φτώχειας και υλικής υστέρησης αυξάνονται ραγδαία στην Ελλάδα. Σύμφωνα μάλιστα με την ετήσια Έκθεση της Τράπεζας της Ελλάδος (2012), η φτώχεια αυξήθηκε στη χώρα μας κατά 43,1% σε ένα μόλις έτος, ενώ η Συγκριτική Έρευνα του Ινστιτούτου Γερμανικής Οικονομίας (IW) κατατάσσει την Ελλάδα στην 25η θέση στην Ευρώπη των 27 αναφορικά με τα ποσοστά φτώχειας του πληθυσμού της. Την ίδια ώρα, οι περικοπές σε κοινωνικές δαπάνες και μεταβιβάσεις στο πλαίσιο του ακολουθούμενου Προγράμματος Δημοσιονομικής Εξυγίανσης αποδυναμώνουν σημαντικά την αναγκαία στήριξη στις πιο ευπαθείς κοινωνικές ομάδες που αντιμετωπίζουν έντονο τον κίνδυνο του κοινωνικού αποκλεισμού και της ακραίας φτωχοποίησης.

Σε αυτήν την κατεύθυνση, και με δεδομένη τη συμμετοχή της στην Τρόικα, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

- Διαθέτει στατιστικά στοιχεία για τη διακύμανση των ποσοστών φτώχειας στα κράτη μέλη για το 2012;
- Πώς αξιολογεί και σχολιάζει το γεγονός ότι η Ελλάδα κατατάσσεται στην 25η θέση όσον αφορά την εισοδηματική φτώχεια των πολιτών της, δηλαδή πολύ χαμηλότερα από χώρες που εισήλθαν στην ΕΕ αρκετά μεταγενέστερα από αυτήν;
- Προτίθεται να υποστηρίξει την αναθεώρηση μέτρων που περιλαμβάνουν περικοπές επιβεβλημένων κοινωνικών δαπανών για την προστασία των πιο ευάλωτων οικονομικά ομάδων, περικοπές που υποβαθμίζουν ευθέως την επίτευξη του εμβληματικού στόχου της ΕΕ για περιορισμό της φτώχειας και του κοινωνικού αποκλεισμού στην ευρωπαϊκή επικράτεια;
- Εκτιμά ότι τα υψηλά ποσοστά φτώχειας σε κράτη μέλη του στενού ευρωπαϊκού πυρήνα, όπως η Ελλάδα, υπονομεύουν τη συνοχή, τη σύγκλιση και συνολικότερα την προοπτική του ευρωπαϊκού οικοδομήματος;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(28 Μαΐου 2013)

Το 2011 η Ελλάδα παρουσίαζε το υψηλότερο ποσοστό φτώχειας στην ευρωζώνη (με βάση τα τελευταία δεδομένα της Eurostat). Εντούτοις, το ποσοστό του πληθυσμού που διέτρεχε κίνδυνο να βρεθεί κάτω από το όριο της φτώχειας ή να υποστεί κοινωνικό αποκλεισμό πριν από την πραγματοποίηση κοινωνικών μεταβιβάσεων ήταν κατά τι υψηλότερο στην ευρωζώνη σε σχέση με την Ελλάδα (25,4% και 24,8% αντίστοιχα). Αντιθέτως, εφόσον λάβουμε υπόψη κοινωνικές τις μεταβιβάσεις, το ποσοστό της φτώχειας πέφτει σε ποσοστό 16,9% στην ευρωζώνη σε σύγκριση με ποσοστό 21,4% στην Ελλάδα.

Το σύστημα κοινωνικής πρόνοιας στην Ελλάδα δεν περιλαμβάνει γενική στήριξη του εισοδήματος και στοχεύει σε περιορισμένο αριθμό πληθυσμού, σε αντίθεση με συστήματα άλλων χωρών της ΕΕ. Η Επιτροπή συνεργάζεται με τις ελληνικές αρχές για την αντιμετώπιση του εν λόγω προβλήματος (βλ. το πλαίσιο που αφορά την κοινωνική ισότητα στην ανασκόπηση του προγράμματος του Δεκεμβρίου 2012⁽¹⁾). Λόγω του δυσχερούς δημοσιονομικού πλαισίου, η επανεξισορρόπηση του συστήματος κοινωνικής πρόνοιας πρέπει να πραγματοποιηθεί σταδιακά. Εντούτοις, οι παροχές ευεργετημάτων βάσει του επιπέδου των πόρων ζωής των δικαιούχων θεσπίστηκαν ήδη το 2013. Ένα δοκιμαστικό πρόγραμμα για ένα ελάχιστο εγγυημένο εισόδημα προγραμματίζεται για το 2014. Προγραμματίζονται επίσης περαιτέρω ενεργές πολιτικές της αγοράς εργασίας.

Επιπλέον, σημαντικές προσπάθειες καταβάλλονται για να εξασφαλιστεί ότι ο πληθυσμός υφίσταται ισότιμα τις προσπάθειες προσαρμογής. Με τη μεταρρύθμιση του φόρου εισοδήματος θα επιμερισθεί πιο δίκαια η φορολογική επιβάρυνση. Στο πλαίσιο της τρέχουσας μεταρρύθμισης της φορολογικής διοίκησης, ενισχύθηκε η καταπολέμηση της φοροδιαφυγής, της νομιμοποίησης εσόδων από παράνομες δραστηριότητες και της διαφθοράς, αλλά πρέπει να καταβληθούν περαιτέρω προσπάθειες. Η Επιτροπή συνεργάζεται με τις αρχές ώστε να επιταχυνθούν οι προσπάθειες προς την κατεύθυνση αυτή.

⁽¹⁾ «European Economy Occasional Paper» 123, Δεκέμβριος 2012.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003534/13
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Significant increase in poverty in Greece and urgent need to support vulnerable social groups

According to Eurostat statistics and reliable academic studies by international and European institutions, the problems of poverty and shortage of goods are spiralling out of control in Greece. According to the Bank of Greece's 2012 annual report, poverty increased in Greece by 43.1% in just one year and a comparative investigation by the German Institute for Economic Research (IW) ranks Greece 25th in the EU of the 27 in terms of the poverty rate among its population. At the same time, cuts in social spending and benefits under the fiscal reform programme are undermining the support needed by the most vulnerable social groups, which are at serious risk of social exclusion and extreme poverty.

This being so and in light of its involvement in the Troika, will the Commission say:

- Does it have statistics on changes in poverty rates in the Member States in 2012?
- How does it assess and what are its comments on the fact that Greece ranks 25th in terms of its citizens' income poverty, i.e. far below countries which joined the EU much later than Greece?
- Does it intend to support the review of measures that include cuts to the social spending needed in order to protect the most financially vulnerable groups, cuts that directly undermine attainment of the EU's flagship objective of reducing poverty and social exclusion within Europe?
- Does it consider that high poverty rates in Member States at the core of Europe, such as Greece, are undermining cohesion, convergence and the prospects of the European construct as a whole?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(28 May 2013)**

Greece had the highest poverty rate in the euro area in 2011 (last Eurostat data). However, the rate of people at risk of poverty or social exclusion before social transfers was a little higher in euro area than in Greece (25.4% and 24.8% respectively). In contrast, after accounting for social transfers the poverty rate falls to 16.9% in the euro area compared with 21.4% in Greece.

The Greek social welfare system does not comprise a general income support and has limited targeting, in contrast with systems elsewhere in the EU. The Commission is working with the Greek authorities to address this problem (see box on social equity in Programme Review from December 2012⁽¹⁾). Given the difficult fiscal context, the rebalancing of the social welfare system will have to be undertaken gradually. Nevertheless, a means-tested child benefit has already been instituted in 2013. A pilot programme for a minimum guaranteed income is planned for 2014. Further active labor market policies are also planned.

In addition, important efforts are being made to ensure that the adjustment efforts are equally shared among the population. The income tax reform will share more equally the tax burden. In the context of the ongoing revenue administration reform, the fight against tax evasion, money laundering and corruption has been reinforced but more needs to be done. The Commission is working with the authorities to step up efforts in this direction.

⁽¹⁾ European Economy Occasional Paper 123, December 2012.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003535/13
an die Kommission
Barbara Lochbihler (Verts/ALE) und Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE)
(27. März 2013)

Betrifft: Thailand: Der Fall Andy Hall

Die EU hat vor kurzem ein Partnerschafts- und Kooperationsabkommen mit Thailand geschlossen und verhandelt derzeit über ein Freihandelsabkommen mit dem Land.

Im Verlauf dieser Verhandlungen wurden schwere Verstöße gegen grundlegende Menschen- und Arbeitnehmerrechte in den wichtigsten Branchen der Exportindustrie Thailands, wie der Garnelen-, der Thunfisch- und der Ananasverarbeitung, gemeldet.

Die öffentlichen Bediensteten Thailands haben nur unzulänglich auf diese ausführlich dokumentierten Vergehen reagiert. Die thailändischen Rechtsvorschriften und die politischen Strategien der öffentlichen Bediensteten schränken die rechtmäßigen Tätigkeiten und das Recht auf freie Meinungsäußerung der Menschenrechtsaktivisten, die diese Verstöße zu Tage gefördert haben, in vieler Hinsicht sogar ein.

Ein vor kurzem veröffentlichter Bericht von Finnwatch, einer finnischen gemeinnützigen Forschungsorganisation, enthielt beispielsweise ausführlich dokumentierte Aussagen von Arbeitnehmern, laut denen ein thailändisches Unternehmen mit engen Beziehungen zum europäischen Markt, Zwangsarbeit sowie Praktiken, die als Menschenhandel bezeichnet werden können, anwendet. Der Experte für Migration und Menschenrechte, der diese Forschung durchgeführt hat, ein britischer Staatsbürger namens Andy Hall, wurde nun von dem Unternehmen wegen Verleumdung verklagt und muss möglicherweise mit einer mehrjährigen Haftstrafe rechnen.

Was wird die EU im Rahmen der aktuellen bilateralen Verhandlungen unternehmen, um die Situation der Menschenrechte in den Branchen der thailändischen Exportindustrie zu verbessern und Thailand dazu zu bewegen, das Recht von Menschenrechtsaktivisten auf freie Meinungsäußerung zu schützen?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(29. Mai 2013)

Die EU ist über das Gerichtsverfahren gegen Andy Hall in Thailand im Zusammenhang mit seiner Tätigkeit für Finnwatch informiert. Die EU verfolgt diese Angelegenheit aufmerksam, hat sie von Anfang an verfolgt und wird dies auch weiterhin in Zusammenarbeit mit den Mitgliedstaaten tun. Die EU-Delegation in Thailand war am ersten Tag der Verhandlungen im April 2013 anwesend und wird auch weiterhin bei den Verhandlungen anwesend sein.

Die EU hat sich stets für die Freiheit der Meinungsäußerung in Thailand eingesetzt und hierzu Ende Januar 2013 ein wichtiges Seminar in Bangkok veranstaltet.

Die EU legt großen Wert darauf, in die kürzlich wieder aufgenommenen Verhandlungen über ein Freihandelsabkommen mit Thailand auch Bestimmungen über den Handel und die nachhaltige Entwicklung aufzunehmen. Hierzu gehört auch die Förderung der wirksamen Umsetzung der Kernarbeitsnormen. Die Bestimmungen über den Handel und die nachhaltige Entwicklung im Freihandelsabkommen könnten auch einen Rahmen für den Dialog in diesem Bereich, auch mit den betroffenen Akteuren, bieten.

In Bezug auf die Studie von Finnwatch möchten wir die Damen Abgeordneten auf die bereits übermittelte Antwort verweisen, die das für Handel zuständige Kommissionsmitglied im Namen der Kommission auf die Frage E-00618/2013 erteilt hat ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/de/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq#sidesForm>

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-003535/13
komissiolle
Barbara Lochbihler (Verts/ALE) ja Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE)
(27. maaliskuuta 2013)

Aihe: Thaimaa: Andy Hallin tapaus

Euroopan unioni on vastikään solminut kumppanuus- ja yhteistyösopimuksen Thaimaan kanssa, ja neuvottelut EU:n ja Thaimaan vapaakauppasopimuksesta ovat parhaillaan käynnissä.

Neuvotteluiden aikana Thaimaasta on raportoitu vakavia perusoikeuksiin ja työntekijöiden oikeuksiin kohdistuvia rikkomuksia Thaimaan keskeisillä vientiteollisuuden aloilla, kuten katkarapujen, tonnikalan ja ananaksen jalostuksessa.

Thaimaan viranomaisten vastaukset kyseisiin hyvin dokumentoituihin väärinkäytöksiin ovat olleet riittämättömiä. Thaimaan lainsäädäntö ja viranomaisten noudattama politiikka ovat monin tavoin rajoittaneet niiden ihmisoikeuksien puolustajien lainmukaista toimintaa ja sananvapautta, jotka ovat tuoneet kyseiset rikkomukset esiin.

Esimerkkinä voidaan mainita suomalaisen voittoa tavoittelemattoman kansalaisjärjestön Finnwatchin laatima tuore raportti. Siinä esitetyissä työntekijöiden hyvin dokumentoiduissa lausunnoissa todetaan, että thaimaalainen yhtiö, jolla on tiiviit yhteydet Euroopan markkinoihin, käyttää pakkotyövoimaa ja harjoittaa ihmiskauppaa viittaavia käytäntöjä. Yhtiö on nyt nostanut kanteen tutkimuksen tehnyttä siirtolaisuuden ja ihmisoikeuksien asiantuntijaa, Yhdistyneen kuningaskunnan kansalaista Andy Hallia vastaan kunnianloukkauksesta. Hall voidaan tuomita usean vuoden vankeusrangaistukseen.

Meneillään olevien kahdenvälisen neuvottelujen yhteydessä pyydämme komissiota vastaamaan seuraaviin kysymyksiin: Mitä suunnitelmia EU:lla on ihmisoikeustilanteen parantamiseksi Thaimaan keskeisillä vientiteollisuuden aloilla? Mitä suunnitelmia EU:lla on sen edistämiseksi, että Thaimaan ihmisoikeuksien puolustajien sananvapaus turvataan?

Korkean edustajan, varapuheenjohtaja Catherine Ashtonin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(29. toukokuuta 2013)

EU on tietoinen siitä, että Thaimaan tuomioistuimet käsittelevät Andy Hallia vastaan nostettuja kanteita, jotka liittyvät hänen Finnwatchille tekemään työhönsä. EU seuraa asiaa tiiviisti, on tehnyt niin alusta lähtien ja tekee niin vastakin yhdessä jäsenvaltioiden kanssa. EU:n edustusto Thaimaassa osallistui ensimmäiseen oikeudenistuntoon huhtikuussa 2013 ja osallistuu niihin myös jatkossa.

Yleisemmin voidaan todeta, että EU työskentelee määrätietoisesti sananvapauden puolesta Thaimaassa ja järjesti asiasta laajan seminaarin Bangkokissa tammikuun lopussa 2013.

EU pitää hyvin tärkeänä sitä, että Thaimaan kanssa hiljattain käynnistettyihin neuvotteluihin vapaakauppasopimuksesta sisällytetään kauppaa ja kestävästä kehityksestä koskevia määräyksiä. Työelämän perusnormien tehokkaan täytäntöönpanon edistäminen muodostaa osan tästä tavoitteesta. Kauppaa ja kestävästä kehityksestä koskevat vapaakauppasopimuksen määräykset voisivat lisäksi tarjota puitteet aiheesta koskevalle keskustelulle, jota käytäisiin myös alan sidosryhmien kanssa.

Finnwatchin tutkimukseen liittyen haluamme kiinnittää arvoisien parlamentinjäsenien huomion vastaukseen, jonka kauppapolitiikasta vastaava komissaari on antanut jo aiemmin komission puolesta kysymykseen E-000618/2013⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fi/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq#sidesForm>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003535/13
to the Commission
Barbara Lochbihler (Verts/ALE) and Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Thailand: the case of Andy Hall

The EU has recently concluded a partnership and cooperation agreement with Thailand and is currently negotiating an EU-Thailand free trade agreement.

While these negotiations have been underway, serious violations of fundamental human and labour rights have been reported in Thailand's key export industries, such as shrimp, tuna and pineapple processing.

Thai officials' responses to such well-documented misdoings have been inadequate. In fact, the legitimate activities and freedom of expression of the human rights defenders who have brought these violations to light are in many ways restricted by Thai legislation and the policies applied by public officials.

A case in point is a recent report by Finnwatch, a Finnish non-profit research organisation, which provides well-documented worker testimonies pointing to the use of forced labour and practices which may amount to human trafficking by a Thai company with strong ties to the European market. The migration and human rights expert who conducted the research, a British citizen named Andy Hall, has now been sued by the company for defamation and may face several years' imprisonment.

In the context of the ongoing bilateral negotiations, what does the EU plan to do to improve the human rights situation in Thailand's export industries and to encourage Thailand to protect the freedom of expression of human rights defenders?

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

The EU is aware of the cases before Thai courts against Mr Andy Hall related to his work for Finnwatch. The EU follows this matter closely, has done so from the beginning and will continue to do so together with Member States. The EU Delegation in Thailand attended the first trial hearing in April 2013 and will continue to do so.

On a more general note, the EU works consistently for freedom of expression in Thailand, and organised a major seminar in Bangkok about this matter in late January 2013.

The EU attaches great importance to including provisions on Trade and Sustainable Development in the recently launched Free Trade Agreement (FTA) negotiations with Thailand. Promoting the effective implementation of core labour standards form part of this objective. The trade and sustainable development provisions in the FTA could also provide a framework for dialogue in this area, including with relevant stakeholders.

Regarding the Finnwatch study, we would also like to draw the Honourable Members' attention to the reply already given by the Commissioner responsible for Trade on behalf of the Commission, namely previous Question E-00618/2013 ⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq#sidesForm>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003536/13
to the Commission
Robert Sturdy (ECR)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: EU-US trade statistics

Would the Commission please provide the following statistics:

1. the average tariff levied by the EU on goods imported from the US;
2. the annual income provided by these tariffs to Member States in the years 2010, 2011 and 2012, and how much of this was passed to the EU budget in each of those years;
3. the expected loss of tariff income from reducing to 0% almost all tariffs on US goods with exception of the most sensitive.

**Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(14 May 2013)**

The simple average EU tariff applicable on imports from non-preferential countries is around 4.5%. The weighted average applicable to actual imports from the US. in 2012 is however less than 2% given the specific composition of imports from the US.

EU tariff revenue is part of the own resources of the European Commission and therefore flows into the EU budget. It consequently only has an indirect effect on the Member States budgets.

The current yearly tariff revenue, as estimated for the impact assessment, is around EUR 2.6 billion.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003537/13
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Communications Capabilities Development Programme (CCPD)

To follow-up from my Written Question E-011445/2012, could the Commission confirm whether an announcement under the EU Technical Standards Directive will be required by the British Government before the implementation of the communications Capabilities Development Programme (CCPD) can take place?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(13 May 2013)**

The United Kingdom Communications Data Bill should be notified under Directive 98/34/EC laying down a procedure for the provision of information in the field of technical standards and regulations and of rules on information society services (OJ L 204, 21.7.1998, p. 37) at a draft stage, if it contains technical regulations and/or rules on information society services falling within the scope of the above Directive.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003538/13
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Re-opening of Khojaly Airport in Nagorno-Karabakh

I have been contacted by a constituent who is concerned over the Government of Armenia's announcement that it intends to re-open Khojaly Airport in Nagorno-Karabakh.

My constituent tells me that Khojaly is in territory recognised by the United Nations as being Azerbaijani sovereign territory, and that not a single country has recognised Nagorno-Karabakh as being either independent or as being part of Armenia.

Does the Commission consider that such an action would be in breach of the Convention on International Civil Aviation — also known as the Chicago Convention?

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

As the Honorary Member might recall and as a general policy line the EU emphasises the importance of finding a peaceful settlement to the conflicts in the South Caucasus. The EU continues to support the OSCE Minsk Group. The Minsk Group Co-Chairs have already expressed their concerns regarding the issue of civilian flights to Nagorno-Karabakh. They have received renewed assurances from the sides that any threat or use of force against civil aircraft will be rejected and that the matter would be pursued through diplomatic channels without further politicizing the issue. The EU expects the sides to abide by these assurances. In the same vein, the EU shares the view that operation of the airport in Nagorno-Karabakh cannot be used to support any claim of change in the status of the region and recalls that the Co-Chairs urged the sides to act in accordance with international law and in consistency with current practice for flights over their territory.

Regarding specifically the Chicago Convention, any assessment of conformity of such potential flights with the Convention can only be done by the relevant UN actors, once the exact factual circumstances are clarified.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003539/13
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Employee engagement initiatives

I have been contacted by a constituent who works for a company which advises on and conducts employee engagement initiatives.

My constituent tells me that his business has achieved great results in this area, which includes conducting employee engagement master classes over the past 10 years to raise awareness of this subject ⁽¹⁾.

My constituent informs me that he recently met with the Hungarian Economic, Trade & Investment Commissioner, and that she expressed interest in exploring the adoption of leading UK employee engagement practices into her native Hungary. He is keen to conduct his programme elsewhere in the European Union but is concerned about the extra costs that this will incur.

Given that my constituent's initiative is helping to improve business results in the UK by means of good employee engagement, could the Commission say:

1. whether it is aware of any EU funding which could help my constituent conduct his programme in other Member States?
2. how my constituent can apply for any such funding?

**Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(31 May 2013)**

The most relevant EU funding instruments could be the European Social Fund and Progress.

1. The mentioned activities are eligible under the ESF Regulation. The specific criteria for assistance under programmes from the ESF and the scope of such assistance are however determined by the Managing Authorities in the Member States ⁽²⁾. Hungarian legislation does not exclude foreign organisations from submitting a funding application; however, individual calls for proposals may set other conditions. The relevant Hungarian Managing Authority is the National Development Agency.

As regards the UK, ESF programmes are aiming to help people mainly by extending employment opportunities and by developing a skilled and adaptable workforce. Supporting companies exploring employee engagement practices into other Member States, such as in this case in Hungary, does not fall within the remit of the current ESF programmes in the UK.

2. Another EU financing instrument is PROGRESS, whose objectives include promoting policy transfer, learning and support among Member States on the implementation of EU employment policies. Such actions are often implemented through calls for tenders or proposals. More information on PROGRESS (and its proposed successor, the Programme for Social Change and Innovation 2014-20) can be found at:
<http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=89&newsId=1093>

⁽¹⁾ Please see this website for further information: <http://www.engageforsuccess.org/>

⁽²⁾ Their contact details are available at <http://ec.europa.eu/esf/main.jsp?catId=524&langId=en>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003541/13
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Double funding within the context of CAP reform

The issue of so-called double funding has been the subject of much debate during the ongoing reform of the common agricultural policy (CAP). As we approach the trilogues, can the Commission provide clarification as to the definition of double funding and detail the extent, nature and source of the advice — legal and other — it has sought and received with regard to this matter?

**Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission
(8 May 2013)**

The Treaty on the European Union sets out the principle of sound financial management in view of achieving the best relationship between resources employed and results achieved. Hence, the EU budget shall not be used twice for funding the same activity. This is in contradiction with the financial principles of the EU and is called 'double funding'.

However, multiple payments on the same piece of land do not represent double funding as long as the rationale for the payment is different and therefore related to different requirements. If both payments are provided for the same requirement, double funding would occur. Hence, a clear distinction between CAP payments is necessary in order to reflect the EU principles for budget expenditure.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-003542/13
do Komisji
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(27 marca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Prognozy kosztów pakietu klimatycznego dla Polski

Czy Komisja dysponuje prognozą wydatków, jakie w latach 2014-2020 Polska będzie zmuszona wydać w związku ze zobowiązaniami wpływającymi z pakietu klimatycznego?

Jaka część tych zobowiązań będzie mogła być pokryta z funduszy przeznaczonych Polsce w budżecie unijnym 2014-2020?

Czy Komisja dysponuje własną lub zewnętrzną długoterminową (np. 10- lub 20-letnią) prognozą kosztów związanych z wprowadzeniem przez Polskę pakietu klimatycznego?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Connie Hedegaard w imieniu Komisji
(21 maja 2013 r.)

Komisja oszacowała, że dostosowanie do pakietu klimatyczno-energetycznego będzie kosztować Polskę 2,2 mld EUR, co odpowiada 0,52 % PKB w 2020 r. ⁽¹⁾. Potrzeba dodatkowych inwestycji w wysokości 0,8 mld EUR rocznie w okresie 2016-2020 doprowadzi w tym samym okresie i kolejnych latach do oszczędności w zakresie paliw w wysokości 0,4 mld EUR rocznie.

Zgodnie z prognozami zawartymi w podstawowej analizie ⁽²⁾ koszty te będą się zmniejszały w dalszej perspektywie, np. do 1,6 mld EUR w 2025 r. (0,33 % PKB) i do 0,7 mld EUR w 2030 r. (0,12 % PKB).

W aktualnym projekcie wieloletnich ram finansowych na lata 2014-2020 uzgodnionym przez Radę Europejską przewiduje się, że 20 % wszystkich wydatków powinno być przeznaczane na zwalczanie zmiany klimatu. Ramy te oferują zatem istotne możliwości w zakresie wspierania inwestycji w technologie niskoemisyjne.

⁽¹⁾ Zob.: dokument roboczy służb Komisji SWD(2012) 5. Są to dodatkowe koszty związane z energią służące świadczeniu wszystkich usług energetycznych w Polsce, nie zaś redukcja PKB. Porównanie z PKB służy ukazaniu wysiłków w odpowiedniej perspektywie.

⁽²⁾ Zob.: http://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/package/docs/technical_report_analysis_2012_en.pdf

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003542/13
to the Commission
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Climate package cost estimates for Poland

Does the Commission have an estimate of the costs that Poland will be forced to pay from 2014 to 2020 in connection with its commitments under the climate package?

What number of these commitments could be covered by funds allocated to Poland in the Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-2020?

Does the Commission have its own or an external long-term (e.g. 10- or 20-year) estimate for the costs that Poland will incur as a result of the introduction of the climate package?

**Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(21 May 2013)**

The Commission has estimated the costs of Poland to comply with the climate and energy package at EUR 2.2 bn or 0.52% of GDP in 2020 ⁽¹⁾. A need for additional investments of EUR 0.8 bn per year in the period 2016 to 2020, leads to annual fuel savings of EUR 0.4 bn in the same period, and continuing thereafter.

The background analysis ⁽²⁾ projects that these costs decrease in the longer term, e.g. to EUR 1.6 bn in 2025 (0.33% of GDP) and EUR 0.7 bn in 2030 (0.12% of GDP).

The current draft of the Multiannual Financial Framework 2014 2020 as agreed by the European Council envisages that 20% of all expenditures should be climate related. So it offers significant opportunities to support low carbon investments.

⁽¹⁾ See SWD(2012) 5. These are additional energy-related expenses to deliver all energy-related services in Poland, not a reduction of GDP. The GDP is used to put the effort into perspective.

⁽²⁾ See http://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/package/docs/technical_report_analysis_2012_en.pdf

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003543/13

à Comissão

Nuno Teixeira (PPE)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Exportações de origem europeia com destino a Angola

As exportações de origem europeia de bens alimentares para Angola estão a ficar retidas no porto de Luanda, devido às inspeções laboratoriais que passaram a ser exigidas pelas autoridades daquele país para que os produtos possam entrar no circuito de comercialização. Os problemas com as exportações começaram a tornar-se flagrantes há cerca de mês e meio, a partir do momento em que o Serviço Nacional de Alfândegas (SNA) entregou à uma empresa angolana a responsabilidade da fazer análises a todas as mercadorias destinadas a consumo humano.

Além da pouca eficácia da empresa angolana, os exportadores queixam-se dos preços praticados por esta empresa para fazer as suas análises. Assim, a inspeção de um contentor de bens alimentares custa 1 500 dólares (1 154 euros), enquanto a de um contentor frigorífico sobe para os 7 400 dólares (5 696 euros, ao câmbio de segunda-feira). Os importadores dos bens alimentares nacionais acabam por pagar duas vezes o mesmo serviço, dado que são realizadas inspeções sanitárias tanto em Portugal como, agora, em Angola.

Em julho de 2012, a União Europeia e Angola assinaram um novo acordo de parceria, o qual visa aprofundar o diálogo político e a cooperação em várias áreas. O objetivo principal da UE nas suas relações com Angola tem sido até agora o de contribuir para o desenvolvimento sustentável através do apoio institucional, e nomeadamente para o combate da pobreza e a prossecução dos Objetivos de Desenvolvimento do Milénio, com base num orçamento de 214 milhões de euros até 2013.

1. Como vê a Comissão o atual problema ao nível da entrada das exportações de origem europeia de bens alimentares em Angola?
2. Como pode este recente acontecimento contribuir para um aprofundamento das relações comerciais e, eventualmente, uma harmonização das normas técnicas e de inspeção entre a União Europeia e Angola?
3. Prevê a Comissão Europeia iniciar negociações com Angola com vista à celebração de um Acordo de Livre Comércio?
4. O que pode a Comissão fazer no futuro para salvaguardar os interesses e as expectativas das empresas europeias exportadoras e também para evitar uma situação semelhante ao caso concreto acima descrito?

Resposta dada por Karel De Gucht em nome da Comissão

(23 de maio de 2013)

A Comissão não recebeu até à data qualquer queixa de operadores europeus ou Estados-Membros. Seriam necessárias informações mais detalhadas sobre os requisitos impostos aos operadores de empresas (por exemplo, legislação aplicável e regras exatas) para poder comentar e tomar eventuais medidas.

Se Angola decidir aderir às negociações entre a UE e o grupo APE SADC, as partes irão negociar artigos sobre normas sanitárias e fitossanitárias, assim como normas sobre os obstáculos técnicos ao comércio. Estas negociações acabarão por contribuir para a harmonização.

Angola está presente nas negociações do Acordo de Parceria Económica entre a UE e o grupo dos países APE SADC, mas ainda não apresentou qualquer oferta de acesso ao mercado. As negociações sempre estiveram abertas a Angola.

Para evitar problemas semelhantes, a Comissão está empenhada na aplicação do acordo SPS da Organização Mundial do Comércio a fim de garantir que todos os procedimentos de verificação e do cumprimento das medidas sanitárias ou fitossanitárias não criem obstáculos desnecessários ao comércio internacional e sejam limitados ao que é razoável e necessário.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003543/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: European exports to Angola

European exports to Angola are being held back at the port of Luanda due to the laboratory checks that the country's authorities have started demanding in order for products to be allowed to enter circulation there. The problems with exports became obvious around a month and a half ago, when the Angolan customs service (SNA) put an Angolan company in charge of testing all goods intended for human consumption.

In addition to the Angolan company being inefficient, exporters are complaining about the prices that the company charges to perform its tests. Inspecting a food container costs USD 1 500 (EUR 1 154), while the price for a refrigerated container rises to USD 7 400 (EUR 5 696, at Monday's rates). Importers of Portuguese foodstuffs end up paying for the same service twice, since health inspections are conducted both in Portugal and, now, in Angola.

In July 2012, the EU and Angola concluded a new partnership agreement aimed at deepening political dialogue and cooperation in a number of areas. Up to now, the EU's main objective in its relations with Angola has been to contribute to sustainable development through institutional support and, in particular, to combat poverty and pursue the Millennium Development Goals, with a budget of EUR 214 million until 2013.

1. What is the Commission's view of the current problem as regards European food exports entering Angola?
2. How can this recent development contribute to deepening trade relations and, potentially, to harmonising technical and inspection standards between the European Union and Angola?
3. Does the Commission plan to start negotiating with Angola about concluding a free trade agreement?
4. What can the Commission do in future to safeguard the interests and expectations of European exporters and to prevent situations similar to the specific one outlined above?

**Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(23 May 2013)**

The Commission has so far not received complaints from European operators or Member States. Further detailed information about requirements imposed on business operators (e.g. applicable legislation and exact rules) would be necessary to comment and take any action.

If Angola decides to join the EU-SADC EPA Group negotiations, the parties will negotiate articles on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Standards (SPS) as well as standards on Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT). This will ultimately contribute to harmonisation.

Angola attends the Economic Partnership Agreement negotiations between the EU and the SADC EPA Group but has not yet made any market access offer. The negotiations have always been open to Angola.

To avoid similar problems, the Commission is engaged in the application of the World Trade Organisation SPS Agreement in order to ensure that any procedures to check and ensure the fulfilment of sanitary or phytosanitary measures do not create unnecessary obstacles to international trade and are limited to what is reasonable and necessary.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003544/13

à Comissão

Nuno Teixeira (PPE)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Descoberta de gás natural liquefeito em Moçambique e mercado europeu

A União Europeia é o maior parceiro comercial de Moçambique, sendo o seu maior exportador (53 %) e o segundo maior importador depois da África do Sul (21 %), tendo aquele Estado também como principais parceiros a China, a Índia e os Estados Unidos da América.

As relações entre a UE e Moçambique foram reforçadas pela assinatura do Acordo de Parceria Económica, em junho de 2009, juntamente com o Botsuana, o Lesoto e a Suazilândia, nos termos do qual foi acordado um acesso ao mercado europeu livre de direitos aduaneiros em troca da liberalização do comércio de Moçambique com a UE na ordem dos 80 %. No que diz respeito ao mercado dos serviços, as negociações estão ainda em curso.

A recente descoberta de gás natural liquefeito em Moçambique pode transformar o país num dos principais atores na área do mercado do gás, a par de outras potências energéticas na África Oriental, no que respeita a reservas de gás e óleo. As reservas de gás em Moçambique e na Tanzânia têm, provavelmente, a mesma dimensão das reservas da Austrália, país que é líder no fornecimento de gás liquefeito no mercado asiático. As reservas de gás recentemente descobertas serviriam para cobrir uma grande parte da procura energética para a próxima década.

1. Tem a Comissão algum plano de parceria estratégica no sentido de estreitar as relações políticas e institucionais com Moçambique?
2. Como vê a Comissão a possibilidade de aprofundar a parceria ao nível das relações económicas da UE com Moçambique e, nomeadamente, o mercado do gás natural liquefeito?
3. Como vê a Comissão a possibilidade de desenvolver a parceria económica da UE com a Tanzânia e outras potências energéticas da África Oriental de forma a negociar um fornecimento ao mercado europeu do gás natural liquefeito aí existente?

Resposta dada por Andris Piebalgs em nome da Comissão

(23 de maio de 2013)

1. A parceria UE-Moçambique é determinada pelo Acordo de Cotonou e os três pilares respetivos de diálogo político, cooperação para o desenvolvimento e trocas comerciais. Através do Fundo Europeu de Desenvolvimento, a UE apoia, designadamente, o reforço institucional, o melhoramento da prestação de serviços e a supressão de lacunas infraestruturais. As conversações com o governo moçambicano incidem igualmente no melhoramento do ambiente empresarial, no sentido de permitir o desenvolvimento não só das pequenas, mas também das grandes empresas. São esforços no âmbito da luta contra a corrupção e de garantia do estado de direito, fundamentais para um ambiente estável propício ao investimento.
2. Moçambique assinou o Acordo Provisório de Parceria Económica, mas ainda não o ratificou. Em vez disso, os Estados do APE SADC ⁽¹⁾, que inclui Moçambique, estão a negociar um APE regional exaustivo com a UE. As negociações estão em curso e intensificam-se. Dado o seu estatuto de país menos avançado, as exportações de Moçambique, incluindo as de gás, estarão isentas de direitos aduaneiros e de quotas no acesso ao mercado da UE.
3. Os intervenientes emergentes no campo dos hidrocarbonetos, incluindo os países da África Oriental, vão contribuir para a reformulação do mapa mundial das fontes de gás natural e das rotas de abastecimento, no sentido de uma maior diversificação. A UE está altamente interessada neste processo de diversificação, tendo em vista garantir melhor o abastecimento de gás no seu território. Neste contexto, a Comissão pretende intensificar o diálogo político e a cooperação com potenciais parceiros energéticos, como a Tanzânia e Moçambique.

⁽¹⁾ Comunidade de Desenvolvimento da África Austral.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003544/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Discovery of liquefied natural gas in Mozambique and the European market

As its largest exporter (53%) and its second-largest importer, after South Africa, the EU is Mozambique's largest trading partner; its other important trading partners include China, India and the US.

EU-Mozambique relations were strengthened by the conclusion of the economic partnership agreement in June 2009, along with Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland. Under the agreement, Mozambique was granted duty-free access to the European market in exchange for liberalising 80% of its trade with the EU. Negotiations regarding the services market are still under way.

The recent discovery of liquefied natural gas in Mozambique could transform the country into a major regional player in the gas market, alongside the other east African countries whose gas and oil reserves make them energy powers. The gas reserves in Mozambique and Tanzania are probably the same size as those of Australia, which is the leading supplier of liquefied natural gas to the Asian market. The recently discovered gas reserves would cover a significant proportion of energy demand over the coming decade.

1. Does the Commission have a strategic partnership plan for closer political and institutional relations with Mozambique?
2. What is the Commission's view of the possibility of deepening the EU's economic partnership with Mozambique, specifically as regards the liquefied natural gas market?
3. Is the Commission in favour of developing the EU's economic partnership with Tanzania and other east African energy powers, so as to negotiate supplying the European market with those countries' liquefied natural gas?

**Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(23 May 2013)**

1. The EU-Mozambique partnership is driven by the Cotonou Agreement and its three pillars of political dialogue, development cooperation and trade exchange. Through the European Development Fund the EU is notably supporting institutional strengthening, improved service delivery and closing infrastructure gaps. Issues around improving the business environment are also taken up in dialogue with the Mozambican Government, as a way to provide a level playing field for both small and large companies to thrive; similar efforts relate to the fight against corruption and ensuring the rule of law, all fundamental elements for a stable environment for investors.
2. Mozambique has signed the interim Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA) but has not yet ratified it. Instead, the SADC⁽¹⁾ EPA Group members, which include Mozambique, are negotiating with the EU a comprehensive regional EPA. These negotiations are ongoing and intensifying. As a Least Developed Country, Mozambique's exports, including gas, will have duty-free, quota-free access to the EU market.
3. Emerging hydrocarbons players, including East Africa countries, will contribute to reshaping the global map of natural gas sources and supply routes in the sense of a greater diversification. The EU has a strong interest in this process of diversification, with a view to achieving greater security of gas supply to the EU. In this context, the Commission is committed to intensify policy dialogue and cooperation with potential energy partners such as Tanzania and Mozambique.

⁽¹⁾ Southern African Development Community.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003545/13

à Comissão

Nuno Teixeira (PPE)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Indicadores na política de coesão após 2020

A Comissão está a estudar a possibilidade de obter indicadores de pobreza regional e de exclusão social provenientes do inquérito sobre o rendimento e as condições de vida e indica que, consoante os resultados desse inquérito, irá examinar se os indicadores referidos podem ser eventualmente considerados na política de coesão após 2020, de acordo com a resposta da Comissão à pergunta E-000654/2013, por mim enviada.

Segundo a Comissão Europeia, fatores como a distância, o isolamento, os transportes e a mobilidade são particularmente relevantes para a conceção da política de coesão, mas não existem dados harmonizados disponíveis a nível europeu, pelo que estes dados não podem ser utilizados na consideração da atribuição dos fundos estruturais ao abrigo daquela política.

O artigo 174.º do TFUE refere que uma especial atenção deve ser consagrada às regiões com limitações particulares, tais como as regiões insulares, e que medidas específicas podem ser executadas nas Regiões Ultraperiféricas da União Europeia, ao abrigo do artigo 349.º do TFUE.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Como podem os indicadores de pobreza regional e de exclusão social vir a ser incluídos na política de coesão após o ano de 2020, isto é, como seria o recurso aos mesmos articulado com o tradicional critério do PIB e qual a ponderação de cada um dos critérios no contexto da atribuição dos fundos estruturais da política de coesão?
2. Todos os outros indicadores — que não os indicadores de pobreza regional e de exclusão social — estão excluídos da possibilidade de virem a ser considerados, eventualmente, na política de coesão após 2020?
3. Quais os fatores que considera incluídos nos indicadores de pobreza regional e de exclusão social?
4. Como devem os fatores como a distância, o isolamento, os transportes e a mobilidade ser devidamente tidos em conta na realização da política de coesão, sem que haja uma harmonização dos dados existentes a seu respeito?
5. Antevê a possibilidade de que tais dados sobre a distância, o isolamento, os transportes e a mobilidade possam vir a estar harmonizados e disponíveis a nível europeu até 2020? Ou, pelo menos, alguns deles, de forma a dar pleno efeito às disposições do Tratado sobre as regiões insulares e as RUP?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão

(14 de maio de 2013)

1. Os indicadores de pobreza regional e de exclusão social poderiam ser utilizados para verificar em que medida o PIB *per capita* subestima a pobreza e a exclusão de uma região.
2. Ainda não se iniciou o debate sobre o período após 2020. Por conseguinte, é prematuro afirmar que outros indicadores irão ser tidos em consideração.
3. Para mais informações sobre indicadores de pobreza e exclusão social, consultar o seguinte endereço:
[http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Glossary:At_risk_of_poverty_or_social_exclusion_\(AROE\)](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Glossary:At_risk_of_poverty_or_social_exclusion_(AROE))
4. Na medida em que a distância, o isolamento e os transportes/a mobilidade influenciam a atividade económica, a pobreza ou a exclusão social, a política de coesão após 2020 poderia tomar em consideração estas questões.
5. A Comissão não tem planos para recolher estatísticas oficiais relativas a distância ou isolamento. O Eurostat publica vários indicadores sobre transportes e mobilidade a nível nacional e regional. Para mais informações, consultar o seguinte endereço:
<http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/transport/introduction>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003545/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Indicators in cohesion policy post-2020

In answer to my Question E-000654/2013 the Commission said that it is investigating the possibility of obtaining regional poverty and social exclusion indicators from the survey on income and living conditions. Depending on the outcome of this investigation, the Commission will examine whether these indicators could possibly be considered in the allocation of cohesion policy post-2020.

The Commission considers that factors such as distance, isolation and transport/mobility are particularly relevant when designing programme strategies. However, since there is no harmonised data available at European level, these factors cannot be taken into account in the allocation of funds.

Article 174 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) states that particular attention shall be paid to regions suffering from certain handicaps, such as island regions, and Article 349 provides that specific measures shall be implemented in the EU's outermost regions.

1. How could regional poverty and social exclusion indicators be included in cohesion policy post-2020? How would they be linked to the traditional GDP criterion and to what extent would each criterion be considered in the allocation of structural funds under cohesion policy?
2. Are regional poverty and social exclusion indicators the only indicators being considered for possible inclusion in cohesion policy post-2020?
3. What factors do regional poverty and social exclusion indicators encompass?
4. How should factors such as distance, isolation and transport/mobility be duly taken into account in the allocation of cohesion policy, without a harmonisation of existing data in this regard?
5. Does the Commission anticipate that such data on distance, isolation and transport/mobility may be harmonised and available at European level by 2020? Will at least some of these data be harmonised and available, to give full effect to the TFEU provisions on island regions and on the outermost regions?

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

1. Regional poverty and social exclusion indicators could be used to verify to what extent GDP per capita underestimates poverty and exclusion in a region.
2. The discussion on the period after 2020 has yet to start. Therefore, it is too early to say which other indicators will be considered.
3. More information on poverty and social exclusion indicators can be found here:
[http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Glossary:At_risk_of_poverty_or_social_exclusion_\(AROE\)](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Glossary:At_risk_of_poverty_or_social_exclusion_(AROE))
4. To the extent that distance, isolation and transport/mobility influence economic activity, poverty or social exclusion, cohesion policy post-2020 could take these issues into account.
5. The Commission has no plans to gather official statistics for distance or isolation. Eurostat publishes a number of indicators on transport and mobility at the national and regional level. More information can be found here:
<http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/transport/introduction>

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003546/13

à Comissão

Edite Estrela (S&D)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Igualdade de género na seleção de pessoal para a Administração Pública Europeia

O Serviço Europeu de Seleção de Pessoal (EPSO) lançou em 2012 o concurso EPSO AD 230/231/12 para seleção de pessoal (AD5/AD7) para as áreas de Administração Pública Europeia, Comunicação, Auditoria, Direito e Relações Externas. Como resultado desse processo de seleção foi elaborada uma lista de laureados. Tendo em conta que a promoção da igualdade de género constitui uma das missões e um objetivo transversal da União Europeia, solicito à Comissão Europeia a disponibilização de informação que permita analisar como a problemática de género foi considerada neste contexto, designadamente elementos relativos ao número de candidatos por cada uma das áreas, bem como o número de laureados, com estratificação de género.

Gostaria também que a Comissão explicitasse como esta problemática foi tratada em todo o processo de seleção, desde o seu início, que medidas concretas foram tomadas para assegurar uma representação coerente com a percentagem de candidaturas de homens e mulheres e informasse da sua análise dos resultados relativamente a esta variável.

Resposta dada por Maroš Šefčovič em nome da Comissão

(23 de maio de 2013)

A Comissão confirma que o EPSO aplicou uma série de medidas destinadas a assegurar a igualdade de género nos concursos gerais. Os júris destes concursos (a igualdade de género é um elemento obrigatório da sua composição) são informados das ações e atitudes que poderiam comprometer a sua imparcialidade, incluindo as questões da igualdade de género, no contexto da formação obrigatória que recebem. No que se refere aos testes, foram tomadas medidas destinadas a garantir que os materiais utilizados nos processos de seleção não contêm qualquer elemento discriminatório em termos de género, idade, nacionalidade ou etnia. O EPSO procede também a uma análise psicométrica contínua das perguntas usadas nos testes feitos em computador para controlar eventuais desvios do princípio da igualdade de género. As perguntas que possam ser consideradas tendenciosas são bloqueadas na base de dados e deixam de ser usadas nos concursos gerais. Apesar destas medidas, no último ciclo de seleção de administradores (EPSO/AD 230-231/12) as candidatas obtiveram piores resultados do que os candidatos (cf. quadro em anexo).

Os estudos encomendados pelo EPSO mostram que esta situação não está ligada à natureza ou ao conteúdo dos testes, podendo ser atribuída ao método de pontuação e à dimensão da população de candidatos. Na verdade, os resultados dos testes variam de concurso para concurso e em alguns perfis e testes as mulheres obtêm melhores resultados do que os homens. Em determinados casos, só uma pequena percentagem dos candidatos com melhor pontuação nos testes de pré-seleção passa à fase seguinte do concurso, o que pode exacerbar as eventuais diferenças na distribuição dos pontos em alguns testes. O Conselho de Administração do EPSO decidiu, por conseguinte, com base em dados empíricos, alterar a pontuação de um teste a realizar em computador, a fim de reduzir o eventual impacto negativo do método de pontuação.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003546/13
to the Commission
Edite Estrela (S&D)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Gender equality in the European Public Administration selection procedure

In 2012 the European Personnel Selection Office (EPSO) launched an open competition (EPSO AD 230/231/12) for Administrators (AD5-AD7) in the fields of European Public Administration, Law, Audit, Communication and External Relations. A list of successful candidates was drawn up as a result of this selection procedure. Given that promoting gender equality is one of the EU's missions and cross-cutting objectives: can the Commission provide information for an analysis of how gender was taken into account during this procedure, namely the number of candidates for each field and how many of these were successful, stratified by gender?

Can it also explain how this issue was handled throughout the selection procedure, from the outset, what specific measures were taken to ensure a coherent representation of the percentage of applications from men and women, and present its analysis of the results on this variable?

**Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(23 May 2013)**

The Commission confirms that EPSO has implemented a number of measures in order to address gender balance across open competitions. Selection Boards (besides gender equality as a compulsory element of their composition) are made aware of actions and attitudes which could result in bias in general, including gender specific issues, in the context of their compulsory training. As regards the tests, a number of measures are taken in order to ensure that test material used in selection procedures is free of any bias towards gender, age, nationality or ethnicity. EPSO also carries out a continuous psychometric review of the performance of the questions used in computer-based testing to monitor any potential gender bias. Questions which show a gender-biased behaviour are blocked in the database and no longer used in open competitions. Despite these measures, in the latest cycle for Administrators (EPSO/AD 230-231/12) female candidates performed less well than male candidates (cf. table in annex).

Studies commissioned by EPSO show that this situation is not linked to the nature or content of the tests, but can rather be attributed to the scoring methodology and the size of the candidate population. In fact performance in the tests varies from competition to competition, and for some profiles and tests women outperform men. In some cases only a small percentage of the top-scoring candidates in pre-selection tests go forward to the next stage of the competition, which can exacerbate any difference in the distribution of scores in some tests. The EPSO Management Board therefore decided, on the basis of empirical data, to change the scoring of one computer-based test in order to reduce any adverse impact of the scoring methodology.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003547/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(27 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Aflatossine: quali rischi e quali controlli sui derivati del mais contenuti nei prodotti ad uso medico — farmacologico in particolare di provenienza extra UE?

Le micotossine sono metaboliti secondari, tossici per gli animali superiori, prodotti da muffe che colonizzano gli alimenti. In condizioni favorevoli allo sviluppo di funghi tossigeni, le micotossine possono essere formate in una qualunque delle fasi di produzione e di trasformazione di un prodotto alimentare. In particolare, le micotossine possono essere prodotte nelle piante infette in pieno campo, nel corso delle operazioni di raccolta, nelle derrate immagazzinate (stoccaggio, trasporto), nel corso delle trasformazioni tecnologiche e delle preparazioni alimentari. Le aflatossine possono essere presenti in prodotti alimentari, come mais, arachidi, frutta a guscio, granoturco, riso, fichi e altra frutta secca, spezie, oli vegetali grezzi e semi di cacao; gli effetti e le conseguenze delle contaminazioni da micotossine sono evidenti principalmente negli allevamenti zootecnici, ma esse hanno un impatto allarmante anche sulla salute umana, in particolare se si pensa alla contaminazione di tutti quei prodotti derivati dal mais utilizzati per scopo non alimentare, ossia medicinali a base di mais, nonché dei parafarmaci e degli integratori alimentari. In particolare, l'aflatossina B1 è la più diffusa in tali prodotti ed è una delle più potenti dal punto di vista genotossico e cancerogeno. Diversi studi hanno inoltre evidenziato come le micotossine aumentano con periodi lunghi di stoccaggio e di trasporto soprattutto del mais GM da USA, Canada, Brasile e Argentina, passando mesi nelle stive di navi umide, il migliore fattore di proliferazione. In particolare poi nell'agricoltura OGM si coltiva mais a ciclo lungo che si raccoglie in autunno, ossia con le piogge che favoriscono le micotossine. In Italia, il limite massimo di aflatossina stabilito per legge in conformità alla normativa europea è di 50 parti per trilione, vale a dire una quantità infinitesimale, mentre la *Food and Drug Administration* degli USA prescrive tolleranze dieci volte superiori a quelle europee.

Considerato che:

- le c.d. aflatossine micotossine derivano dai luoghi di stoccaggio e dai trasporti nelle navi, da fattori ambientali come umidità e temperature elevate, ma anche dalle colture ripetute del mais GM;
- campionare correttamente le partite è quindi molto difficile e spesso le valutazioni commerciali di conformità vengono effettuate su campioni, contrattuali o meno, che possono difettare di reale rappresentatività;
- esiste una legislazione europea puntuale in materia di campionamenti ufficiali (da ultimo il regolamento (UE) n. 574/2011) cui tuttavia si affiancano norme volontarie e contrattuali soprattutto rispetto ai controlli con i paesi extra UE,

può la Commissione far sapere quali controlli vengono effettuati per verificare l'assenza di aflatossine in tutti i prodotti di importazione, in particolare sui derivati del mais per uso medico o farmacologico quali medicinali, parafarmaci e integratori alimentari?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(29 maggio 2013)

L'UE dispone di una copiosa legislazione relativa alla presenza di aflatossine nei mangimi e negli alimenti. La direttiva 2002/32/CE⁽¹⁾ e il regolamento (CE) n. 1881/2006⁽²⁾ fissano i tenori massimi per le aflatossine presenti nel mais e nei prodotti derivati dal mais destinati rispettivamente all'alimentazione animale e all'alimentazione umana.

Per controllare alle frontiere gli alimenti importati da paesi terzi è adottata una politica impostata sul rischio. Ciò avviene conformemente alle disposizioni del regolamento (CE) n. 882/2004⁽³⁾.

Inoltre, i regolamenti (CE) n. 669/2009⁽⁴⁾, (CE) n. 1152/2009⁽⁵⁾ e (UE) n. 91/2013⁽⁶⁾ impongono una maggiore frequenza dei controlli della presenza di aflatossine in determinati prodotti provenienti da alcuni paesi terzi.

⁽¹⁾ GUL 140 del 30.5.2002, pag. 10.

⁽²⁾ GUL 364 del 20.12.2006, pag. 5.

⁽³⁾ GUL 191 del 28.5.2004, pag. 1.

⁽⁴⁾ GUL 194 del 25.7.2009, pag. 11.

⁽⁵⁾ GUL 313 del 28.11.2009, pag. 40.

⁽⁶⁾ GUL 33 del 3.2.2013, pag. 2.

Per quanto riguarda i medicinali, nell'Unione sono in atto diversi meccanismi di controllo volti a garantirne la sicurezza e la qualità.

La legislazione dell'UE ⁽⁷⁾ impone al titolare di un'autorizzazione di fabbricazione o di importazione di medicinali di conformarsi ai principi e alle linee guida sulle buone prassi di fabbricazione (GMP) dei medicinali ⁽⁸⁾ e a utilizzare come materie prime solo sostanze attive fabbricate secondo le GMP, parte II ⁽⁹⁾.

Inoltre, dal 2 luglio 2013, tutte le sostanze attive che entrano nell'UE dovranno essere accompagnate da una conferma scritta dell'autorità competente del paese terzo esportatore, attestante che gli standard di buone prassi di fabbricazione e di controllo dell'impianto sono equivalenti a quelli dell'Unione ⁽¹⁰⁾.

Infine, nel presentare la domanda di autorizzazione all'immissione in commercio, le imprese devono tra l'altro documentare che il medicinale finito è di qualità adeguata e che i criteri di qualità fissati dalla legislazione e nelle linee guida dell'UE sono soddisfatti.

⁽⁷⁾ Titolo IV della direttiva 2001/83/CE; articolo 13 della direttiva 2001/20/CE, titolo IV della direttiva 2001/82/CE.

⁽⁸⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/eudralex/vol-4/>

⁽⁹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/health/files/eudralex/vol-4/pdfs-en/2005_10_03_gmp-partii-activesubstance_en.pdf

⁽¹⁰⁾ Articolo 46ter della direttiva 2011/62/UE.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003547/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Aflatoxins: what are the risks connected with, and controls on, maize derivatives — particularly those originating outside the EU — contained in products used for medical or pharmacological purposes?

Mycotoxins are secondary metabolites, toxic to higher animals, produced by mould growing on foodstuffs. If conditions favour the development of toxic fungi, mycotoxins can form at any stage in the production and processing of a food product. In particular, mycotoxins can be produced in crops contaminated in the field or in the course of harvesting, in foodstuffs being stored or transported, and in the course of technical processing and food preparation. Aflatoxins can be present in food products such as maize, peanuts and other nuts, rice, figs and other dried fruit, spices, raw vegetable oils and cocoa beans. The effects and repercussions of mycotoxin contamination are most evident in the livestock production sector, but it also has an alarming impact on human health, particularly in relation to the contamination of products derived from maize which are used for purposes other than food, including maize-based medicinal products, parapharmaceutical products and food supplements. Aflatoxin B1, the aflatoxin most widely found in such products, is one of the most genotoxic and carcinogenic of these mycotoxins. Various studies have also shown how subjecting commodities to long periods of storage and transport increases the incidence of mycotoxins, particularly in the case of GM maize from the US, Canada, Brazil and Argentina, which can spend months in the humid atmosphere of ships' holds, the main factor favouring aflatoxin production. In the GM agricultural sector, in particular, long-cycle maize is grown; it is harvested in autumn, when rain is likely to favour the formation of mycotoxins. In Italy, the maximum limit for aflatoxins laid down by law in line with EU legislation is 50 parts per trillion, in other words an infinitesimally small quantity, whereas the maximum levels laid down by the US Food and Drug Administration are ten times higher than the European maximum level.

Aflatoxin mycotoxins can occur as a result of storage and transport by ship, environmental factors such as humidity and warm conditions, or indeed the repeated cultivation of GM crops. Correct sampling of consignments is therefore very difficult, and commercial assessments of conformity are often made on the basis of — contractual or other — samples which may not be truly representative. European legislation covering official sampling exists (most recently, Regulation (EU) No 574/2011), but is accompanied by voluntary and contractual rules, particularly in the case of controls involving non-EU countries.

Could the Commission state what controls are carried out to ensure the absence of aflatoxins in all imported products, in particular in the case of maize derivatives used for medical or pharmacological purposes, such as medicinal and parapharmaceutical products and food supplements?

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

The EU has very extensive legislation on the presence of aflatoxins in feed and food. Maximum levels are established for aflatoxins in maize and derived products intended for feed by Directive 2002/32/EC ⁽¹⁾ and intended for food by Regulation (EC) No 1881/2006 ⁽²⁾.

A risk based policy is adopted to check at the border food imported from third countries. This approach is fully in line with the provisions of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 ⁽³⁾.

In addition, increased frequency of controls on the presence of aflatoxins on certain products from certain third countries is imposed by Regulation (EC) No 669/2009 ⁽⁴⁾, Regulation (EC) No 1152/2009 ⁽⁵⁾ and Regulation (EU) No 91/2013 ⁽⁶⁾.

As regards medicinal products, several control mechanisms are in place in the Union to guarantee safety and quality.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L140, 30.5.2002, p. 10.

⁽²⁾ OJ L 364, 20.12.2006, p. 5.

⁽³⁾ OJ L 191, 28.5.2004, p. 1.

⁽⁴⁾ OJ L 194, 25.7.2009, p. 11.

⁽⁵⁾ OJ L 313, 28.11.2009, p. 40.

⁽⁶⁾ OJ L L33, 3.2.2013, p. 2.

EU legislation ⁽⁷⁾ obliges the holder of a manufacturing or import authorisation for medicinal products to comply with the principles and guidelines of good manufacturing practice (GMP) for medicinal products ⁽⁸⁾ and to use as starting materials only active substances which have been manufactured in accordance with GMP Part II ⁽⁹⁾.

In addition, as of 2 July 2013, all active substances entering the EU will have to be accompanied by a written confirmation from the competent authority of the exporting third country confirming that the standards of good manufacturing practice and control of the plant are equivalent to those in the Union ⁽¹⁰⁾.

Last but not least, when applying for a marketing authorisation, companies, *inter alia*, must document that the finished medicinal product will be of appropriate quality and that the criteria set for quality in EU legislation and guidelines are fulfilled.

⁽⁷⁾ Title IV of Directive 2001/83/EC; Article 13 of Directive 2001/20/EC, Title IV of Directive 2001/82/EC.

⁽⁸⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/eudralex/vol-4/>

⁽⁹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/health/files/eudralex/vol-4/pdfs-en/2005_10_03_gmp-partii-activesubstance_en.pdf

⁽¹⁰⁾ Article 46(b) of Directive 2011/62/EU.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003549/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(27 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Nuove sostanze stupefacenti: quali sono gli effetti sul corpo umano e come eradicare il traffico illegale?

Attualmente il problema delle sostanze stupefacenti risulta essere uno tra i più allarmanti della nostra società. La velocità con cui vengono immesse di continuo nuove sostanze sul mercato è impressionante. Secondo alcune statistiche riguardanti l'anno 2012, alcune tra queste, conosciute come «sballo legale», sono facilmente reperibili in rete e sono diffuse in maniera capillare, tanto che contribuiscono a un notevole aumento dei rischi per la salute pubblica. Questo è in parte dovuto al fatto che quando si comincia a fare uso di droghe il corpo non è più in grado di eliminarle completamente. I metaboliti, che ne costituiscono i residui organici, anche se eliminati dai tessuti organici del corpo, possono fermarsi in tessuti grassi e rimanervi per anni. In seguito possono penetrare nel sangue e provocare un desiderio irrefrenabile di ripiombare nel «tunnel della droga», anche per chi aveva deciso di uscirne.

Considerato che:

- i servizi per la tossicodipendenza sono servizi pubblici dei sistemi sanitari nazionali dediti alla cura, prevenzione e riabilitazione di persone con problemi dovuti all'assunzione di sostanze stupefacenti;
- non è possibile affrontare il problema della dipendenza con un percorso univoco ma è auspicabile un intervento multidisciplinare che verta sull'aspetto psicologico così come su quello farmacologico, educativo e sociale;
- nonostante i divieti degli Stati membri, le innumerevoli organizzazioni criminali riescono a evadere i controlli scegliendo altri paesi per la produzione;

sono a chiedere alla Commissione:

- se ritiene importante appoggiare sistemi e servizi di informazione e prevenzione che agiscano direttamente nei luoghi frequentati dai giovani e collaborino con il personale operante all'interno di centri specializzati;
- se reputa significativo promuovere attività informative su quelli che sono gli effetti sul sistema cerebrale, in correlazione all'età di assunzione, delle nuove sostanze stupefacenti;
- quali misure restrittive intende adottare per aumentare e rendere più efficaci i controlli sullo stoccaggio e la distribuzione della droga sul territorio europeo.

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(7 giugno 2013)

La riduzione della domanda di droga è principalmente di competenza degli Stati membri, che sviluppano e attuano politiche in materia di prevenzione, trattamento e riduzione dei danni, per informare i cittadini e ridurre l'uso di sostanze stupefacenti.

La Commissione europea integra l'azione degli Stati membri, promuovendo lo sviluppo di approcci innovativi e la condivisione delle migliori pratiche, nonché finanziando la ricerca nel campo delle droghe attraverso programmi finanziari dell'UE. Il Programma di prevenzione e informazione in materia di droga ⁽¹⁾ ha finanziato numerosi progetti destinati a esplorare gli effetti e i rischi delle nuove sostanze stupefacenti e ad aumentare la consapevolezza di tali rischi, in particolare tra i giovani, le famiglie e i professionisti che operano nel settore della prevenzione e della salute.

(1) Per i dettagli del programma, cfr. http://ec.europa.eu/justice/anti-drugs/programme/drug-prevention-information/index_en.htm

Nella comunicazione «Verso un'azione europea più incisiva nella lotta alla droga» ⁽²⁾, adottata nell'ottobre 2011, la Commissione ha individuato la diffusione delle nuove sostanze psicoattive come una delle sfide più impegnative nella politica in materia di droga, a cui l'UE deve rispondere in modo più deciso. Ha inoltre sottolineato come, per affrontare il problema della droga nell'Unione europea, sia importante ridurre la domanda. La Commissione prevede di presentare proposte legislative riguardanti le nuove sostanze stupefacenti, e appoggia lo sviluppo di standard minimi di qualità nel contenimento della domanda di stupefacenti, per migliorare nell'UE l'efficacia dei servizi e degli interventi di prevenzione, trattamento e riduzione dei danni cagionati da tali sostanze.

È inoltre prioritario sostenere l'azione degli Stati membri nella lotta contro il traffico illecito di stupefacenti, anche finanziando progetti di cooperazione transfrontaliera nell'ambito di programmi finanziari dell'UE.

(2) COM(2011)689 definitivo.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003549/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: New drugs: what are their effects on the human body, and how can we eradicate illegal trafficking?

The drugs problem is one of the most alarming issues facing our society today. New substances continue to come on to the market at a startling pace. According to statistics for 2012, some of these substances — known as ‘legal highs’ — are easily available via the Internet and are now widespread, to the extent that they represent a significant increase in the risks for public health. This is partly because once someone starts using drugs, the body can no longer completely eliminate them. Even if they are eliminated from the organs, the metabolites — which are the organic residues of the drugs — may lodge in fatty tissue and stay there for years. Subsequently, these substances may enter the bloodstream and trigger an irresistible urge to start using the drugs again, even in people who have decided to kick the habit.

Drug addiction services are public services offered by national health systems for the treatment, prevention and rehabilitation of people with drug-related problems.

It is not possible to tackle the problem of addiction with a single-strand approach. There needs to be a multidisciplinary approach that takes account of the psychological aspect, as well as the pharmacological, educational and social aspects.

Despite the bans imposed by the Member States, countless criminal organisations manage to evade the controls by using other countries to produce the drugs.

Can the Commission answer the following questions:

Does it believe it is important to support information and prevention systems and services that act directly on the ground in places frequented by young people and that collaborate with the staff working in specialised centres?

Does it believe it is important to promote information activities about the effects of these new drugs on the brain, according to the age at which the user starts taking them?

What restrictive measures does it intend to take to increase and improve the effectiveness of controls on the storage and distribution of drugs in Europe?

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

Drug demand reduction is primarily a competence of the Member States, which develop and implement policies on drug prevention, treatment and harm reduction, to inform citizens and reduce the use of psychoactive substances.

The European Commission complements Member States’ action, by promoting the development of innovative approaches, the sharing of best practices and by funding drug research through EU financial programmes. The Drug Prevention and Information Programme ⁽¹⁾ has funded several projects exploring the effects and risks of new psychoactive substances and raising awareness of such risks, particularly among young people, families and professionals working in prevention and health.

In its communication ‘Towards a stronger European response to drugs’ ⁽²⁾, adopted in October 2011, the Commission identified the spread of new psychoactive substances as one of the most challenging developments in drugs policy requiring a firmer EU response. It also stressed the importance of demand reduction in addressing the drugs problem in the EU. The Commission is planning to present legislative proposals on new psychoactive substances. The Commission supports the development of minimum quality standards in drug demand reduction, to improve the effectiveness of drug prevention, treatment and harm reduction interventions and services in the EU.

Supporting Member States’ action in addressing illicit drug trafficking, including through the funding of cross-border cooperation projects under EU financial programmes, is also a priority.

⁽¹⁾ For details of the Programme, see http://ec.europa.eu/justice/anti-drugs/programme/drug-prevention-information/index_en.htm

⁽²⁾ COM(2011) 689 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003550/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(27 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Reti da pesca abbandonate: quali misure urgenti per ridimensionare il problema?

Il problema delle reti da pesca abbandonate in mare costituisce una grave minaccia per l'ecosistema marino e per gli organismi viventi che lo popolano. Secondo un rapporto realizzato dall'Unep (Programma delle Nazioni Unite per l'Ambiente) e dalla Fao (Organizzazione delle Nazioni Unite per l'Alimentazione e l'Agricoltura), le reti dismesse negli oceani ammontano a 640.000 tonnellate e causano danni ingenti, quantificabili nel decesso di 100.000 cetacei e 100.000 squali. Si tenga inoltre presente che, a causa del crescente inquinamento, il 40 % del plancton e metà delle barriere coralline sono scomparsi. Attualmente, numerosi progetti mirano a ridurre il numero delle reti fantasma, riciclandole e ricavandone altri prodotti quali calze, costumi da bagno e tappeti. Tra questi merita particolare menzione un'iniziativa a livello internazionale, «The Healthy Seas, a Journey from Waste to Wear», che interessa l'area mediterranea, adriatica e del Mare del Nord ed è mirata a sensibilizzare e mobilitare autorità competenti e cittadini europei, al fine di ottenere risultati tangibili e duraturi.

Considerato che le reti fantasma rimangono alla deriva per anni, devastando i fondali e causando gravi danni ecologici nonché rischi notevoli per la navigazione, sono a chiedere alla Commissione se:

- intenda sostenere l'approvazione di leggi e misure di prevenzione per il recupero della qualità dell'ambiente marino, avvalendosi del sostegno e delle competenze tecnico-scientifiche delle associazioni ambientaliste;
- ritenga opportuno valutare un eventuale utilizzo di sostanze biodegradabili per produrre le reti, in modo da renderle facilmente disintegrabili in acqua, dunque inoffensive;
- reputi necessario avvalersi di nuove tecnologie per monitorare i fondali e ridurre la presenza di reti fantasma;
- consideri concretizzabile la possibilità di dare incentivi economici ai pescatori per incoraggiarli a denunciare la perdita di attrezzature specifiche e a riportare a terra le reti danneggiate e non più utilizzabili;
- reputi opportuno istituire un registro per contrassegnare ogni rete in dotazione ai pescherecci al fine di tracciare eventuali perdite e ridurre la portata del fenomeno.

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(29 maggio 2013)

Le reti da pesca abbandonate sono considerate rifiuti marini e in quanto tali a esse si applica la direttiva quadro sulla strategia per l'ambiente marino (2008/56/CE). Inoltre l'allegato V della convenzione MARPOL proibisce alle navi di scaricare e abbandonare in mare i rifiuti, compresi gli attrezzi da pesca.

Nell'ambito dell'attuazione della direttiva quadro sulla strategia per l'ambiente marino, il sottogruppo tecnico per i rifiuti marini raccomanda agli Stati membri di sviluppare metodi armonizzati di monitoraggio dei rifiuti in questione, inclusi i rifiuti trovati sui fondali. La Commissione ha recentemente avviato un progetto pilota, lanciato dal Parlamento europeo, inteso a valutare le migliori pratiche per i programmi di rimozione di questo tipo di rifiuti marini, inclusi gli attrezzi perduti. Il progetto procederà alla consultazione di diverse parti interessate, tra cui i pescatori, e costituirà inoltre la base per valutare la fattibilità del finanziamento. È troppo presto per stabilire quali metodi siano più promettenti, dato che il progetto dovrebbe terminare nel 2014.

Quanto all'eventuale uso di materiali biodegradabili, la loro decomposizione dipende da diversi fattori e tra l'altro da condizioni specifiche che spesso non si trovano nell'ambiente marino. Le questioni concernenti i materiali biodegradabili sono valutate nel Libro verde della Commissione sui rifiuti di plastica ⁽¹⁾.

(1) COM(2013)123 del 7.3.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003550/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(27 March 2013)

Subject: Abandoned fishing nets: what urgent measures can be taken to reduce the problem?

The problem of fishing nets abandoned at sea poses a serious threat to the marine ecosystem and to the living organisms that inhabit it. According to a report published by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO), there are 640 000 tonnes of discarded nets in the sea, which cause enormous damage and have resulted in the death of 100 000 cetaceans and 100 000 sharks. It is also noted that, as a result of increasing pollution, 40% of plankton and half of all coral reefs have disappeared. Currently, many projects aim to reduce the number of 'ghost nets' by recycling them and turning them into other products such as socks, swimsuits and carpets. One particularly notable project is an international initiative called 'The Healthy Seas, a Journey from Waste to Wear'. This covers the Mediterranean, the Adriatic and the North Sea, and aims to raise awareness among the relevant European authorities and the general public, and to prompt action that will produce tangible and lasting results.

Ghost nets carry on drifting for years, ruining the sea bed and causing serious ecological damage, as well as posing considerable hazards to navigation.

Can the Commission answer the following questions:

Does it intend to support the adoption of laws and preventive measures to restore the quality of the marine environment, drawing on the support and the technical and scientific skills of environmental associations?

Does it believe it would be useful to assess the possible use of biodegradable materials for producing nets, so that they would break down easily in the water and thus be made harmless?

Does it believe that new technologies should be used to monitor the sea beds and reduce the presence of ghost nets?

Does it regard it as feasible to give financial incentives to fishermen, to encourage them to report any losses of gear and to bring back to shore any damaged nets that can no longer be used?

Does it believe it would be a good idea to set up a register to identify every net in use on fishing vessels, in order to track any losses and reduce the scale of the problem?

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

Abandoned fishing nets are considered to be marine litter and as such are addressed through the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (2008/56/EC). Furthermore, MARPOL Convention, Annex V forbids waste including fishing gear from ships to be discharged or abandoned at sea.

The Technical Subgroup on marine litter under the Marine Strategy Framework Directive implementation advises Member States developing harmonised methods for monitoring of marine litter, including the litter found at the seabed. The Commission has recently started a pilot project, initiated by the European Parliament, assessing best practices for this type of marine litter removal schemes including lost fishing gear. The project will consult different stakeholders including fishermen and will also provide a basis for judging the feasibility of funding. It is too early to say which are the most promising methods as the project is expected to end in 2014.

As regards the possible use of biodegradable materials, their decomposition depends on many factors including specific conditions which are often not found in the marine environment. Questions related to biodegradable materials are addressed in the Commission's Green Paper on Plastic Waste ⁽¹⁾.

⁽¹⁾ COM(2013) 123 of 7.3.2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003551/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(27 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Vietare l'uso di pesticidi neonicotinoidi per proteggere le api: quali prospettive per il futuro a livello europeo?

Il ruolo delle api è duplice in quanto non si occupano solo della produzione di miele, propoli e di un integratore importante quale la pappa reale, ma anche dell'impollinazione dei fiori di molte piante di frutta e verdura delle quali ci nutriamo. Di conseguenza migliorano la qualità dei prodotti ortofrutticoli nella cui creazione vengono impiegate. In Europa l'84 % delle 264 colture più importanti vengono impollinate, mentre 4 000 specie di vegetali sopravvivono grazie all'impollinazione. Sotto il profilo economico, ad esempio, in Italia il mercato dei prodotti dell'apicoltura conta un fatturato di 1 600 milioni di euro l'anno, mentre nei paesi europei ammonta a circa 70 miliardi annui. Le frequenti morie di api verificatesi tra il 2005 e il 2008 in Italia, Germania e altri paesi hanno spinto i ricercatori ad analizzarne le cause scatenanti. La responsabilità va attribuita principalmente ad alcuni pesticidi, noti come neonicotinoidi, usati come fertilizzanti per i semi di mais e altre colture, che vengono dispersi nell'aria al momento della semina a causa della sottile pellicola che li lega ai semi e che si disgrega facilmente. Queste sostanze, assunte dalle api, provocano non solo danni ai loro neuroni e al loro intestino ma anche un'alterazione del comportamento; a causa di ciò, infatti, non sono più in grado di orientarsi, dunque non riuscendo più a individuare le fonti di cibo, vivono una fase di iperattività al termine della quale muoiono paralizzate. A livello europeo la direttiva 91/414/CEE prevede che i blocchi cautelativi in questo ambito differiscano da Stato a Stato e che i controlli finali su queste sostanze siano sempre a carico dei produttori senza nessuna possibilità di intervento da parte degli enti di controllo.

Considerato che:

- la recente proposta di abolire per due anni l'uso di sostanze dannose avanzata dalla Commissione non ha ricevuto piena approvazione da parte degli Stati membri;
- molti paesi europei si sono mobilitati per ottenere restrizioni sulla concia del mais,

può la Commissione far sapere:

- se intende imporre un divieto a lungo termine sull'uso di determinate sostanze che non sia esteso solo a mais e colza e che accomuni tutti gli Stati membri;
- se intende promuovere ulteriori campagne di sensibilizzazione a livello europeo che aiutino a capire l'importanza delle api per il nostro ecosistema?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(27 maggio 2013)

1. La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole deputato alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-002933/2013 ⁽¹⁾. Non sono proposti interventi per le colture in relazione alla quali l'EFSA non ha individuato nessun rischio.
2. L'azione dell'UE per le api è trasversale e interessa diversi ambiti, dal monitoraggio della salute delle api all'uso sostenibile dei pesticidi, dai progetti di ricerca al sostegno finanziario per il ripopolamento del patrimonio apicolo. Sono state inoltre condotte attività di comunicazione per attirare l'attenzione sull'importanza degli insetti pronubi. Anche grazie a questa azione il livello di sensibilizzazione tra i cittadini dell'UE sull'importanza delle api per il nostro ecosistema è estremamente alto, come è dimostrato da diverse petizioni firmate negli ultimi mesi per promuovere l'azione dell'UE sui neonicotinoidi.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/it/parliamentary-questions.html>

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003551/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(27 March 2013)

Subject: Banning the use of neonicotinoid pesticides to protect bees — what are the future prospects in the EU?

The role of bees is twofold, as not only do they produce honey, propolis and the important royal jelly supplement, but they also pollinate flowers and many of the fruit and vegetable plants we eat. Consequently, they improve the quality of the fruit and vegetables they are used to create. In Europe, 84% of the 264 most important crops are pollinated, while 4 000 species of plants survive thanks to pollination. From an economic perspective, for example, in Italy, the market for bee products has a turnover of EUR 1.6 billion per year, while in European countries overall the figure is approximately EUR 70 billion per year. The frequent bee die-offs that occurred between 2005 and 2008 in Italy, Germany and other countries have prompted researchers to study the underlying causes. The responsibility lies mainly with some pesticides, known as neonicotinoids, which are used as fertilisers for corn seeds and other crops; they are dispersed in the air during sowing because of the thin film that binds them to the seeds, which easily erodes. These substances, when taken in by bees, not only damage their neurons and intestines, but also change their behaviour — they lose their sense of direction and are therefore no longer able to identify sources of food; they then go through a phase of hyperactivity, after which they become paralysed and die.

At EU level, Directive 91/414/EEC provides that precautionary suspensions in this area may differ from country to country and that the final tests on these substances should always be the responsibility of their producers, with supervisory bodies being unable to intervene.

Given that:

- the recent Commission proposal to abolish the use of harmful substances for two years did not meet with the full approval of the Member States;
- many EU countries have mobilised to seek restrictions on the coating of corn seeds,

can the Commission say:

- whether it intends to impose a universal long-term ban on the use of certain substances — and not only for corn and oilseed rape — in all the Member States;
- whether it will promote further awareness-raising campaigns at EU level to help people to understand how important bees are to our ecosystem?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(27 May 2013)

1. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-002933/2013 ⁽¹⁾. No actions are proposed for the crops for which EFSA did not identify risks.
2. The EU action on bees is cross-cutting and concerns several areas, from bee health monitoring to the sustainable use of pesticides, from research projects to financial support on restocking of hives. In addition communication activities have been carried out to draw the attention to the importance of pollinators. Also thanks to this action, the level of awareness among EU citizens on the importance of bees for our ecosystem is very high, as demonstrated by numerous petitions signed over the last months to promote EU action on neonicotinoids.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html>

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003552/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Memória Ativa — momentos decisivos da história europeia moderna

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-000812/2013, Viviane Reding, Vice-Presidente, declarou, em nome da Comissão, que «A Comissão propôs que na próxima geração do programa (2014-2020) se alargasse a vertente “Memória ativa” para incluir “momentos decisivos da história europeia moderna”».

Assim, pergunto à Comissão que critério presidirá à escolha dos «momentos decisivos da história europeia moderna»? Pode adiantar exemplos dos mesmos?

Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão

(27 de maio de 2013)

A Comissão propôs, com efeito, que na próxima geração do programa (2014-2020) se alargasse a vertente «Memória ativa» para incluir «momentos decisivos da história europeia moderna».

Trata-se de eventos que representam um importante ponto de viragem na história moderna da Europa, com consequências profundas na sua vida política, social e económica.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003552/13
to the Commission**

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(27 March 2013)

Subject: Active remembrance — defining moments in modern European history

In answer to my Question E-000812/2013, Vice-President Reding, on behalf of the Commission, said that 'The Commission has proposed for the next generation of the programme (2014-2020) broadening the focus of the Remembrance strand to include "defining moments in modern European history".'

What criteria will the Commission use to select the 'defining moments in modern European history'? Can it provide examples of such moments?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission

(27 May 2013)

The Commission has indeed proposed for the next generation of the programme (2014-2020) broadening the focus of the Remembrance strand to include 'defining moments in modern European history'.

These are events which represent a major turning point in Europe's modern history with profound consequences on its political, social and economic life.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003553/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Marca do Património Europeu

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-000812/2013, a senhora Vice-Presidente Viviane Reding declarou, em nome da Comissão, que «a Comissão está a preparar a implementação da Marca do Património Europeu. O objetivo desta iniciativa é conferir visibilidade aos sítios que celebram e simbolizam a integração, os ideais e a história da Europa. A primeira seleção de sítios realizar-se-á em finais de 2013.»

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

- Que critérios presidirão à escolha das «marcas do património europeu»? Pode adiantar exemplos dos mesmos?
- Não considera que esta designação é equívoca, redutora e mesmo ofensiva porquanto a União Europeia não pode arrogar-se a ter o exclusivo daquilo que se designa por «património europeu» e que este não remete apenas para o período de existência das comunidades europeias?
- Não considera que os termos constantes da decisão n.º 1194/2011/UE, de 16 de novembro de 2011, nomeadamente aquele que advoga o apoio «sem reservas» da integração europeia por parte dos cidadãos, preconizam uma inadmissível acriticidade dos cidadãos face ao projeto europeu?

Resposta dada por Androulla Vassiliou em nome da Comissão

(23 de maio de 2013)

De acordo com a decisão que estabelece a Marca do Património Europeu ⁽¹⁾, os sítios irão ser designados com base nos seguintes critérios: o valor europeu simbólico e o seu papel na história e na cultura da Europa e/ou na construção da União Europeia; a qualidade do projeto proposto pelo sítio para promover a sua dimensão europeia (informação, atividades educativas, etc.) e a qualidade do plano de trabalho a executar pelo sítio (boa gestão, acesso, comunicação, etc.).

O ano de 2013 é o primeiro ano de seleção para a Marca. Foram pré-selecionados um total de nove locais de entre os cinco Estados-Membros que participaram no ano de seleção, nomeadamente a Áustria, a Dinamarca, a Estónia, o Luxemburgo e os Países Baixos.

A lista dos sítios propostos está publicada no sítio web da Comissão ⁽²⁾. Serão avaliados por um painel de peritos independentes com base nos critérios acima mencionados.

Não há especificação quanto à época de construção dos sítios que possam ser distinguidos com a Marca.

A Marca tem como objetivos realçar o valor simbólico e aumentar a visibilidade de sítios que tenham desempenhado um papel significativo na história europeia e contribuir para que os cidadãos europeus compreendam melhor o seu património cultural comum, ainda que diverso. Tal abordagem ajuda a informar os cidadãos e a incentivar o debate aberto.

⁽¹⁾ N.º 1194/2011/UE.

⁽²⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/doc/label/list-of-preselected-sites-ehl-2013.pdf>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003553/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: European Heritage Label

In answer to my Question E-000812/2013 Vice-President Reding, on behalf of the Commission, said that 'the Commission is preparing the implementation of the European Heritage Label. The aim of this scheme is to highlight heritage sites that symbolise European integration, ideals and history. The first selection of sites will take place later in 2013.'

- What criteria will the Commission use to designate 'European Heritage Labels'? Can it provide examples of eligible sites?
- Does it not believe that this designation is misleading, simplistic and even offensive since the EU cannot claim exclusive rights to all 'European heritage', which encompasses a period greater than the Union's existence?
- Does it not believe that Decision No 1194/2011/EU of 16 November 2011, by calling for citizens to lend their 'full' support to European integration, prevents them from applying the necessary critical judgment to the European project?

**Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(23 May 2013)**

According to the decision establishing the European Heritage Label ⁽¹⁾ the sites will be designated on the basis of the following criteria: the symbolic European value of the site and its role in the history and culture of Europe and/or in the creation of the European Union; the quality of the project proposed by the site to promote its European dimension (information, educational activities etc.); the quality of the work plan implemented by the site (sound management, access, communication etc.).

2013 is the first selection year for the label. A total of nine sites were pre-selected by the five Member States participating in the selection year, namely Austria, Denmark, Estonia, Luxembourg and the Netherlands.

The list of the proposed sites is published on the Commission website ⁽²⁾. They will be assessed by a panel of independent experts against the criteria mentioned above.

There is no specification as to when sites, which may be awarded the label, have been built.

The objectives of the label are to stress the symbolic value and raise the profile of sites which have played a significant role in European history and to increase European citizens' understanding of their common, yet diverse cultural heritage. Such an approach helps to inform citizens and encourage open debate.

⁽¹⁾ No 1194/2011/EU.

⁽²⁾ <http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/doc/label/list-of-preselected-sites-ehl-2013.pdf>

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003554/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Estratégia Conjunta UE-África

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-000811/2013, o senhor Comissário Andris Piebalgs declarou, em nome da Comissão, que «a tradução na prática de uma tal estratégia ambiciosa revelou-se um desafio e as modalidades de execução existentes não se revelaram tão eficazes como se tinha inicialmente previsto» e que «do lado da UE, está em curso uma reflexão a nível interno sobre o futuro da Estratégia Conjunta, que será vastamente discutida com todos os parceiros europeus e africanos, incluindo a UA, as comunidades económicas regionais, os parlamentos e a sociedade civil, na perspetiva da próxima Cimeira em 2014.»

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

- Que razões motivaram essa menor eficácia na execução?
- Por que formas pretende manter a ambição da estratégia e fazê-la coincidir com uma execução mais eficaz?
- Quando tenciona apresentar resultados da reflexão interna em curso?

Resposta dada por Andris Piebalgs em nome da Comissão
(28 de maio de 2013)

A ECAE 2007 ⁽¹⁾ baseia-se em valores comuns, interesses e a visão de África e da UE sobre a sua relação. É executada através de planos de ação sucessivos, com 8 parcerias temáticas com diálogo político e uma dimensão operacional. Foram alcançadas importantes realizações na maior parte dos domínios ⁽²⁾.

Em retrospectiva, os planos de ação da Estratégia Conjunta África-UE sofriam de uma agenda demasiado ambiciosa, assim como da falta de participação dos principais intervenientes a nível regional e nacional, da apropriação e integração de instrumentos para a cooperação existentes insuficientes e da falta de ajuda financeira específica para apoiar uma estratégia transcontinental inovadora. Para resolver estas insuficiências, é necessário refletir sobre a forma de melhorar a estrutura e organizar o trabalho, de modo a obter resultados mais tangíveis. No âmbito do QFP, a Comissão terá um novo Programa Pan-Africano para apoiar a Estratégia Conjunta África-UE de forma específica. Atualmente, uma pequena dotação de 10 milhões de EUR constitui um mecanismo de apoio e a Comissão continua a apoiar o reforço das capacidades da União Africana (UA), através do Programa de Apoio da UA.

Na reunião CE-AUC (25-26 de abril de 2013), ambas as partes analisaram a situação e decidiram dar início aos primeiros diálogos sobre a reforma da Estratégia Conjunta África-UE. A Cimeira África-UE de 2014 deverá fazer o balanço dos resultados destes diálogos, aprovar propostas de reforma e conferir o impulso necessário para o trabalho futuro. A cimeira poderá igualmente acordar as prioridades operacionais e uma arquitetura de aplicação mais eficaz, com base nos respetivos interesses estratégicos e os resultados esperados.

O diálogo com o Parlamento sobre o Programa Pan-Africano proposto encontra-se em curso no contexto do Quadro Financeiro Plurianual (QFP). Nas vésperas da Cimeira, a Comissão está disposta a discutir sugestões de reforma com o Parlamento Europeu e todos os outros interessados.

⁽¹⁾ Estratégia Conjunta África-UE.

⁽²⁾ Para informações mais pormenorizadas consultar: www.africa-eu-partnership.org

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003554/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Joint Africa-EU Strategy

In answer to my Question E-000811/2013 Commissioner Piebalgs, on behalf of the Commission, said that 'the translation of such an ambitious strategy into practice has proved challenging and the working arrangements in place have not proved as effective as originally foreseen'. He added that 'Internal reflection on the future of the Joint Strategy is ongoing on the EU side and will also be widely discussed with all European and African partners, including the AU, Regional Economic Communities, parliaments and civil society, ahead of the next Summit in 2014.'

- Why has the implementation of this strategy been less effective than foreseen?
- How will the Commission ensure a more effective implementation of this strategy while maintaining its ambition?
- When does it intend to present the results of the ongoing internal reflection?

**Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(28 May 2013)**

The 2007 JAES ⁽¹⁾ is based on shared values, interests and vision of Africa and the EU on their relationship. It is implemented through successive Action Plans, with 8 thematic partnerships with political dialogue and an operational dimension. Important achievements have been made in most areas ⁽²⁾.

In retrospect, the JAES Action Plans suffered from an over-ambitious agenda, lack of buy-in from key stakeholders at regional and national levels, insufficient appropriation and mainstreaming in existing cooperation-instruments and the lack of dedicated financial support to underpin such an innovative transcontinental Strategy. To address these shortfalls, we need to reflect on how to better structure and organise our work so as to deliver more tangible results. Under the MFF, the Commission will have a new Pan-African Programme to provide dedicated support for the JAES. At present, a small envelop of EUR 10 million serves as a support mechanism and the Commission continues to support the capacity building of the African Union (AU) via the AU Support Programme.

At the EC-AUC meeting (25-26 April 2013) both Colleges reviewed the situation and decided to start first discussions on the reform of the JAES. The IV. Africa-EU Summit in 2014 is expected to take stock of results of these discussions, endorse reform proposals and provide the necessary impetus for future work. The Summit could also agree the operational priorities and a more effective implementation architecture, based on our respective strategic interests and expected results.

Discussions with Parliament on the proposed Pan-African Programme are ongoing in the MFF context. In the run-up to the Summit, the Commission stands ready to discuss the reform suggestions with the EP and all other stakeholders.

⁽¹⁾ Joint Africa-EU Strategy.

⁽²⁾ for detailed information see: www.africa-eu-partnership.org

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003555/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Prejuízos decorrentes do mau tempo nos Açores

O mau tempo na ilha de São Miguel, no arquipélago dos Açores, originou diversas derrocadas e causou três mortos. No grupo central, as ilhas da Terceira e das Flores foram também afetadas pela intempérie. Segundo o Governo Regional, os prejuízos patrimoniais estão orçados em 35 milhões de euros. Campanhas de solidariedade estão já em curso para minorar os prejuízos das populações atingidas.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

- Tem conhecimento desta situação?
- Recebeu pedido de apoio por parte das autoridades regionais?
- Estará disponível para o avaliar caso venha a recebê-lo?
- Em que áreas crê que o seu auxílio poderia ser mais relevante e eficaz?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão

(14 de maio de 2013)

A Comissão está ciente da situação e contactou as autoridades regionais dos Açores, que inquiriram sobre a possibilidade de solicitar assistência financeira do Fundo de Solidariedade da UE. Os pedidos, contudo, só podem ser apresentados à Comissão pelas autoridades nacionais no prazo de 10 semanas a contar da ocorrência da catástrofe.

Se as autoridades portuguesas tencionam apresentar um pedido, a Comissão está disposta a proporcionar uma maior orientação e aconselhamento. Todos os pedidos recebidos são avaliados de acordo com os critérios estabelecidos no Regulamento do Fundo de Solidariedade⁽¹⁾. O limiar normal de ativação do Fundo de Solidariedade no caso de Portugal corresponde a um montante de danos superior a 1 002 milhões de euros. Só podemos avaliar se os critérios de ativação excecional do fundo para uma catástrofe regional de carácter extraordinário estão preenchidos uma vez conhecidas as informações pormenorizadas constantes do pedido.

Se o apoio do Fundo de Solidariedade for concedido, as autoridades portuguesas serão as responsáveis pela seleção de operações de emergência que merecem beneficiar do financiamento como, por exemplo, reparação de infraestruturas essenciais, habitações provisórias ou compensação das despesas incorridas com as operações de salvamento. Os danos privados não podem ser compensados pelo Fundo de Solidariedade.

⁽¹⁾ Regulamento (CE) n.º 2012/2002 do Conselho, de 11 de novembro de 2002, que institui o Fundo de Solidariedade da União Europeia, JO L 311 de 14.11.2002.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003555/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Damage caused by bad weather in the Azores

Bad weather on the island of São Miguel, in the Azores archipelago, has caused several landslides and claimed three lives. The islands of Terceira and Flores, in the Central Group, were also hit by the storm. According to the regional government, property damage is estimated at EUR 35 million. Solidarity campaigns are already underway to minimise the losses of those affected.

- Is the Commission aware of this situation?
- Has it received an aid application from the regional authorities?
- Is it prepared to assess such an application should it receive one?
- In which areas does it believe that EU aid could be most relevant and effective?

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

The Commission is aware of the situation and has been in contact with the regional authorities of the Azores who enquired about the possibility to request financial assistance from the EU Solidarity Fund. Applications, however, can only be presented to the Commission by the national authorities within 10 weeks of the occurrence of the disaster.

If the Portuguese authorities intend to submit an application, the Commission is ready to provide further guidance and advice. All applications received are assessed according to the criteria laid down in the Solidarity Fund Regulation⁽¹⁾. The normal threshold for activating the Solidarity Fund in the case of Portugal is damage exceeding EUR 1.002 billion. Whether the criteria for exceptionally activating the Fund for a so-called extraordinary regional disaster are met could only be assessed on the basis of detailed information to be provided in the application.

If aid from the Solidarity Fund were to be granted, the Portuguese authorities would be responsible for selecting relevant emergency operations for financing, for instance to repair essential infrastructure, for provisional housing or to compensate the cost of rescue operations. Private damage may not be compensated from the Solidarity Fund.

⁽¹⁾ Council Regulation (EC) No 2012/2002 of 11 November 2002 establishing the European Union Solidarity Fund, OJ L 311, 14.11.2002.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-003556/13

komissiolle

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE)

(27. maaliskuuta 2013)

Aihe: Tutkimusrahoitus Israelin siirtokuntien yrityksille

EU on jatkuvasti ilmaissut olevansa huolissaan Israelin toimista siirtokunta-alueilla. Siirtokunnat rikkovat kansainvälistä oikeutta ja häiritsevät Palestiinan ja Israelin hallitusten välistä rauhanprosessia. Israelin hallituksen suorien toimien lisäksi siirtokunta-alueilla on israelilaisia (ja ulkomaisia) yrityksiä, jotka toimivat tukeakseen Israelin hallituksen pyrkimyksiä rikkoa kansainvälistä oikeutta, erityisesti neljännen Geneven yleissopimuksen 49 artiklaa.

Komission ja EU:n toimielinten olisi pidättäydyttävä rahoittamasta näitä yrityksiä. Lisäksi komission olisi selvitettävä, saavatko kyseiset yritykset rahoitusta EU:lta. Tästä syystä tiedustelen seuraavaa:

1. Rahoittaako EU tutkimushankkeita, joissa on vastaanottajina tällaisia israelilaisia (tai ulkomaisia) yrityksiä?
2. Jos vastaus on myönteinen, mistä tutkimushankkeista tällaisia yrityksiä rahoitetaan?
3. Mihin toimiin EU aikoo ryhtyä varmistaakseen, ettei EU:n rahoituksella tueta suoraan tai epäsuorasti Israelin pyrkimyksiä rikkoa neljännen Geneven yleissopimuksen 49 artiklaa?

Maire Geoghegan-Quinnin komission puolesta antama vastaus

(14. toukokuuta 2013)

Israelilaisten tutkimusyksiköiden osallistumista seitsemännestä tutkimuksen, teknologian kehittämisen ja demonstroinnin puiteohjelmasta (2007–2013) tuettaviin tutkimushankkeisiin säännellään Euroopan yhteisön ja Israelin valtion välisellä tieteellistä ja teknistä yhteistyötä koskeva sopimuksella ⁽¹⁾. Kyseisen sopimuksen 2 artiklan 1 kohdan ja liitteen I nojalla Israelin tutkimusyksiköt voivat osallistua ja saada rahoitusta seitsemännestä puiteohjelmasta samoin edellytyksin kuin EU:n jäsenvaltioista peräisin olevat tutkimusyksiköt.

Useita mekanismeja on otettu käyttöön sen estämiseksi, että EU:n rahoitusta käytetään suoriin toimiin, jotka voivat olla kansainvälisen oikeuden vastaisia.

Ensinnäkin komissio tarkistaa huolellisesti, että tutkimusyhteenliittymiin hakevat israelilaiset tutkimusyksiköt eivät ole sijoittautuneet siirtokunta-alueille, vaan Israelin vuotta 1967 edeltävien rajojen sisäpuolelle.

Toiseksi useimmat seitsemänneksen puiteohjelman hankkeet ovat luonteeltaan yhteistoiminnallisia, ja niissä on useita osanottajia eri maista. Kaikki hankkeet valitaan tieteellisen huippuosaamisen perusteella ja tarvittaessa niille tehdään eettinen arviointi. Eettisessä arvioinnissa tarkastellaan muun muassa sitä, onko kulloinkin tutkimuksen tuote tai teknologia mahdollisesti kaksikäyttöistä. Tätä sovelletaan esimerkiksi yrityksiin, jotka osallistuvat turvallisuustutkimuksen alan toimiin tai jotka toimivat puolustus- ja turvallisuusosalalla.

Komissio on tietoinen Euroopan parlamentin ja kansalaisyhteiskunnan organisaatioiden esille ottamista huolenaiheista, jotka liittyvät tiettyjen israelilaisten tutkimusyksiköiden osallistumiseen puiteohjelman hankkeisiin. Komissio pohtii parhaillaan keinoja näiden ongelmien ratkaisemiseksi EU:n seuraavan tutkimus- ja innovointirahoituksen Horisontti 2020 -puiteohjelman (2014–2020) täytäntöönpanossa.

⁽¹⁾ EUVLL 220, 25.8.2007.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003556/13
to the Commission
Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Research funding to Israeli settlement companies

The EU has continually expressed its concern over Israeli actions in the settlement areas. These settlements violate international law and damage the peace process between the Palestinian and the Israeli Governments. In addition to the Israeli Government's direct actions, there are Israeli (and foreign) companies in the settlement areas which operate to support the Israeli Government's efforts in breaking international law, specifically Article 49 of the Fourth Geneva Convention.

The Commission and the EU institutions should refrain from funding these companies. Moreover, the Commission should find out whether such companies are receiving research funding from the EU. I therefore ask:

1. Is the EU funding research projects which have such Israeli (or foreign) companies as fund recipients?
2. If so, which research projects are funding such companies?
3. What actions will the EU take in order to make sure that the EU funding does not, directly nor indirectly, support Israeli actions that infringe Article 49 of the Fourth Geneva Convention?

**Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(14 May 2013)**

The participation of Israeli entities in research projects supported by the Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013) is governed by the 'Agreement on Scientific and Technical Cooperation between the European Community and the State of Israel'.⁽¹⁾ On the basis of Art 2(1) and Annex I of this Agreement, research entities from Israel participate in and receive funding from FP7 under the same conditions as those applicable to entities from EU Member States.

Several mechanisms have been put in place to prevent EU funding from being used directly for activities that might be contravening international law.

First, the Commission checks carefully whether Israeli entities applying for participation in research consortia are not established in settlements but in Israel's pre-1967 borders.

Secondly, most FP7 projects are of a collaborative nature and include several participants from different countries. All projects are selected on the basis of scientific excellence and, when relevant, subject to ethical review. The ethical review examines i.a. issues such as the possible dual use of the given research product or technology. This applies, for example, to companies participating in security research activities and active in the fields of defence and security.

The Commission is aware of the concerns raised by the European Parliament and civil society organisations in relation to the participation of certain Israeli entities in FP projects and it is currently reflecting on ways to address those concerns in the implementation of Horizon 2020, the future research and innovation funding programme (2014-2020).

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 220, 25.8.2007.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003557/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Luta europeia contra o extremismo violento

Na sua resposta à minha pergunta E-001002/2013, a senhora Comissária Cecilia Malmström não respondeu à terceira e quarta perguntas que então coloquei e que agora reitero.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

- Como avalia as manifestações de extremismo violento na Europa? Quais são as suas principais causas e consequências?
- Que medidas concretas tem tomado quanto a esta matéria? Quais foram os seus resultados?

Resposta dada por Cecilia Malmström em nome da Comissão

(6 de maio de 2013)

O potencial de extremismo violento existe em todos os países. O extremismo violento não se limita a uma religião ou ideologia política e pode manifestar-se de diferentes formas, seja extremismo de direita ou de esquerda, seja separatismo ou extremismo por motivos religiosos.

As causas subjacentes ao fenómeno não podem ser meramente explicadas por um só conjunto de fatores. Embora alguns investigadores apontem causas socioeconómicas gerais relacionadas com a globalização e o enfraquecimento das comunidades e identidades tradicionais, outros argumentam que o extremismo violento pode ser explicado por teorias relativas às redes sociais e às interações sociais. Outra escola de pensamento aponta para fatores de carácter individual, como necessidades pessoais e inclinações psicológicas.

A Comissão continua a estudar formas de ajudar os Estados-Membros a responderem à radicalização, independentemente da sua motivação e métodos, como uma das prioridades da segurança interna, tendo em conta que a responsabilidade principal continua a ser exercida a nível local e nacional. Mais especificamente, em setembro de 2011, a Comissão lançou a Rede de Sensibilização para a Radicalização na UE (RAN), que liga grupos envolvidos na prevenção da radicalização que conduz ao terrorismo e ao extremismo violento. A rede destina-se a reunir os conhecimentos, as experiências e os ensinamentos colhidos, de modo a preparar melhor os profissionais de primeira linha para o seu trabalho diário com os indivíduos e grupos de risco.

Tal como anunciado na Conferência de Alto Nível dedicada ao tema «Responsabilizar os órgãos de poder local no combate ao extremismo violento» (29 de janeiro de 2013), a Comissão utilizará a experiência adquirida no quadro da RAN para atualizar e rever o quadro político de resposta ao problema do extremismo violento.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003557/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: European fight against violent extremism

In answer to my Question E-001002/2013 Commissioner Malmström did not respond to my third and fourth questions, which I will ask once again.

- How does the Commission assess manifestations of violent extremism in Europe? What are their main causes and consequences?
- What specific measures has it taken on this issue? What were the outcomes of these measures?

**Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(6 May 2013)**

The potential for violent extremism exists in all countries. Violent extremism is not confined to one faith or political ideology and it may manifest itself in different forms, be it right-wing or left-wing extremism, separatism or religiously motivated extremism.

The underlying causes of the phenomenon cannot be simply explained by one set of factors. Whereas some researchers point to overall socioeconomic causes linked to globalisation and the weakening of traditional communities and identities, others argue that violent extremism can be explained by theories of social networks and social interactions. Another school of thought points to the individual-level factors such as individual needs and psychological inclinations.

The Commission continues to work on ways to assist Member States in addressing radicalisation regardless of motivation and methods, as one of the internal security priorities, bearing in mind that the primary responsibility remains at local and national level. More specifically in September 2011 the Commission launched the EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN), connecting groups involved in preventing radicalisation leading to terrorism and violent extremism. The Network aims to pool experience, knowledge and lessons learned to better equip first-line practitioners in their daily work with at risk individuals and groups.

As announced at the High Level Conference on empowering local actors to prevent violent extremism (29 January 2013), the Commission will use the experience gathered within the RAN to update and revise the policy framework to address the issue of violent extremism.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003558/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Fim das quotas leiteiras — estudo de impacto

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-000594/2013, o senhor Comissário Dacian Cioloș declarou, em nome da Comissão, que «a Comissão lançou um estudo independente com o objetivo de obter uma análise prospetiva sobre a evolução mais provável do setor do leite no futuro contexto sem quotas. Embora sem incidir especificamente nos Açores, o estudo, que deverá estar concluído no verão de 2013, abordará, em especial, o papel do setor do leite na manutenção de comunidades rurais vivas, em especial nas zonas mais frágeis.»

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

- Que entidade desenvolve o estudo independente?
- Que fará se, como se prevê, a evolução das economias mais dependentes do setor do leite no futuro contexto sem quotas for muito negativa?
- Se se verificar que sem quotas leiteiras será extremamente difícil a manutenção de comunidades rurais vivas, em especial nas zonas mais frágeis, admite propor a sua reposição?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloș em nome da Comissão

(30 de abril de 2013)

O estudo obedeceu a um convite à apresentação de propostas. Todas as informações estão no sítio Web da Comissão ⁽¹⁾, incluindo o nome do adjudicando: Ernst & Young Actuaires Conseils. Entre as atribuições do mesmo, conta-se a seleção de seis técnicos independentes altamente considerados a nível internacional. Incumbe-lhes responder a diversas questões relacionadas com a evolução provável do setor leiteiro num contexto futuro sem quotas.

Os pareceres independentes dos técnicos serão discutidos com as partes interessadas da cadeia de abastecimento de leite, as instituições europeias e os Estados-Membros, numa conferência a decorrer a 24 de setembro, organizada pela Comissão, na qual todos os participantes poderão exprimir a sua opinião.

Enquanto não se conhecerem os resultados do estudo e da conferência, são prematuros os comentários da Comissão.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/calls-for-tender/2012-257989_en.htm

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003558/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: End of milk quotas — impact study

In answer to my Question E-000594/2013 Commissioner Ciolos, on behalf of the Commission, said that 'The Commission has initiated an independent study to obtain a prospective analysis on the most likely evolution of the milk sector in the future context without quotas. While there is no specific focus on the Azores, the study, which is expected to be finalised by the summer 2013, will tackle particularly the role of the milk sector in maintaining vibrant rural communities, especially in the most fragile areas.'

- Which body conducted the independent study?
- What will the Commission do if, as expected, the economies most dependent on the milk sector in the future context without quotas experience a significant downturn?
- Will it propose that milk quotas be restored should it prove extremely difficult to maintain vibrant rural communities, especially in the most fragile areas, without them?

**Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission
(30 April 2013)**

The study has been launched through an open call for tender. All information is available on the Commission's website ⁽¹⁾, including the name of the successful tenderer: Ernst & Young Actuaire Conseils. One of the contractor's tasks was to select six independent experts enjoying the highest international reputation. Those experts' role is to reply to a series of questions linked to the likely evolution of the milk sector in the future context without quotas.

Independent views of experts will be discussed with the stakeholders of the milk supply chain, all interested European institutions and the Member States in a conference that the Commission has planned on 24 September, where the opportunity will be given to all parties involved to express their opinion.

As long as the findings of the study and of the conference are not available, it is premature for the Commission to comment.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/calls-for-tender/2012-257989_en.htm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003559/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Menções tradicionais — vinho do Porto

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-1233/2013, o senhor Comissário Dacian Cioloș declarou, em nome da Comissão, que «após a publicação dos referidos pedidos no Jornal Oficial da União Europeia, Portugal transmitiu pedidos de oposição relativamente a cada uma destas menções.

A Comissão está ainda a avaliar os pedidos em causa em conformidade com o procedimento e os critérios enunciados no capítulo III do Regulamento (CE) n.º 607/2009 da Comissão que estabelece normas de execução do Regulamento (CE) n.º 479/2008 no que respeita às denominações de origem protegidas e indicações geográficas protegidas, às menções tradicionais, à rotulagem e à apresentação de determinados produtos vitivinícolas.»

Está a Comissão em condições de antecipar uma data indicativa para a publicitação da sua decisão quanto a esta matéria?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloș em nome da Comissão

(30 de abril de 2013)

Os pedidos das organizações profissionais americanas estão ainda em exame e a Comissão não tomará qualquer decisão a curto prazo, dado que muitos dos pedidos em questão estão sujeitos a oposições que implicarão procedimentos mais demorados.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003559/13
to the Commission**

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(27 March 2013)

Subject: Traditional descriptions — port wine

In answer to my Question E-1233/2013 Commissioner Ciolos, on behalf of the Commission, said that 'Following the publication of those applications in the *Official Journal of the European Union*, Portugal submitted requests of objection for each of those terms.

The Commission is still evaluating the concerned applications in accordance with the procedure and the criteria laid down in Chapter III of Commission Regulation (EC) No 607/2009 laying down certain detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 479/2008 as regards protected designations of origin and geographical indications, traditional terms, labelling and presentation of certain wine sector products.'

Is the Commission able to provide an indicative date for the publication of its decision on this matter?

Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission

(30 April 2013)

The requests of the American professional organisations are still under examination and no decision will be made by the Commission in a short-term since many of these requests are subject to oppositions which imply longer delays in proceedings.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003560/13

à Comissão

Diogo Feio (PPE)

(27 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Grandes livros da cultura europeia

Na sua resposta à minha pergunta E-000801/2013, a senhora Comissária Androulla Vassiliou declarou, em nome da Comissão, que «em conformidade com o Tratado sobre o Funcionamento da União Europeia, os Estados-Membros são os únicos responsáveis pela organização e pelo conteúdo dos sistemas de ensino. Cabe, portanto, a cada Estado-Membro decidir quais as obras literárias que devem ser estudadas nos estabelecimentos de ensino. No entanto, a Comissão está empenhada em promover a divulgação das obras literárias da cultura europeia.».

Chamo a atenção para o facto de em nenhum momento sugerir ou recomendar à Comissão que se substitua aos Estados na organização e conteúdo dos respetivos sistemas de ensino. Esta circunstância não deveria impedir a Comissão de promover, não apenas a divulgação mas o conhecimento efetivo das mesmas. Lamento que, no entender da Comissão, a palavra «estudo» aparente ser apenas reconduzível aos sistemas educativos e que a Comissão não subscreva uma noção mais ampla do significado da mesma.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

- Não considera que, mais do que disponibilizar primeiras edições em suporte digital das grandes obras europeias, deveria promover a publicação e difusão dos grandes livros da cultura europeia e o seu conhecimento efetivo por parte dos cidadãos europeus? E que esta promoção extravasa o aspeto escolar e é, ela própria, essencial para o conhecimento e divulgação da história, civilização e cultura europeias?
- Dispõe de especialistas capazes de, em colaboração com os Estados-Membros, propor e decidir que obras deveriam figurar nessa lista?
- Que montante gasta anualmente com edições em papel? Não poderia alocar parte do seu orçamento para a edição de grandes obras europeias que já façam parte do domínio público?

Resposta dada por Androulla Vassiliou em nome da Comissão

(3 de junho de 2013)

A Comissão está empenhada em promover a difusão do conhecimento, incluindo as grandes obras da cultura europeia, através do programa «Cultura». A Comissão concorda com o Senhor Deputado que tal promoção não se confina à educação formal. No entanto, a Comissão não está em posição de estabelecer quais são os livros essenciais para o conhecimento e a difusão da cultura europeia.

Com vista a celebrar a diversidade cultural da Europa e reforçar o seu património cultural comum, o programa «Cultura» incentiva a circulação da literatura pela Europa fora, segundo várias modalidades, promovendo assim a diversidade cultural e o diálogo intercultural. Em especial, o Prémio da UE para a Literatura procura promover novos autores europeus.

A Europeana — o ponto de acesso multilingue comum ao património cultural europeu em linha, que atualmente dá acesso a cerca de 27 milhões de objetos provenientes de mais de 2 200 instituições parceiras — contribui amplamente para a promoção e difusão das grandes obras literárias da cultura europeia. Cerca de 40 % dos objetos atualmente acessíveis através da Europeana referem-se a texto, incluindo obras-primas da literatura europeia, nomeadamente sonetos de Fernando Pessoa, «A Tempestade» de Shakespeare, «Tartufo» de Molière ou «Dom Quixote de La Mancha» de Cervantes.

O acesso a obras-primas da literatura europeia deve continuar a melhorar até 2015: mediante a sua Recomendação sobre a digitalização e a acessibilidade em linha de material cultural e a preservação digital, de 27 de outubro de 2011 ⁽¹⁾, a Comissão convidou os Estados-Membros a contribuírem para o desenvolvimento da Europeana, fazendo com que todas as suas obras-primas no domínio público estejam disponíveis, através dela, em 2015.

(¹) JO L 283 de 29.10.2011, p. 39.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003560/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Great books of European culture

In her answer to my Question E-000801/2013, Commissioner Vassiliou stated on behalf of the Commission that '[i]n accordance with the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Member States have the sole responsibility for the organisation and content of education systems. It is therefore up to each Member State to decide which literary works to study at school. However, the Commission is committed to promoting the dissemination of literary works of European culture.'

I would point out that at no point did I suggest or recommend that the Commission assume the Member States' responsibility for the organisation and content of their education systems. That should not prevent the Commission from promoting not just the dissemination, but also genuine knowledge of such works. It is regrettable that the Commission seems to understand the word 'study' as relating solely to education systems and that the Commission does not subscribe to a broader notion of the word.

- Does the Commission agree that, beyond making available digital versions of the first editions of great European books, it should promote the publication and dissemination of the great works of European culture and genuine knowledge of them by the European public? Does it also agree that such promotion goes beyond schools and is itself essential to knowledge and dissemination of European history, civilisation and culture?
- Does it have any specialists who could work with the Member States to propose and decide which books should feature on this list?
- How much does it spend per year on paper publishing? Could it not allocate part of its budget to publishing great European works that are already in the public domain?

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

The Commission is committed to promoting the dissemination of knowledge, including great works of European culture, through the Culture Programme. The Commission agrees with the Honourable Member that such promotion is not limited to formal education. However, the Commission is not in a position to prescribe which books are essential to knowledge and dissemination of European culture.

Aiming to celebrate Europe's cultural diversity and enhance its shared cultural heritage, the Culture Programme stimulates the circulation of literature across Europe in several ways, thereby promoting cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue. In particular, the EU Prize for Literature seeks to promote emerging European authors.

Europeana — the common, multilingual access point to Europe's cultural heritage online, which currently gives access to almost 27 million objects from over 2 200 partner institutions, contributes vastly to the promotion and dissemination of great books of European culture. Some 40% of the objects currently accessible through Europeana represent text, including masterpieces of European literature, such as sonnets by Fernando Pessoa, *The Tempest* by Shakespeare, *Le Tartuffe* by Molière or *Don Quijote de la Mancha* by Cervantes.

Access to masterpieces of European literature should further improve by 2015: Through its Recommendation on the digitisation and online accessibility of cultural material and digital preservation of 27 October 2011 ⁽¹⁾, the Commission has invited the Member States to contribute to the further development of Europeana by ensuring that all their public domain masterpieces will be accessible through Europeana by 2015.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 283, 29.10.2011, p. 39.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-003561/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Spyros Danellis (S&D)
(27 Μαρτίου 2013)

Θέμα: Πρακτικές υποβολής αιτήσεων για καταβολή ενιαίων άμεσων ενισχύσεων

Στην Ελλάδα, η υποβολή αιτήσεων των δικαιούχων για την είσπραξη της ενιαίας άμεσης ενίσχυσης γίνεται με έναν από τους εξής τρεις τρόπους:

1. άμεσα, από τον δικαιούχο μέσω διαδικτύου,
2. άμεσα, από τον δικαιούχο μέσω αλληλογραφίας,
3. έμμεσα, μέσω τρίτων που παρεμβάλλονται για τη διεκπεραίωση της διαδικασίας.

Ερωτάται η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή:

1. Ποια είναι γενικά η πρακτική που ακολουθείται στα άλλα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ;
2. Πώς αξιολογεί η Επιτροπή τις πρακτικές που ακολουθούνται ως προς τη διαφάνεια, την απλοποίηση, την αποτελεσματικότητα και την αποδοτικότητα τους τόσο για το κράτος μέλος, την ΕΕ, όσο και για τους δικαιούχους;
3. Σε περίπτωση που η Επιτροπή μπορεί να υποδείξει πιο αποτελεσματικές πρακτικές από αυτές που εφαρμόζονται στην ΕΕ ως προς τα κριτήρια που αναφέρονται στην προηγούμενη ερώτηση, θα μπορούσε η Επιτροπή να βοηθήσει την Ελλάδα, παρέχοντας τεχνική βοήθεια, ώστε να υιοθετηθεί από τη χώρα μια πιο άμεση, διαφανής, αποτελεσματική και αποδοτική διαδικασία;

Απάντηση του κ. Ciolos εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(23 Απριλίου 2013)

Σχετικά με τις πρακτικές που ακολουθούνται στην Ελλάδα και σε άλλα κράτη μέλη ως προς τη διαχείριση των αιτήσεων για το καθεστώς ενιαίας ενίσχυσης, οι απαιτήσεις καθορίζονται στην νομοθεσία της ΕΕ και, σύμφωνα με τις ρυθμίσεις που διέπουν την εφαρμογή των κοινοτικών καθεστώτων στήριξης στο πλαίσιο της κοινής γεωργικής πολιτικής, αναμένεται στα κράτη μέλη να λαμβάνουν όλα τα αναγκαία μέτρα για να διασφαλίζουν ότι οι εν λόγω απαιτήσεις τηρούνται έτσι ώστε οι ενισχύσεις να χορηγούνται ορθά, καθώς και να προλαμβάνονται και να αντιμετωπίζονται οι παρατυπίες. Η Επιτροπή υποβάλει τα κράτη μέλη σε τακτικούς ελέγχους εκκαθάρισης λογαριασμών ώστε να ελέγχεται η ορθή εφαρμογή της ενωσιακής νομοθεσίας.

Ειδικότερα όσον αφορά τις αιτήσεις άμεσων ενισχύσεων, τα κράτη μέλη παρέχουν στους γεωργούς, μεταξύ άλλων με τη χρήση ηλεκτρονικών μέσων, τυποποιημένα έντυπα αιτήσεων με βάση τις εκτάσεις που είχαν καθοριστεί το προηγούμενο έτος καθώς και σχεδιαγράμματα στα οποία εντοπίζεται η θέση αυτών των εκτάσεων (άρθρο 19 παράγραφος 2 του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 73/2009⁽¹⁾ του Συμβουλίου).

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⁽²⁾ της Επιτροπής, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των αιτήσεων ενίσχυσης, να υποβάλλονται ηλεκτρονικά τόσο από την πλευρά των γεωργών προς τις αρχές όσο και αντιστρόφως. Το άρθρο 20 του εν λόγω κανονισμού ορίζει επίσης όσον αφορά την υποβολή των αιτήσεων ενίσχυσης, 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.

⁽¹⁾ ΕΕ L 30 της 31.1.2009.

⁽²⁾ ΕΕ L 316 της 2.12.2009.

(English version)

**Question for written answer P-003561/13
to the Commission
Spyros Danellis (S&D)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Practices followed in applying for the Single Direct Farm Payment

In Greece, beneficiaries apply for the Single Direct Farm Payment in one of the following ways:

1. Directly via the Internet;
2. Directly by mail;
3. Indirectly, through third parties, who intervene to complete the procedure.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. What is the practice generally followed in other EU Member States?
2. How does it evaluate the practices followed as regards transparency, simplicity, effectiveness and efficiency from the point of view of the Member State in question, the EU and the beneficiaries?
3. In so far as it is able to designate more effective practices than those applied in the EU in terms of the criteria stated above, could it help Greece by providing technical assistance so that Greece adopts a more direct, transparent, efficient and effective procedure?

**Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission
(23 April 2013)**

Concerning the practices followed by Greece and other Member States in managing the applications for the single payment scheme, the requirements are defined in the EU legislation and, under the arrangements governing the implementation of Union support schemes in the framework of the common agricultural policy, it is for the Member States to take all the measures necessary to ensure that those requirements are implemented in such a way that subsidies are granted correctly and to prevent and deal with irregularities. The Commission undergoes regular audits of clearance of accounts in the Member States to check that the EU legislation has been correctly implemented.

In particular, Member States shall provide to farmers, for the aid applications of direct payments, *inter alia* by the use of electronic means, pre-established forms based on the areas determined in the previous year as well as graphic material indicating the location of those areas (Article 19(2) of Council Regulation No (EC) 73/2009 ⁽¹⁾).

As means of simplification, Member States are generally allowed to permit or require that any kind of communications under the Commission Regulation No (EC) 1122/2009 ⁽²⁾, including aid applications, both from the farmers to the authorities and vice versa be made by electronic means. Article 20 of that regulation also stipulates with regard to the submission of aid applications that 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.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 30, 31.1.2009.

⁽²⁾ OJ L 316, 2.12.2009.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003562/13
to the Commission
Gay Mitchell (PPE)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: Credit union deposits with the Irish Banking Resolution Corporation (IBRC)

In 2005, a number of Irish credit unions invested in an Anglo Irish Bank deposit-based tracker bond which was custom-made for credit unions and duly named the Anglo Irish Bank Credit Union Bond 2005 (the 'deposit-based tracker bond'). The deposit-based tracker bond was an eight year, three month product which was due to mature on 30 September 2013. The capital was to be guaranteed at maturity with an additional minimum 12% return.

These credit unions were encouraged and advised to invest excess funds in the security of deposits of highly rated financial institutions. Anglo Irish Bank was an A-rated institution at the time these deposit-based tracker bonds were purchased and the purchase was fully permitted under the Trustee Authorised Investments Order, 1998, with which credit unions were compelled to comply at that time.

It is my understanding that when Anglo Irish Bank deposits were transferred to Allied Irish Bank in 2011, Anglo/IBRC refused to transfer the deposit-based tracker bond despite repeated requests from credit unions to do so.

Each of the credit unions has now received EUR 100 000 from the State's Deposit Guarantee Scheme (being the maximum available under the terms of that scheme). While the average investment in these deposits by credit unions was EUR1 million, some credit unions invested EUR 2 m and so are now carrying a loss of EUR 1.9 million.

Is there an EU competence to assist these credit unions with this matter?

**Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(28 May 2013)**

The resolution of IBRC was an important step in the restructuring of the Irish financial sector which significantly reinforced the sustainability of the well-performing Irish programme. The Commission is firmly of the view that Member States in the EU are obliged to ensure full and effective protection of depositors, even in times of severe crisis. That is why all depositors in the European Union have since 2010 been guaranteed up to EUR 100.000. As part of the resolution of IBRC the Irish authorities fully met their commitments under the Deposit Guarantee Scheme and also under the Eligible Liabilities Guarantee Scheme (ELG) introduced in December 2009. As the Anglo Irish Bank Credit Union Bond 2005 was issued in 2005 it is not covered by the ELG as it pre dates the scheme. While it is very regrettable that any losses may incur to Irish Credit Unions as a result of the resolution of IBRC, the process fully respected the relevant guarantee applicable to the Anglo Irish Bank Credit Union Bond 2005 in a liquidation procedure.

The liquidation of IBRC was carried out under Irish national law. Likewise, the State Deposit Guarantee Scheme is part of the Irish national legislative framework. We are not aware of any infringement of competition law or any other area of EC law in the context of the IBRC liquidation. Therefore, any possible disputes would have to be settled in national courts.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003563/13
προς την Επιτροπή (Αντιπρόεδρος/Υπατη Εκπρόσωπος)
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(27 Μαρτίου 2013)

Θέμα: VP/HR — Στρατόπεδο Liberty στο Ιράκ

Στις 9 Φεβρουαρίου στο στρατόπεδο Liberty, στο Ιράκ, που φιλοξενεί 3 100 ιρανούς πρόσφυγες, έγινε επίθεση με πυραύλους που άφησε επτά νεκρούς και 100 τραυματίες. Το στρατόπεδο Liberty δεν έχει σταθερά κτίρια ή καταφύγιο, και οι κάτοικοι αναγκάζονται να ζουν σε ιδιαίτερα ευάλωτα ρυμουλκούμενα. Η UNHCR επιβεβαιώνει ότι οι ιρανοί πρόσφυγες δικαιούνται διεθνή προστασία σύμφωνα με το διεθνές δίκαιο. Επιπλέον, ο Ειδικός Αντιπρόσωπος του Γενικού Γραμματέα του ΟΗΕ στο Ιράκ, Martin Kobler, έχει υποσχεθεί σε αυτούς τους κατοίκους του στρατοπέδου Liberty, ασφάλεια και προστασία και ταχεία μετεγκατάσταση σε ασφαλείς χώρες. Δυστυχώς, ωστόσο, μόνο επτά άτομα έχουν επανεγκατασταθεί, και η ασφάλεια έχει αποδειχθεί ότι είναι ανύπαρκτη.

Παρά την τραγωδία η ιρακινή κυβέρνηση αρνείται να παραχωρήσει στους ανθρώπους αυτούς βασικά μέτρα ασφαλείας, όπως κράνη ή θωρακισμένα γιλέκα. Επιπλέον, τίποτα δεν έχει γίνει είτε από τον Υπατο Εκπρόσωπο της ΕΕ για Θέματα Εξωτερικής Πολιτικής είτε από κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ, επιτρέποντας στο ιρακικό καθεστώς και την κυβέρνηση του Ιράκ να συνεχίσουν τις δολοφονίες και τις επιθέσεις.

Θέτουμε, λοιπόν, τα εξής ερωτήματα:

1. Πώς μπορεί η Ευρωπαϊκή Υπηρεσία Εξωτερικής Δράσης να εξασφαλίσει την ασφάλεια αυτών των προσφύγων, οι οποίοι ζουν σε διαρκή φόβο;
2. Ποια είναι η απάντηση της ΕΥΕΔ στο αίτημα των κατοίκων της Liberty να επιστρέψουν αμέσως στην πόλη Ασράφ, όπου μπορούν να έχουν περισσότερη ασφάλεια, και να επανεγκατασταθούν αργότερα σε μια ασφαλέστερη τρίτη χώρα;

Απάντηση της Υπάτου Εκπροσώπου της Ένωσης/Αντιπροέδρου Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(22 Μαΐου 2013)

Η ΕΕ παρακολουθεί το θέμα της επανεγκατάστασης των πρώην κατοίκων του στρατοπέδου Ασράφ και υποστηρίζει τις προσπάθειες εξεύρεσης μιας ειρηνικής και ομαλής λύσης.

Τόσο η Υπατη Εκπρόσωπος/Αντιπρόεδρος της Επιτροπής, όσο και η Επιτροπή, έχουν τονίσει επανειλημμένα την πλήρη υποστήριξη τους προς την εν εξελίξει διαδικασία που προωθείται από τα Ηνωμένα Έθνη, καθώς και προς τον Ειδικό Εκπρόσωπο Martin Kobler. Ο Υπάτος Αρμοστής του ΟΗΕ για τους Πρόσφυγες (UNHCR) προχωρεί, όπως προβλέπεται, με τον «καθορισμό του καθεστώτος του πρόσφυγα» των κατοίκων που διαμένουν προσωρινά στο στρατόπεδο Huwriya. Η ΕΕ έχει τη μεγαλύτερη συνεισφορά σε αυτή τη διαδικασία, με 12 εκατ. ευρώ, ώστε να βοηθήσει τους οργανισμούς των Ηνωμένων Εθνών που συμμετέχουν — και ιδίως την UNHCR και το Γραφείο των Ηνωμένων Εθνών για τις υπηρεσίες υποστήριξης των προγραμμάτων (UNOPS) — στη χρηματοδότηση των δραστηριοτήτων τους.

Η στήριξη της ΕΕ στη διαδικασία αυτή, ωστόσο, δεν συνεπάγεται την ανάληψη ευθύνης για τη θέσπιση περαιτέρω μέτρων προστασίας της ασφάλειας των διαμενόντων στο στρατόπεδο Huwriya, — ευθύνη της ιρακινής κυβέρνησης, σύμφωνα με το μνημόνιο συμφωνίας της 25ης Δεκεμβρίου 2011 μεταξύ της ιρακινής κυβέρνησης και των Ηνωμένων Εθνών. Μετά τις πρόσφατες επιθέσεις στο στρατόπεδο Huwriya, η ιρακινή κυβέρνηση αντέδρασε άμεσα με την αποστολή ομάδων περιφρούρησης της περιοχής του καταυλισμού και αναλαμβάνοντας τη μετακομιδή των τραυματιών. Ο πρωθυπουργός διόρισε επιτροπή για να ερευνήσει το περιστατικό. Οι επιθέσεις μας υπενθυμίζουν την επείγουσα ανάγκη επιτάχυνσης της διαδικασίας επανεγκατάστασης, με τη συνεργασία τόσο των κατοίκων, όσο και των τρίτων χωρών που προσφέρονται να τους φιλοξενήσουν. Επομένως, είναι σημαντικό να ανταποκριθούν θετικά οι κάτοικοι στις προσφορές επανεγκατάστασης.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003563/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: VP/HR — Iraq's Camp Liberty

On 9 February at Camp Liberty, which hosts 3 100 Iranian refugees in Iraq, there was an attack by missiles that left seven dead and 100 wounded. Camp Liberty has no fixed buildings or shelter, and the residents are forced to live in highly vulnerable trailers. The UNHCR reaffirms that the Iranian refugees are entitled to international protection under international law. Furthermore, the UN Secretary-General's Special Representative in Iraq, Martin Kobler, has promised these residents of Camp Liberty safety, security and rapid resettlement to countries of safety. Unfortunately, however, only seven people have been resettled, and safety has proved to be non-existent.

Despite this tragedy the Iraqi Government refuses to give these people basic security measures such as helmets or armoured vests. Moreover, nothing has been done by either the EU's High Representative for Foreign Affairs or by the EU Member States, allowing the Iranian regime and the Government of Iraq to continue with murders and aggression.

We therefore ask the following:

1. How can the European External Action Service secure safety for these refugees, who live in permanent fear?
2. What is the response of the EEAS to the request by Liberty residents to be immediately returned to the town of Ashraf, where they could have more security, and to be resettled further to a safer third country?

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

The EU follows the issue of resettlement of the former residents of Camp Ashraf and supports efforts to find a peaceful and orderly solution.

Both the HR/VP and the Commission have repeatedly stressed their full support to the ongoing process facilitated by the United Nations and to Special Representative Martin Kobler. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) is proceeding as foreseen with the 'refugee status determination' of the residents who are staying at the temporary transit location Camp Hurriya. The EU has been the biggest contributor to this process, with EUR 12 million provided to help the United Nations agencies involved — notably the UNHCR and the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) — to finance their operations.

The EU support to this process however does not imply responsibility for introducing further measures to protect the safety of Camp Hurriya residents, as it is the responsibility of the Iraqi Government in accordance with the memorandum of understanding of 25 December 2011 between the Iraqi Government and the United Nations. After the recent attacks on Camp Hurriya, the Iraqi Government responded rapidly by dispatching teams to secure the area around the camp and assisting with medical transportation of the wounded. The Prime Minister formed a committee to investigate the incident. The attacks remind us of the urgency to accelerate the resettlement process, with the cooperation of both the residents and third countries that are ready to receive them. It is therefore crucial that the residents respond positively to the resettlement offers made.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003564/13
προς την Επιτροπή (Αντιπρόεδρος/Υπατη Εκπρόσωπος)
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(27 Μαρτίου 2013)

Θέμα: VP/HR — Παραβιάσεις των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων: καταδίκη του δημοσιογράφου Avaz Zeynalli στο Αζερμπαϊτζάν

Έχει υποπέσει στην αντίληψή μου ότι το Ινστιτούτο για την Ελευθερία και την Ασφάλεια των Δημοσιογράφων (IRFS) καταγγέλλει την καταδίκη του αρχισυντάκτη της εφημερίδας Khural, Avaz Zeynalli σε εννέα χρόνια φυλάκιση για δωροδοκία, εκβιασμό και φοροδιαφυγή, κατηγορίες οι οποίες, όπως πιστεύει ο οργανισμός, είναι κατασκευασμένες. Η απόφαση αυτή και η 16μηνη κράτηση του Zeynalli θεωρείται ως παραβίαση των διεθνών προτύπων που εγγυώνται την ελευθερία της έκφρασης, και το IRFS απευθύνει έκκληση για την άμεση απελευθέρωσή του.

Επιπλέον, υπάρχει ένας αυξανόμενος αριθμός δημοσιογράφων στο Αζερμπαϊτζάν που αντιμετωπίζουν μεγάλες ποινές φυλάκισης με βάση κατασκευασμένες κατηγορίες.

Το δικαίωμα στην ελευθερία της έκφρασης και της πληροφόρησης είναι εγγυημένο και προστατεύεται από τις διατάξεις των διεθνών οργάνων και τις συνθήκες που έχουν υπογραφεί και κυρωθεί από την κυβέρνηση του Αζερμπαϊτζάν.

Ερωτάται η Αντιπρόεδρος/Υπατη Εκπρόσωπος της Ένωσης για Θέματα Εξωτερικής Πολιτικής και Πολιτικής Ασφαλείας Catherine Ashton:

Τι μπορεί να κάνει η ΕΕ στο πλαίσιο των σχέσεών της με την κυβέρνηση του Αζερμπαϊτζάν για να σταματήσουν αυτές οι συλλήψεις, που βασίζονται σε κατασκευασμένα γεγονότα και αντικεινται στα διεθνή πρότυπα που εγγυώνται την ελευθερία της έκφρασης;

Απάντηση της Υπατης Εκπροσώπου/Αντιπροέδρου Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(29 Μαΐου 2013)

Η κατάσταση στον τομέα των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων και των θεμελιωδών ελευθεριών στο Αζερμπαϊτζάν εμφανίζει σημάδια επιδείνωσης κατά τους τελευταίους μήνες. Αυτό ισχύει ιδίως όσον αφορά την κατάσταση που επικρατεί στον τομέα ελευθερίας της έκφρασης. Ενόψει των προεδρικών εκλογών του Οκτωβρίου, προβάλλει η ανάγκη να εξασφαλιστεί ένας ανοικτός πολιτικός χώρος για δημόσιο διάλογο και συζήτηση: τα ελεύθερα και ενεργά μέσα ενημέρωσης μπορούν να συνεισφέρουν σημαντικά σε κάθε δημοκρατία.

Η ΕΕ έχει επανειλημμένα χρησιμοποιήσει όλους τους διαύλους επικοινωνίας με την κυβέρνηση του Αζερμπαϊτζάν με σκοπό να εκφράσει τις ανησυχίες της σε αυτόν τον τομέα και να προτείνει την υποστήριξή της στις προσπάθειες που καταβάλλονται για βελτίωση της κατάστασης. Αυτό ισχύει και για την περίπτωση του κ. Zeynalli, την οποία παρακολουθεί στενά η αντιπροσωπεία της ΕΕ στο Μπακού.

Η διεξαγωγή των εκλογών στο Αζερμπαϊτζάν, καθώς και ο σεβασμός των δημοκρατικών δικαιωμάτων και ελευθεριών στο πλαίσιο των εκλογών αυτών, θα αντανakλούν την κατάσταση εφαρμογής από τη χώρα των δεσμεύσεών της έναντι του ΟΟΣΑ και του Συμβουλίου της Ευρώπης, καθώς και στο πλαίσιο της ανατολικής εταιρικής σχέσης. Το γεγονός αυτό θα έχει εν τέλει αντίκτυπο στο επίπεδο των στόχων που επιδιώκονται στο πλαίσιο των σχέσεων μεταξύ ΕΕ και Αζερμπαϊτζάν.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003564/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(27 March 2013)**

Subject: VP/HR — Human rights violations: the sentencing of journalist Avaz Zeynalli in Azerbaijan

It has come to my attention that the Institute for Reporters' Freedom and Safety (IRFS) condemns the sentencing of Khural newspaper chief editor Avaz Zeynalli to nine years in jail for bribery, extortion and tax evasion, charges which the organisation believe to have been fabricated. This verdict and Zeynalli's 16-month detention are seen as a breach of international standards guaranteeing freedom of expression, and the IRFS is calling for his immediate release.

Furthermore, there are an increasing number of Azerbaijani journalists facing lengthy prison sentences based on fabricated charges.

The right to freedom of expression and information is guaranteed and protected by the provisions of international instruments and treaties signed and ratified by the Government of Azerbaijan.

We ask the Vice-President/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy Catherine Ashton:

What can the EU do in the framework of its relations with the Government of Azerbaijan to stop these arrests, which are based on allegedly fabricated facts and go against international standards that guarantee freedom of expression?

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

The situation regarding human rights and fundamental freedoms in Azerbaijan has shown signs of deterioration in recent months. This is particularly true for the situation regarding freedom of expression. Ahead of the October Presidential Elections, there is a need to ensure an open political space for debate and discussion: a free and active media has an important contribution to make in any democracy.

The EU has repeatedly used all communication channels with the Azerbaijani government to express its concerns in this area, and to propose support to efforts aimed at improving the situation. This applies equally to the case of Mr Zeynalli, which has been followed closely by the EU Delegation in Baku.

The conduct of elections in Azerbaijan, and the respect for democratic rights and freedoms around those elections, will reflect the state of the country's implementation of its commitments towards the OSCE, the Council of Europe and in the framework the Eastern Partnership. This will ultimately impact on the degree of ambition of relations between the EU and Azerbaijan.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003565/13
à la Commission
Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)
(27 mars 2013)

Objet: Durabilité des écosystèmes marins et accroissement des populations de phoques

De nombreuses études scientifiques menées ces dernières années ont analysé et quantifié les différents types de dommages causés par les populations de phoques en croissance en Europe. Certaines études établissent clairement un lien entre les populations grandissantes de phoques et la réduction des stocks de poissons (ce qu'a reconnu le Parlement européen lui-même dans deux résolutions du 12 septembre 2012). La même préoccupation a été évoquée par plusieurs États membres qui, de fait, contrôlent les populations locales de phoques: le Royaume-Uni (en particulier en Écosse), la Suède, le Danemark, la Finlande, l'Estonie et les Pays-Bas.

Les États membres supportent directement les coûts résultant des dommages générés par les phoques. La Suède à elle seule a dépensé 4,6 millions d'euros en 2009 pour compenser les dommages occasionnés par les phoques gris aux communautés de pêcheurs. Le Fonds européen pour la pêche affecte spécifiquement des fonds à l'indemnisation de ces dommages dans plusieurs États membres, dont l'Irlande, la Lettonie et la Finlande.

La Commission peut-elle expliquer comment elle entend concilier la nécessité de gérer les populations de phoques avec la protection des stocks de poissons, à un moment où les subventions publiques sont mises sous pression?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Damanaki au nom de la Commission
(17 mai 2013)

La Commission est consciente des conflits entre la pêche et les phoques; les phoques nuisent aux pêcheries dans la mesure où ils causent des dommages aux captures et aux engins et ont une incidence directe sur les stocks de poissons du fait de la prédation. Toutefois, la Commission tient à souligner que la pêche a des répercussions bien plus importantes sur les stocks de poissons que les phoques. En outre, en raison de l'insuffisance des données, il est difficile de déterminer si la prédation des phoques a une incidence significative sur ces stocks (cabillaud de l'ouest de l'Écosse, par exemple ⁽¹⁾).

La gestion des populations de phoques relève de la responsabilité des autorités compétentes des États membres. Celles-ci doivent définir les mesures de conservation nécessaires afin d'assurer le maintien ou le rétablissement, dans un état de conservation favorable, de toutes les populations de phoques couvertes par la directive «Habitats». Dans ce contexte, il appartient aux États membres d'évaluer l'état de la population de phoques. Les États membres peuvent, le cas échéant, prendre des mesures pour réduire la population de phoques, tant que celle-ci est maintenue dans un état de conservation favorable.

La Commission est consciente du fait que des crédits du Fonds européen pour la pêche (FEP) ont été utilisés dans le passé par la Finlande et que des fonds nationaux ont été débloqués en Suède pour indemniser des pêcheurs qui avaient subi des dégâts causés par des phoques. Toutefois, ce type de financement n'a pas été inclus dans la proposition de Fonds européen pour les affaires maritimes et la pêche (FEAMP). En revanche, le FEAMP financera des études pilotes et des mesures d'atténuation visant à réduire la prédation par les phoques.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2012/2012/cod-scow.pdf>

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003565/13
to the Commission**

Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE)

(27 March 2013)

Subject: Durability of marine ecosystems and increase in seal populations

Many scientific studies carried out in recent years have analysed and quantified the different kinds of damage caused by growing seal populations in Europe. Some studies establish a clear connection between the growing seal populations and the decline in fish stocks, which the Parliament itself recognised in two resolutions on 12 September 2012. The same concern has been raised by several Member States which actually control local seal populations: the United Kingdom (particularly in Scotland), Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Estonia and the Netherlands.

Member States themselves are bearing the cost of the damage caused by the seals. Sweden alone spent EUR 4.6 million in 2009 to pay for the damage caused by grey seals in fishing communities. The European Fisheries Fund specifically allocates funds to compensate for this damage in several Member States, including Ireland, Latvia and Finland.

Can the Commission explain how it intends to reconcile the need to manage seal populations with the protection of fish stocks, at a time when public subsidies are under pressure?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission

(17 May 2013)

The Commission is aware of conflicts between seals and fisheries, with seals affecting fisheries through damage to catches and gear as well as impacting directly on fish stocks through predation. However, the Commission would point out that fishing has a far greater impact on fish stocks than seals. Moreover data limitations make it difficult to determine whether seal predation significantly impact on those stocks (e.g. cod in the west of Scotland ⁽¹⁾).

The management of seal populations is the responsibility of the competent authorities in Member States. They must determine the necessary conservation measures in order to maintain or restore the favourable conservation status of all populations of seals covered under the Habitats Directive. Under this framework it is for the Member States to assess the state of the seal population. If necessary, they may take measures to reduce the seal population, as long as they are maintained at favourable conservation status.

The Commission is aware that funding from the European Fisheries Fund (EFF) has been used in the past by Finland and national funds in Sweden to compensate fishermen for damage caused by seals. However, such type of funding has not been included in the proposed European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF). Instead, the EMFF does provide funding for pilot studies and mitigation measures to reduce predation by seals.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication%20Reports/Advice/2012/2012/cod-scow.pdf>

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003566/13
aan de Commissie
Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE)
(28 maart 2013)

Betref: Misdrijven met betrekking tot wilde diersoorten

Het EU-actieplan voor de Overeenkomst inzake de internationale handel in bedreigde in het wild levende dier- en plantensoorten (CITES) werd op 13 juni 2007 aangenomen door de Commissie, in de vorm van een aanbeveling aan de 27 lidstaten. Dit actieplan moet ervoor zorgen dat in de Europese Unie beter wordt toegezien op de naleving van CITES. Ik wil graag weten wat de stand van zaken van dit actieplan is. Daarnaast zou ik een overzicht willen ontvangen dat ten minste op de volgende vragen antwoord biedt:

Hebben de lidstaten nationale actieplannen aangenomen om de handhaving te coördineren, met duidelijk omschreven doelstellingen en tijdschema's?

Zorgen de lidstaten ervoor dat alle relevante handhavingsinstanties over voldoende financiële en personele middelen beschikken voor de handhaving van Verordening (EG) nr. 338/97, en toegang hebben tot speciale apparatuur en relevante deskundigheid? Hebben de lidstaten bevestigd dat sancties voor inbreuken op Verordening (EG) nr. 338/97 een afschrikkend effect hebben tegen het plegen van misdrijven met betrekking tot wilde diersoorten?

Hebben alle desbetreffende handhavingsinstanties in de lidstaten toegang tot passende training wat Verordening (EG) nr. 338/97 en het vaststellen van soorten betreft?

Zorgen de lidstaten voor een adequate informatievoorziening aan het publiek en belanghebbenden, met name om het bewustzijn over de negatieve gevolgen van illegale handel in wilde diersoorten te vergroten? ⁽¹⁾

Kan de Commissie mij ook voorzien van afzonderlijke overzichten van de bestaande sancties voor misdrijven met betrekking tot wilde diersoorten per lidstaat en van de financiële en personele middelen per lidstaat?

Is de Commissie het met mij eens dat de huidige inspanningen, zowel op Europees als internationaal niveau, met inbegrip van de meest recente (financiële) initiatieven, niet voldoende zijn? Deelt de Commissie het standpunt dat misdrijven met betrekking tot wilde diersoorten, evenals de handel daarin, niet alleen via naleving van CITES kunnen worden tegengegaan, maar dat deze op alle niveaus moeten worden aangepakt? Zo niet, waarom niet? Is de Commissie op de hoogte van mijn actieplan inzake de handel in wilde diersoorten?

Volgens TRAFFIC (het netwerk dat toeziet op de handel in wilde dier- en plantensoorten) werd in 2012 elke 15 minuten een olifant door stropers om het leven gebracht. Als deze moorden in het huidige tempo doorgaan, zullen wilde olifanten snel tot het verleden behoren. De situatie van neushoornen en tijgers en veel andere soorten is zelfs nog nijpender. Volgens Europol hebben internationale criminaliteit, rebellengroepen en terroristen misdrijven met betrekking tot wilde diersoorten tot de op drie na meest lucratieve misdrijven ter wereld gemaakt. Het is een bijzonder winstgevend handel, waarin circa 14 miljard euro per jaar omgaat.

Is de Commissie het ermee eens dat dringend actie moet worden ondernomen, niet alleen om de meest iconische diersoorten van onze planeet te redden, maar ook om rebellengroepen en de activiteiten van terroristen een halt toe te roepen? Is zij daartoe bereid een reactie te geven op mijn actieplan?

Antwoord van de heer Potočník namens de Commissie
(7 mei 2013)

De Commissie werkt nauw samen met de lidstaten om de EU-regels voor handel in wilde dieren steeds beter te handhaven.

De lidstaten verstrekken informatie over de tenuitvoerlegging van de Aanbeveling van de Commissie C(2007) 2551 over het EU-actieplan voor handhaving (EU EAP) in de tweejaarlijkse verslagen die worden ingediend uit hoofde van de CITES-overeenkomst.

⁽¹⁾ http://site.d66.nl/gerbrandy/document/eu_action_plan_against_wildlife/f=vj7iilz6wlmw.pdf

De meest recente compilatie en analyse van deze verslagen op EU-niveau zijn online te vinden op:

http://ec.europa.eu/environment/cites/pdf/analysis_2009-2010.pdf

http://ec.europa.eu/environment/cites/pdf/compilation_2009-2010.pdf

De Commissie ziet toe op de tenuitvoerlegging van het EU-actieplan voor handhaving en zal overwegen of nieuwe initiatieven moeten worden gelanceerd. De Commissie beoordeelt ook momenteel de omzetting door de lidstaten van Richtlijn 2008/99/EG inzake de bescherming van het milieu door middel van het strafrecht, die lidstaten ertoe verplicht illegale handel in wilde dieren en planten als een strafrechtelijk delict te behandelen.

Vanwege het verband met georganiseerde misdaad en, in sommige gevallen, met vrede- en veiligheidsaangelegenheden, is de Commissie het ermee eens dat de illegale handel in wilde dieren en planten op een alomvattende wijze moet worden bestreden. De Commissie heeft kennis kunnen nemen van het door het geachte Parlementslid opgesteld actieplan, dat veel interessante initiatieven in die richting bevat.

Als een zeer concrete stap heeft de EU onlangs 1,7 miljoen euro toegekend aan het internationaal consortium ter bestrijding van criminaliteit op het gebied van wilde dieren (International Consortium for Combating Wildlife Crime of ICCWC), waarin voor het eerst een grote verscheidenheid aan deskundigheid (CITES-secretariaat, Interpol, UNODC, de Wereldbank en de Werelddouaneorganisatie) onder één paraplu bijeen worden gebracht. Ook zal zij ernaar streven het politieke profiel van dit thema bij haar partners en in het VN-systeem te versterken.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003566/13
to the Commission
Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE)
(28 March 2013)**

Subject: Wildlife crime

The European Community Action Plan on the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) was adopted on 13 June 2007 by the Commission, in the form of a recommendation to the 27 EU Member States. Its purpose is to strengthen the enforcement of CITES in the European Union. I would like to know what the state of play of this action plan is and I would like to be provided with an overview addressing at least the following questions:

Have Member States adopted national action plans to coordinate enforcement, with clearly defined objectives and time-frames?

Do Member States ensure that all relevant enforcement agencies have adequate financial and personnel resources for the enforcement of Regulation (EC) No 338/97, with access to specialised equipment and relevant expertise? Have Member States ensured that penalties for infringements of Regulation (EC) No 338/97 act as a deterrent against wildlife trade crime?

Do all relevant enforcement agencies in the Member States have access to adequate training on Regulation (EC) No 338/97 and on the identification of species?

Do Member States ensure the provision of adequate information to the public and stakeholders with a view, in particular, to raising awareness about the negative impacts of the illegal wildlife trade? ⁽¹⁾

Can the Commission also provide me with separate overviews of existing penalties for wildlife crime per Member State and of financial and personnel resources per Member State?

Does the Commission agree with me that current efforts, both at European and international level, including the most recent (financial) initiatives, are not sufficient? Does the Commission agree that wildlife crime and trafficking cannot be solved solely through CITES enforcement, but that illegal wildlife crime needs to be addressed at all levels? If not, why not? Is the Commission aware of my action plan on wildlife trade?

According to the wildlife trade monitoring network TRAFFIC, an elephant was killed by poachers every 15 minutes in 2012. At the current rate of killings, wild elephants will soon become something of the past. The situation of rhinos and tigers and many other species is even more threatening. International crime, rebel groups and terrorists have made wildlife crime the fourth most lucrative crime in the world, according to Europol. It is an extremely profitable business, worth approximately EUR 14 billion a year.

Does the Commission agree that urgent action is needed to save not only the most iconic species on our planet, but also to fight rebel groups and terrorist activities? Is it therefore willing to provide me with a reaction to my action plan?

**Answer given by Mr Potočník on behalf of the Commission
(7 May 2013)**

The Commission works closely with the Member States to constantly strengthen enforcement of EU wildlife trade rules.

Member States provide information on the implementation of Commission Recommendation C(2007)2551 on the EU Enforcement Action Plan (EU EAP) in the biennial reports that are submitted pursuant to the CITES Convention.

The latest compilation and analysis of those reports at EU level are available online:
http://ec.europa.eu/environment/cites/pdf/analysis_2009-2010.pdf
http://ec.europa.eu/environment/cites/pdf/compilation_2009-2010.pdf

⁽¹⁾ http://site.d66.nl/gerbrandy/document/eu_action_plan_against_wildlife/f=/vj7iilz6wlmw.pdf

The Commission scrutinises the implementation of the EU Enforcement Action Plan and will consider if new initiatives should be launched. The Commission is also in the process of assessing the transposition by Member States of Directive 2008/99/EC on the protection of the environment through criminal law which obliges Member State to consider wildlife trafficking a criminal offence.

Given its link with organised crime and, in some cases, peace and security issues, the Commission agrees that the combat against wildlife trafficking should be dealt with in a comprehensive way. The Commission has been made aware of the action plan prepared by the Honourable Member which contains many interesting initiatives going in that direction.

As a very concrete step, the EU provided recently EUR 1.7 million to the International Consortium for Combating Wildlife Crime (ICWC), which for the first time assembles expertise from a broad range of actors (CITES Secretariat, Interpol, UNODC, the World Bank and the World Customs Organisation) under one umbrella. It will also endeavour to raise the political profile of the issue with its partners and in the UN system.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003567/13

à Comissão

Nuno Melo (PPE)

(28 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Banca cipriota

Sabendo-se já em 2008, ano de entrada de Chipre na moeda única, que a sua banca era sobredimensionada em relação ao PIB do país e que tal situação poderia acarretar futuros problemas, pergunto à Comissão:

- Não se poderia ter previsto atempadamente os problemas agora verificados na banca cipriota, face às suas características?
- O reconhecimento, atempado, desses problemas não poderia ter evitado mais esta grave crise do euro?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão

(14 de maio de 2013)

A decisão de adoção do euro foi formalmente tomada pelo Conselho a 10 de julho de 2007 ⁽¹⁾. No momento da tomada da decisão de adoção do euro, Chipre cumpria plenamente todos os critérios formais, segundo a avaliação do relatório de convergência ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ http://www.eurozone.europa.eu/media/migrated/596488/c.decision_on_adoption_of_single_currency_cyprus_2007.pdf

⁽²⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/publication_summary443_en.htm

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003567/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 March 2013)**

Subject: Cypriot banking sector

Having known that the Cypriot banking sector was oversized in relation to national GDP when Cyprus adopted the single currency in 2008 and that this could lead to future problems:

- Could the problems now facing the Cypriot banking sector not have been foreseen earlier, given its characteristics?
- Could the timely recognition of these problems not have helped prevent this serious euro crisis?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(14 May 2013)**

The decision on euro adoption was formally taken by the Council on 10 July 2007 ⁽¹⁾. At the time of the decision on euro adoption, Cyprus successfully complied with all formal criteria as assessed in the convergence report ⁽²⁾.

⁽¹⁾ http://www.eurozone.europa.eu/media/migrated/596488/c.decision_on_adoption_of_single_currency_cyprus_2007.pdf
⁽²⁾ (http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/publication_summary443_en.htm).

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003568/13

à Comissão

Nuno Melo (PPE)

(28 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Restrições na circulação de capitais em Chipre

A medida de controlo sobre os movimentos de capitais no Chipre destina-se a proteger a economia cipriota de uma previsível fuga de vastas quantidades de dinheiro dos grandes depositantes. No entanto, vários analistas consideram a medida o maior risco para a permanência de Chipre no euro. Sem a capacidade de movimentar dinheiro de um país para outro dentro de uma união monetária, «o valor de um euro num banco cipriota torna-se significativamente inferior ao valor de um euro em qualquer outro banco da zona euro», avisa Guntram Wolff, do centro de reflexão Bruegel. «O que significa, de facto, que um euro cipriota deixou de ser um euro», prossegue, frisando que, com esta medida, se «introduziu uma nova moeda em Chipre».

1. Tem a Comissão consciência das consequências das restrições na circulação de capitais em Chipre?
2. Está a Comissão de acordo com as conclusões de Guntram Wolff, do centro de reflexão Bruegel?
3. Considera a Comissão que esta medida põe em causa a permanência do Chipre na Zona Euro?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão

(15 de maio de 2013)

Os Estados-Membros podem, em certas circunstâncias e condições rigorosas, justificadas por razões de ordem pública ou de segurança pública, restringir e controlar a circulação de capitais. Em conformidade com a jurisprudência do Tribunal de Justiça da União Europeia, poderão ser igualmente introduzidas medidas por razões imperiosas de interesse público geral.

Uma tal exceção ao princípio da livre circulação de capitais deve ser interpretada de forma muito estrita e não discriminatória, adequada, proporcional, e aplicada durante um período o mais curto possível.

Nas atuais circunstâncias, a estabilidade dos mercados financeiros e do sistema bancário de Chipre constitui uma questão imperativa de interesse público e de ordem pública que justifica a imposição de restrições temporárias à circulação de capitais.

Embora as medidas restritivas impostas sejam necessárias nas atuais circunstâncias, a livre circulação de capitais deve ser restabelecida assim que possível, no interesse da economia cipriota e do mercado interno da União Europeia no seu conjunto. A Comissão, enquanto guardiã dos Tratados, está a acompanhar de perto a situação e garantirá que estas medidas não duram mais tempo que o estritamente necessário.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003568/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 March 2013)**

Subject: Restrictions on capital movements in Cyprus

The aim of controls on capital movements in Cyprus is to protect the Cypriot economy from the likely withdrawal of huge sums held by major depositors. However, a number of analysts consider this measure the greatest threat to Cyprus staying in the euro. According to Guntram Wolff, of the think tank Bruegel, without the ability to move money from one country to another within a monetary union, a euro in a Cypriot bank becomes worth significantly less than a euro in any other bank in the euro area. He adds that it effectively means that a Cypriot euro is not a euro anymore, stressing that this measure has introduced a new currency in Cyprus.

1. Is the Commission aware of the consequences of restricting capital movements in Cyprus?
2. Does the Commission agree with the conclusions of Bruegel's Guntram Wolff?
3. Does the Commission think that this measure jeopardises Cyprus staying in the euro area?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(15 May 2013)**

Member States may introduce restrictions on capital movement, including capital controls, in certain circumstances and under strict conditions on the grounds of public policy or public security. In accordance with the case law of the European Court of Justice, measures may also be introduced for overriding reasons of general public interest.

Such exception to the principle of the free movement of capital must be interpreted very strictly and be non-discriminatory, suitable, and proportionate and applied for the shortest possible period.

In current circumstances, the stability of financial markets and the banking system in Cyprus constitutes a matter of overriding public interest and public policy justifying the imposition of temporary restrictions on capital movements.

While the imposed restrictive measures were necessary in the current circumstances, the free movement of capital should be reinstated as soon as possible in the interests of the Cypriot economy and the European Union's single market as a whole. The Commission, as the guardian of the Treaties, is closely monitoring the situation and will ensure that these measures last no longer than strictly necessary.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003569/13

à Comissão

Nuno Melo (PPE)

(28 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Setor público empresarial do Estado em Portugal

Considerando que:

Tem vindo a ser referido há muito que o setor empresarial do Estado Português, nomeadamente o setor dos transportes, está excessivamente endividado, referindo-se valores na ordem dos 20 mil milhões de euros; e que esse endividamento excessivo tem contribuído para retirar o crédito necessário aos privados, para que estes possam ter liquidez para investir, levando assim ao necessário crescimento económico.

Pergunta-se:

1. Tem conhecimento desta realidade do setor público empresarial português?
2. Não teria sido oportuno, aquando da negociação inicial do envelope de 78 mil milhões de euros para Portugal, ter sido prevista uma verba para a reestruturação deste setor, à semelhança do que foi feito para a banca?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão

(24 de maio de 2013)

1. A Comissão tem acompanhado de perto a situação financeira do setor público empresarial do Estado Português (SPE) desde o início do programa de ajustamento. O programa requer a apresentação de dados que incluem a prestação mensal de dados sobre as necessidades de financiamento do setor registadas e previstas, incluindo necessidades de financiamento para equilíbrio operacional, despesas de capital, pagamento de juros e reembolsos do capital da dívida. As reformas destinadas a conter passivos contingentes que emanam do setor das empresas públicas (SPE) e a melhorar a sua eficácia têm sido muito importantes no programa. Estas reformas permitiram ao setor alcançar um equilíbrio operacional até ao final de 2012, através de medidas como a racionalização do pessoal, tarifas que refletem mais os custos ou redução das derrogações das tarifas gerais. Além disso, em fevereiro de 2013 entrou em vigor a nova lei sobre governação das empresas públicas, que permite uma maior racionalização dessas despesas.

2. As reformas estruturais previstas no programa permitirão controlar a dívida do setor público ao longo do tempo. Os dados do Banco de Portugal sobre o endividamento indicam que o risco de exclusão do acesso ao crédito é pouco provável uma vez que a dívida das empresas públicas é relativamente pequena em comparação com a dívida global de todas as empresas portuguesas. Os empréstimos a nível interno às empresas de exportação têm vindo a aumentar desde 2011, depois de terem registado uma queda em 2010. O país enfrenta agora uma desalavancagem regular, dado que as famílias, as empresas e o governo acumularam níveis de dívida insustentáveis. Neste contexto, é normal que o nível global da dívida diminua e que as condições de acesso ao crédito sejam restringidas. Os dados sobre o acesso dos exportadores ao crédito provam, no entanto, que as empresas com planos comerciais viáveis não foram excluídas da oferta de crédito.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003569/13
to the Commission**

Nuno Melo (PPE)

(28 March 2013)

Subject: Portugal's state-owned companies

It has been observed for some time that Portugal's state-owned companies, particularly in the transport sector, are in too much debt, owing sums of around EUR 20 billion. It is thought that this excessive debt has contributed to keeping credit out of the hands of individuals, who need it to have liquidity to invest, which would lead to much needed economic growth.

1. Is the Commission aware of the situation of Portugal's state-owned companies?
2. Would it not have been judicious to have provided for a sum for restructuring this sector, as was the case for the banking sector, during the initial negotiations of the EUR 78 billion for Portugal?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission

(24 May 2013)

1. The Commission has been closely monitoring the financial situation of the Portuguese state-owned enterprises (SOEs) since the inception of the Adjustment Programme. The programme data requirements include the monthly provision of data on the past and projected financing needs of SOEs, including financing needs for the operational balance, capital expenditure, interest payments and debt principal repayments. Reforms aimed at containing contingent liabilities emanating from the SOEs sector and at improving its efficiency have been very prominent in the programme. These reforms allowed SOEs to reach operational balance on average by the end of 2012 through measures such as staff rationalisation, making the tariffs more cost reflective or reducing the exemptions from the general tariffs. Moreover in February 2013 the new law on SOEs governance entered into force, which allows further rationalisation of the SOE expenditure.

2. The structural reforms foreseen in the programme will allow controlling SOEs debt over time. The data by Banco de Portugal on Indebtedness indicate that crowding out is unlikely as the debt of the SOEs is relatively small as compared to the overall debt of all the Portuguese enterprises. Domestic loans to the exporting corporations have been increasing since 2011, after they registered a fall in 2010. The country faces now an orderly deleveraging, as unsustainable levels of debt were accumulated by households, corporations and the government. In this context, it is normal that overall level of debt is falling and the access conditions to credit are tightened. The data on the exporters' access to credit proves, however, that companies with viable business plans have not been cut off from the credit supply.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003570/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Análise do Tribunal Constitucional português a normas do orçamento de Estado 2013

O Governo português aguarda a decisão do Tribunal Constitucional no que respeita a algumas normas constantes do orçamento de Estado de 2013. O chumbo dessas normas pelo referido tribunal representará a quebra de uma receita significativa inscrita no orçamento de Estado.

1. Tem a Comissão acompanhado esta situação com o Governo português?
2. Considera a Comissão que existe uma alternativa para a quebra de receita anunciada, caso o Tribunal Constitucional chumbe as normas em análise?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(31 de maio de 2013)

Em 5 de abril de 2013, o Tribunal Constitucional pronunciou-se contra várias medidas do orçamento para 2013 com um impacto orçamental global de 1,3 mil milhões de euros ou 0,8 % do PIB. O Tribunal declarou, nomeadamente, inconstitucional o corte no décimo quarto mês de salário dos trabalhadores do setor público e pensionistas, bem como a contribuição para a segurança social sobre os subsídios de doença e desemprego. O Governo português convocou um Conselho de Ministros extraordinário em 6 de abril de 2013 reiterando o seu empenhamento nos objetivos do programa.

Por outro lado, em 12 de abril de 2013, o Conselho (Ecofin) e o Eurogrupo acordaram em prolongar os prazos de vencimento dos empréstimos do MEEF e do FEEF concedidos à Irlanda e a Portugal mediante o aumento do limite médio ponderado de vencimento do prazo por sete anos, tendo em vista apoiar os esforços destes países para recuperarem o pleno acesso aos mercados e saírem com êxito dos seus programas. No caso de Portugal esta decisão foi condicionada pela conclusão da sétima revisão do programa de ajustamento, tal como virá a acontecer.

A Comissão acompanhou e tem acompanhado de perto esta situação. As autoridades portuguesas convidaram a Comissão, o BCE e o FMI, a realizar uma visita a Lisboa, de 15 a 18 de abril de 2013, com vista a avaliar o impacto da decisão do Tribunal e identificar medidas compensatórias. Estas medidas devem garantir o cumprimento dos objetivos de défice revistos da sétima revisão — 5,5 % do PIB em 2013, 4 % do PIB em 2014 e 2,5 % do PIB em 2015. O Conselho de Ministros português de 17 de abril de 2013 preparou um pacote de medidas que foi integrado na análise mais abrangente da despesa pública anunciada pelo Primeiro-Ministro em 3 de maio de 2013. A delegação técnica de 7 a 11 de maio concluiu que estas medidas eram suficientes tanto em termos de dimensão como de qualidade para garantir a concretização dos objetivos entre 2013 e 2015. Estas conclusões foram apoiadas pelo Eurogrupo em 13 de maio de 2013.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003570/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 March 2013)**

Subject: Portuguese Constitutional Court analysing 2013 budget items

The Portuguese Government is awaiting the decision of the Constitutional Court regarding certain items included in the 2013 Portuguese budget. If the court rules against these items, it will represent the loss of a significant proportion of the revenue included in the budget.

1. Has the Commission been monitoring this situation with the Portuguese Government?
2. Does the Commission think there is an alternative to the aforementioned loss of revenue if the Constitutional Court rules against the items under consideration?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(31 May 2013)**

On 5 April 2013 the Constitutional Court ruled against various measures of the 2013 budget, with an overall fiscal impact of EUR 1.3 billion or 0.8% of GDP. In particular, the Court ruled unconstitutional the cut in the 14th salary of public sector employees and pensioners and the contribution to the social security of sickness and unemployment benefits. The Portuguese Government held an extraordinary Council of Ministers on 6 April 2013 reiterating its commitment with the programme objectives.

Furthermore, on 12 April 2013, the Council (Ecofin) and the Eurogroup took position in favour of lengthening the maturities of the EFSM and EFSF loans to Ireland and Portugal by increasing the weighted average maturity limit by seven years in view of supporting their efforts to regain full market access and successfully exit their programmes. For Portugal, this decision was conditional on the completion of the 7th review of the adjustment programme, which is now the case.

The Commission has been and is currently monitoring this situation very closely. The Portuguese authorities invited the Commission, the ECB and the IMF, to a mission to Lisbon on 15-18 April 2013 to evaluate the impact of the Court decision and identify compensatory measures. These measures should ensure that the revised 7th review deficit targets — 5.5% of GDP in 2013, 4% of GDP in 2014 and 2.5% of GDP in 2015 — are met. The Portuguese Council of Ministers on 17 April 2013 prepared a package of measures, which was embedded in the broader public expenditure review announced by the Prime Minister on 3 May 2013. A technical mission on 7-11 May concluded that these measures were sufficient in size and quality to ensure the attainment of the targets in 2013-2015. These conclusions were endorsed by the Eurogroup of 13 May 2013.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003571/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Preços da energia e das telecomunicações em Portugal

Considerando que o Chefe de missão do FML, Abebe Selassie, se mostrou «desapontado» com os preços ainda praticados em Portugal nas telecomunicações e na energia, pergunto à Comissão:

1. É também da opinião de que os preços da energia e das telecomunicações em Portugal são demasiado elevados?
2. O que tem sido exigido para que esses preços sejam ajustados?
3. Não considera que preços mais justos na energia e nas telecomunicações poderiam contribuir para o crescimento económico, face às poupanças que iriam gerar nas empresas e particulares?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(31 de maio de 2013)

Um dos principais fatores que contribuem para que os custos da energia sejam tão elevados em Portugal são os chamados «custos políticos», ou seja, as generosas compensações resultantes da extinção dos anteriores acordos de compra de energia e as tarifas demasiado generosas que são pagas aos produtores de energias renováveis que alimentam a rede. Outro elemento é a falta de concorrência no setor da energia. No setor das telecomunicações, os principais problemas são os reativamente abundantes obstáculos à entrada no mercado, o acesso limitado às radiofrequências para o acesso em banda larga sem fios e a falta de competitividade e transparência na prestação do serviço universal.

O Memorando de Entendimento (ME) celebrado entre a Comissão e as autoridades portuguesas no âmbito da assistência prestada pelo MEEF incluía diversas medidas específicas para resolver estas questões, nomeadamente: completar a liberalização dos mercados da eletricidade e do gás; garantir a sustentabilidade financeira do sistema energético, eliminando o défice tarifário; completar o mercado ibérico da eletricidade e do gás e reforçar os poderes da entidade reguladora; reforçar a independência das telecomunicações nacionais; facilitar a entrada no mercado através da concessão do direito a utilizar as «novas» radiofrequências para o acesso sem fios em banda larga a novos operadores; e reduzir as tarifas de terminação móvel.

A Comissão está de acordo em dizer que a promoção da competitividade dos preços da energia e das telecomunicações, através de um reforço da concorrência e da criação de condições equitativas, resolveria um grave problema estrutural da economia portuguesa e contribuiria para o crescimento económico. As medidas do ME acima descritas deverão contribuir para inverter a tendência de aumento dos preços, que no entanto são influenciados também por outros fatores exógenos.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003571/13
to the Commission**

Nuno Melo (PPE)

(28 March 2013)

Subject: Energy and telecommunications costs in Portugal

Abebe Selassie, the IMF Mission Chief for Portugal, has expressed his disappointment at current energy and telecommunications costs in the country.

1. Does the Commission also believe that energy and telecommunications costs in Portugal are too high?
2. What demands have been made regarding adjustments to these prices?
3. Does it not believe that fairer energy and telecommunications costs could contribute to economic growth, given the resulting savings for businesses and individuals?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission

(31 May 2013)

A main factor making Portuguese energy costs high are the so-called 'political cost', i.e. generous compensations resulting from the extinction of previous power purchasing agreements and over-generous feed-in tariffs for renewable generators. Another element has been the weak competition in the energy sector. In the telecom sector, the main problem has been relatively high barriers to entry, restrained access to radio frequencies for broadband wireless access, and lack of competitive and transparent universal service provision.

The Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) concluded between the Commission and the Portuguese authorities within the framework of the assistance provided by the EFSM included several specific measures meant to address these issues such as: completing the liberalisation of the electricity and gas markets; ensuring financial sustainability of energy system by eliminating the tariff deficit; completing the Iberian market for electricity and gas and reinforcing the power of the energy regulator; enhanced independence of the national telecom; facilitated market-entry by awarding new players the right to use 'new' radio frequencies for broadband wireless access; and lowering mobile termination rates.

The Commission agrees that promoting competitive prices of energy and telecommunications through enhanced competition and by creating a level playing field addresses a serious structural problem of the Portuguese economy and contributes to economic growth. The MoU measures described above should help curbing the trend of increasing prices which however are influenced also by other exogenous factors.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003572/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Desemprego e quebra do PIB

Considerando o seguinte:

Segundo um estudo de um economista português, o crescente desemprego dos últimos três anos levou a que se produzisse menos 91 mil milhões de euros, cerca de 55 % do PIB; com as previsões do desemprego existentes esses valores podem atingir os 142 mil milhões de euros;

Pergunta-se:

1. Tem a Comissão conhecimentos deste estudo?
2. O que tem sido feito para minimizar as profundas consequências na economia do crescente desemprego?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(16 de maio de 2013)

A Comissão não tem conhecimento do estudo referido pelo Senhor Deputado. Contudo, procedeu à análise da relação entre o PIB e a evolução do desemprego em Portugal. Por conseguinte, remetemos o Senhor Deputado para a consulta do «Programa de ajustamento económico para Portugal — quarta avaliação» («The Economic Adjustment Programme for Portugal — Fourth review») (páginas 11-12) ⁽¹⁾. Este mesmo relatório apresenta uma análise das medidas destinadas a melhorar o funcionamento do mercado do trabalho em Portugal, incluindo políticas ativas neste setor que facilitem um regresso mais rápido dos desempregados ao mercado do trabalho (páginas 35-36). A nível da UE, a Comissão apresentou várias iniciativas favoráveis à criação de emprego e à melhoria das políticas sociais. Estas medidas incluem o Pacto para o crescimento e o emprego, a Análise anual do crescimento para 2013, o Pacote relativo ao emprego dos jovens e o Pacote de investimento social.

(1) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2012/pdf/ocp111_en.pdf

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003572/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 March 2013)**

Subject: Unemployment and fall in GDP

According to a study by a Portuguese economist, rising unemployment over the past three years has led to production losses of EUR 91 billion, which is around 55% of Portuguese GDP. Current unemployment forecasts could see this figure reach EUR 142 billion.

1. Is the Commission aware of this study?
2. What has been done to mitigate the serious economic impact of rising unemployment?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(16 May 2013)**

The Commission is not aware of the study mentioned by the Honourable Member. However, the Commission has analysed the relation between GDP and unemployment developments in Portugal. The Commission would like therefore to refer the Honourable Member to 'The Economic Adjustment Programme for Portugal — Fourth review' (pages 11-12) ⁽¹⁾. This same report presents a review of measures to improve the labour market functioning in Portugal, including Active Labour Market Policies to facilitate a faster return of unemployed to work (pages 35-36). At the EU level the Commission has presented various initiatives conducive to employment creation and to improve social policies. These measures include the Compact for Growth and Jobs, the 2013 Annual Growth Survey, the Youth Employment Package and the Social investment package.

⁽¹⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2012/pdf/ocp111_en.pdf

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003573/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Consequências das medidas a serem tomadas em Chipre

Considerando que:

As medidas que podem vir a ser adotadas em Chipre podem acarretar duas graves consequências:

- corrida massiva aos depósitos, com a consequente falta de liquidez da banca cipriota; e
- grande redução do PIB, havendo especialistas que falam numa redução na ordem dos 30 a 50 %;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Tem a Comissão previstas as possíveis consequências, na zona euro, das medidas a serem tomadas no Chipre?
2. Poderá haver uma quebra da confiança nos bancos, que levará a uma corrida aos depósitos em outros países da zona euro, nomeadamente nos intervencionados?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(13 de maio de 2013)

Não obstante a dimensão reduzida da economia cipriota relativamente à dimensão da área do euro, a sua estabilidade financeira é importante para o bom funcionamento da área do euro. Qualquer desenvolvimento adverso pode ter implicações diretas para a Grécia e consequências indiretas para toda a zona euro, nomeadamente através de efeitos na confiança. Tal poderá constituir um risco suscetível de conduzir a uma nova instabilidade financeira que exija a adoção de medidas de correção adicionais e a uma nova perda de crescimento na área do euro.

Chipre é um caso único devido à dimensão do seu setor bancário (7 a 8 vezes o PIB), conjugado com a sua estrutura, nível de assunção de riscos e insuficiência de supervisão. Assim, as medidas são adaptadas à situação absolutamente excepcional em Chipre, com vista a restabelecer a viabilidade do setor bancário, protegendo, ao mesmo tempo, todos os depósitos abaixo de um limiar de 100 000 euros em conformidade com as regras da UE.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003573/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 March 2013)**

Subject: Consequences of the steps being taken in Cyprus

The steps that could be taken in Cyprus could have two serious consequences:

- massive deposit flight with the resulting lack of liquidity in the Cypriot banking system; and
 - a major reduction in GDP, with some experts talking about a 30-50% reduction.
1. Has the Commission planned for the potential consequences for the euro area of the steps to be taken in Cyprus?
 2. Could there be a loss of confidence in banks, leading to deposit flight in other euro area countries, particularly those undergoing bailout programmes?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(13 May 2013)**

Despite the small size of the Cypriote economy relative to the size of the euro area, its financial stability is important for the functioning of the euro area. Any adverse developments could have direct implications for Greece and indirect consequences for the wider euro area, *inter alia* via confidence effects. This could pose a risk to renewed financial instability requiring further mitigating policies and to a further loss of growth in the Eurozone.

Cyprus is a unique case because of the size of its banking sector (7 to 8 times GDP), combined with its structure, level of risk-taking and suboptimal supervision. So measures 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 EU rules.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003574/13

à Comissão

Nuno Melo (PPE)

(28 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Empresas de capitais estrangeiros a laborar em Chipre

Considerando que:

Segundo a imprensa internacional, os montantes russos «ilegais» depositados em Chipre serão uma pequena amostra, quando comparados com os negócios legais efetuados em Chipre devido à baixa carga fiscal. «Há tantas empresas russas registadas em Chipre para evitar impostos, que o país é já o primeiro da lista de investimento direto estrangeiro na Rússia».

Pergunta-se:

1. A Comissão tem conhecimento desta realidade?
2. Os interesses «legais» das empresas estrangeiras sediadas em Chipre vão ser salvaguardados quando se proceder ao programa de resgate?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão

(28 de maio de 2013)

1. A Comissão está ciente do facto de que Chipre é o maior investidor direto estrangeiro na Rússia (dados do final de 2011).
2. Foi realizada uma avaliação independente da execução da estrutura de combate ao branqueamento de capitais (AML) em instituições financeiras cipriotas, com a participação do comité Moneyval e de uma empresa internacional privada de auditoria. Na sua declaração de 13 de maio de 2013, o Eurogrupo acolheu favoravelmente a conclusão dessa avaliação. As instituições da Troica comunicaram as principais conclusões do Eurogrupo, devendo as recomendações com vista a retificar as deficiências ser integradas no plano de ação AML a ser acordado entre as instituições da Troica e as autoridades cipriotas na primeira revisão do programa. O plano de ação deverá visar domínios que abrangem a aplicação de diligências adequadas relativamente aos clientes por parte de bancos, nomeadamente através de uma supervisão adequada, bem como o funcionamento do registo de empresas, entre outros.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003574/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 March 2013)**

Subject: Foreign-owned companies operating in Cyprus

According to the international media, 'illegal' Russian deposits in Cyprus pale in comparison with legal business conducted there because of its low tax rate. There are so many Russian companies registered in Cyprus to avoid tax that the country tops the list of Russian foreign direct investment.

1. Is the Commission aware of this situation?
2. Will the 'legal' interests of foreign companies registered in Cyprus be safeguarded when the bailout programme is implemented?

**Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(28 May 2013)**

1. The Commission is aware of the fact that Cyprus is the largest foreign direct investor in Russia (data as of end-2011).
 2. There has been an independent assessment of implementation of the anti-money laundering (AML) framework in Cypriot financial institutions, involving Moneyval alongside a private international audit firm. In its statement of 13 May 2013, the Eurogroup welcomed the completion of this assessment. The Troika institutions have reported the key findings to the Eurogroup, and recommendations to rectify deficiencies will be integrated in the AML action plan to be agreed between the Troika institutions and the Cypriot authorities at the time of the first programme review. The action plan will need to target areas covering implementation of customer due diligence by banks, including through adequate supervision, and the functioning of the company registry, among others.
-

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003575/13

à Comissão

Nuno Melo (PPE)

(28 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Mortes em acidentes com bicicletas

Considerando que:

- Há cada vez mais cidadãos em toda a União Europeia a utilizarem a bicicleta, seja por questões de saúde, seja por razões económicas ou ambientais. Por outro lado, os dados relativos ao aumento dos acidentes com bicicletas resultantes em mortes têm vindo a revelar-se cada vez mais preocupantes;
- Em Londres, só em 2011, dos 16 ciclistas que morreram em acidentes de trânsito, nove envolveram camiões. Além dos mortos, houve 555 feridos graves, num total de 4 497 acidentes;
- Uma associação de ciclistas de Londres, com mais de 11 mil membros, propôs um novo desenho para os camiões, de forma a evitar acidentes fatais com bicicletas ou peões;
- Uma das associações, que representa algumas empresas que utilizam este tipo de camiões, já mostrou abertura para «considerar qualquer inovação no *design* do veículo que possa reduzir o risco de colisão entre camiões e qualquer utilizador vulnerável da estrada».

como avalia a Comissão esta medida?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão

(6 de maio de 2013)

A Comissão está muito empenhada em incentivar a crescente utilização da bicicleta: neste contexto, é importante ter em consideração as questões que se prendem com a segurança rodoviária.

A proposta da Comissão para a revisão da Diretiva relativa a pesos e dimensões ⁽¹⁾, adotada em 15 de abril de 2013, deverá conduzir a grandes melhorias em termos de segurança para os ciclistas.

Permite aos fabricantes de camiões conceberem cabines mais inteligentes, que contribuirão para melhorar não só o desempenho aerodinâmico dos veículos como também a segurança, designadamente no que se refere aos utentes vulneráveis da estrada, como os ciclistas e os peões. Essas cabines mais inteligentes permitirão nomeadamente ao condutor ter uma melhor visibilidade. Introduzirão também uma zona de deflexão que, num impacto a baixa velocidade, impede que os peões e os ciclistas sejam atropelados em caso de acidente. Além disso, uma zona deformável na frente da cabina reduz o impacto das colisões frontais.

⁽¹⁾ Diretiva 96/53/CE do Conselho, de 25 de julho de 1996, que fixa as dimensões máximas autorizadas no tráfego nacional e internacional e os pesos máximos autorizados no tráfego internacional para certos veículos rodoviários em circulação na Comunidade.

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003575/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 March 2013)**

Subject: Fatal bicycle-related accidents

An increasing number of EU citizens are riding bicycles, for health, economic and environmental reasons. However the rise in fatal bicycle-related accidents is becoming an increasing concern.

In London, 16 cyclists were killed in road traffic accidents — nine of which involved lorries — in 2011 alone. A further 555 cyclists were seriously injured in a total of 4497 accidents.

A London-based cyclists' association, with over 11 000 members, has come up with a new lorry design, to prevent fatal accidents involving bicycles and pedestrians.

An association that represents a number of companies using these types of lorries has said that it is 'happy to consider any innovation in vehicle design which could help reduce the risk of collision between lorries and any vulnerable road user'.

What is the Commission's assessment of this measure?

**Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(6 May 2013)**

The Commission is very keen to encourage further increases in cycling: in this context it is important that road safety issues are addressed.

The Commission proposal for the revision of the directive on weights and dimensions ⁽¹⁾, adopted on 15 April 2013, should result in significant safety improvements in safety for cyclists.

It allows truck manufacturers to design smarter cabins which will improve both the aerodynamic performance of the vehicle and safety, especially with regard to vulnerable users such as cyclists and pedestrians. In particular, the smarter cabins will provide for better driver vision. They will also introduce a deflecting shape which for low speed impact helps prevent pedestrians and cyclists from being overrun in the event of an accident. Moreover, a crumple zone in the front of the cabin reduces the impact of frontal collisions.

⁽¹⁾ Council Directive 96/53/EC of 25 July 1996 laying down for certain road vehicles circulating within the Community the maximum authorised dimensions in national and international traffic and the maximum authorised weights in international traffic.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003576/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Novas regras para combater a doença de Alzheimer

Considerando que:

- A agência que vigia os medicamentos e os alimentos nos Estados Unidos — FDA — mudou as recomendações para testar a eficácia de medicamentos no tratamento da doença de Alzheimer;
- Foi proposta uma nova regulamentação para promover estudos de produtos químicos que combatam a doença neurodegenerativa, com o objetivo de facilitar o desenvolvimento de tratamento dos sintomas avançados da doença e assim travar os sintomas de um problema que afeta milhões de pessoas em todo o mundo;

Como avalia a Comissão esta proposta?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(13 de maio de 2013)

A Comissão e a Agência Europeia de Medicamentos têm conhecimento do projeto de orientações relativas ao desenvolvimento de medicamentos para a doença de Alzheimer ⁽¹⁾ elaborado pela FDA norte-americana.

Na UE, as orientações científicas sobre os requisitos pormenorizados para demonstrar a qualidade, a segurança e a eficácia dos medicamentos, tal como exigidas pela legislação farmacêutica da UE ⁽²⁾, são elaboradas pela Agência Europeia de Medicamentos.

As orientações relativas aos medicamentos para o tratamento da doença de Alzheimer e de outras demências ⁽³⁾ entraram em vigor em 2009. Em fevereiro de 2012, a Agência publicou um documento de reflexão sobre a não-necessidade de reapreciação dessas orientações ⁽⁴⁾. Esse documento sublinha que uma atualização das orientações, neste momento, é considerada prematura, em virtude da atual investigação de base e clínica, em especial nos domínios dos critérios de diagnóstico e da potencial utilização de biomarcadores nas diferentes fases de desenvolvimento de um medicamento. No entanto, o documento de reflexão menciona uma eventual reapreciação de uma atualização das orientações em 2013.

Neste contexto, a Agência, no âmbito das suas interações regulares com a FDA, procede ao intercâmbio de conhecimentos e partilha abordagens científicas, inclusive no domínio da doença de Alzheimer, com vista a facilitar o desenvolvimento de medicamentos à escala mundial.

Além disso, a Agência presta aconselhamento científico às empresas sobre programas de desenvolvimento inovadores, no quadro das atividades de investigação e desenvolvimento em matéria de produtos farmacêuticos. Os respetivos pareceres sobre a qualificação, inclusive sobre biomarcadores e a doença de Alzheimer, são publicados no sítio Web da Agência ⁽⁵⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/UCM338287.pdf>

⁽²⁾ Diretiva 2001/83/CE que estabelece um código comunitário relativo aos medicamentos para uso humano, JO L 311 de 28.11.2001, alterada.

⁽³⁾ http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Scientific_guideline/2009/09/WC500003562.pdf

⁽⁴⁾ http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Scientific_guideline/2012/03/WC500124534.pdf

⁽⁵⁾ http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/regulation/document_listing/document_listing_000319.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac0580022bb0

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-003576/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 March 2013)**

Subject: New rules for combating Alzheimer's disease

The US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has offered new guidance on testing the efficacy of drugs used to treat Alzheimer's disease.

The proposed rule changes promote studies into chemicals used to combat the neurodegenerative disease, with the aim of helping develop treatment for the early indications thereof and thus forestall the symptoms of a condition that affects millions of people worldwide.

What is the Commission's assessment of this proposal?

**Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(13 May 2013)**

The Commission and the European Medicines Agency are aware of the US FDA's draft guidance for Alzheimer's disease drug development ⁽¹⁾.

In the EU, scientific guidelines on detailed requirements for demonstrating the quality, safety and efficacy of medicinal products as required by the EU's pharmaceutical legislation ⁽²⁾ are prepared by the European Medicines Agency.

The Guideline on medicinal products for the treatment of Alzheimer's disease and other dementias ⁽³⁾ came into effect in 2009. In February 2012 the Agency published a 'Concept paper on no need for revision of this guideline' ⁽⁴⁾. It outlines that currently an update of the guideline is considered premature due to the ongoing basic and clinical research, particularly in the areas of diagnostic criteria and the potential use of biomarkers in the different stages of development of a medicinal product. However, the concept paper mentions a possible reconsideration of an update of the guideline in 2013.

In this context, the Agency as part of its regular interactions with the FDA is exchanging knowledge and sharing scientific approaches including in the area of Alzheimer's disease, aiming at facilitating global product development.

In addition, the Agency provides scientific advice to companies on innovative development programs in the context of the research and development into pharmaceuticals. Respective qualification opinions including those on biomarkers and Alzheimer disease are published on the Agency's website ⁽⁵⁾.

⁽¹⁾ <http://www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/UCM338287.pdf>
⁽²⁾ Directive 2001/83/EC on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use, OJ L 311, 28.11.2001, as amended.
⁽³⁾ http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Scientific_guideline/2009/09/WC500003562.pdf
⁽⁴⁾ http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Scientific_guideline/2012/03/WC500124534.pdf
⁽⁵⁾ http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/regulation/document_listing/document_listing_000319.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac0580022bb0

EUR-Lex (<http://new.eur-lex.europa.eu>) joffri aċċess dirett u bla ħlas għal-liġijiet tal-Unjoni Ewropea. Dan is-sit jippermetti li jkun ikkonsultat *Il-Gurnal Uffiċjali tal-Unjoni Ewropea* u jinkludi wkoll it-Trattati, il-leġiżlazzjoni, il-ġurisprudenza u l-atti preparatorji tal-leġiżlazzjoni.

Biex tkun taf aktar dwar l-Unjoni Ewropea, ikkonsulta: <http://europa.eu>

